



**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
October 26, 2021
Virtual Conference
Palo Alto, California**

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Commissioners Present: Chair Anne Cribbs, Keith Reckdahl, David Moss, Amanda Brown, Jeff LaMere, Vice Chair Greenfield

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present: Council Member Kou

Staff Present: Daren Anderson,

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Cribbs shared that she and Commissioner Moss had a tour of the Junior Museum. She expressed positive comments regarding the museum and their experience there. She is excited for the opening, the staff, and the community, and she congratulated those involved in its opening.

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT

Mr. Anderson reported that staff installed two new signs explaining the rules for Cubberley synthetic field and track, general rules for those areas, including one that dogs are allowed on-leash on the track but not on the field. He appreciates the Vice Chair’s help in working with staff on finalizing that. On October 18th, he said, Council directed staff to move forward with formalizing the Parks and Recreation Commission's role for the Urban Forest Master Plan. He reported on the recruitment efforts for the Park and Recreation Commission. There was an extension of the deadline which extended it up until today. He had checked in with the Clerk’s Office last week and learned that they had six applicants. He will find out what the number is now that they've reached the deadline for submittals.



1
2 Mr. Anderson gave a brief update on the Rinconada Park Improvement Project . The
3 project is underway and is anticipated to be completed in January. He said the Second
4 Annual Jack-O-Jaunt will be held Friday, October 29th, 6p.m. to 8:30 p.m., at Lytton
5 Plaza. More information is available on the *Enjoy!* online page. He also shared that the
6 Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo will reopen with the completely rebuilt facility and re-
7 imagined visitor experience on November 12th, with a limited schedule. Staff are excited
8 to welcome everyone back, from November 12th through December 20th, on Fridays
9 through Sundays with morning and afternoon slots. This gives staff time to sanitize
10 between visits. More information is available at cityofpaloalto.org./jmz. Mr. Anderson
11 thanked John Aiken , director of the JMZ, for providing tours for the Commissioners.

12 Chair Cribbs invited questions from the Commissioners regarding the Department Report.
13 Hearing none, she closed the item.

14 **V. BUSINESS**

15 **1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the September 28, 2021, Parks and Recreation**
16 **Meeting**

17 **MOTION**

18 Approval of the draft Minutes, including correction on page 3, was moved by
19 Commissioner Reckdahl and seconded by Commissioner Moss. The motion passed 6-0,
20 by roll call vote.

21 **Ad Hoc and Liaison Updates**

22 Baylands Tidegate - Vice Chair Greenfield felt the ad hoc role at this point could be
23 changed to a liaison, since the ad hoc role was to get through the action of
24 recommending a PIO for the work to be done, and it is becoming more of a follow-up
25 role at this point.

26 CIP Review - Commissioner Moss said he and Commissioner Brown got a preliminary
27 list of CIP projects. They will meet early next month to review it. In the meantime, they
28 also passed it along to the Fundraiser Ad Hoc to see if they wanted to look at possible
29 early fundraisers.

30 Dog Park and Restrooms - Chair Cribbs said the restrooms project continues to move
31 forward. Regarding the dog park, they have not been able to organize a community
32 meeting.

1 Fund Development - Chair Cribbs said she had an opportunity to look at something from
2 the CIP. It appears that, in terms of doing some things that will make some sense, they
3 need to be a little more thoughtful about how they organized that particular ad hoc, but
4 she said they will let this go for a little bit.

5 Recreational Activities - Commissioner Reckdahl said they had a meeting last week
6 about the gymnasium and have been discussing locations in the city where one could be
7 located. They looked at the 10.5 Acres, Greer Park , Mitchell Park, and the Ventura
8 School site and wondered whether any of these would be an appropriate site to have a
9 city gymnasium. He stated that Cubberley is getting old and during the construction, if
10 and when it is redeveloped, it likely would lose at least some gym access, so they
11 wondered if it made sense to plan a gym facility somewhere else in the city.
12 Commissioner LaMere stressed it was a preliminary search for where a good location
13 might be. He also emphasized the lifespan of the Cubberley facility and the condition of
14 the gyms there. In addition, they felt that, because a city of Palo Alto's stature does not
15 have its own gym, it is something to look into and pursue as the Parks and Rec
16 Commission.

17 Commissioner Reckdahl added that they have no staff time and no money, so if they do
18 want a gym they're going to have to do private fundraising, which is difficult because
19 you can't have a plan without fundraising, but you can't have fundraising without a plan.
20 He said he would like to go forward and have a low level activity where they at least can
21 have some ideas that could be more formalized, and then go out for fundraising. He said
22 this would make it more about something real, not just asking for a commitment of
23 money. He suggested that it's easier to raise money by saying, "We need money for this,"
24 and show pictures and ideas. This is where they're trying to go to get enough "meat on
25 the bone" that they can raise money.

26 Chair Cribbs thought this was a good summary, recalling that the intent of the Ad Hoc
27 was to put together a memo in which they could come to the whole Commission in
28 November and get their support for moving forward, and at least have a community
29 discussion about the need for a gym and its potential location, as they shared with the
30 staff. She recalled that staff came back and said there are certain things the Council will
31 want to know before they go too much farther along. They will continue to meet in the
32 next couple weeks and hopefully be able to have this on the agenda in November.

33 Chair Cribbs said the other recreational opportunity is that they have met again with the
34 skateboard group, and they are talking among themselves about location and what the
35 park needs to look like. She thinks that part is moving along very well and hopes they
36 can come back to the Commission to have another discussion in November.

37 Sidewalk Vendor Policy - Vice Chair Greenfield thought this could be transferred to a
38 liaison role, or dissolved after it goes to City Council. Chair Cribbs thought this was

1 good news because that would be in keeping with the rules for an ad hoc. She said the
2 Committee had done a great job looking at all the possibilities, and it was very much
3 appreciated.

4 Aquatics Liaison - Chair Cribbs said it has been asked that the report about Aquatics
5 come back in January, and she thought that was fine. There is a group from Rinconada
6 that would like to meet as well, so that meeting has been scheduled.

7 Baylands 10.5 - Chair Cribbs Said she is still seeking a meeting with Rodrigo Baptista,
8 who was the Palo Alto Soccer Club representative.

9 Foothills Nature Preserve - Commissioner Moss said they have had several meetings and
10 another meeting scheduled in a week. They are rushing to get all of the remaining issues
11 they were talking about all summer to the Commission in neither November nor
12 December. They include the Gate D for bicyclists, videography, infrastructure, fees,
13 reservation systems, dogs, a litany of items. Commissioner Reckdahl added that, of the
14 long list, not all of them are changes. With some of the things they looked at, the results
15 are that they like it the way it is and are not going to change. Chair Cribbs asked if Mr.
16 Anderson had a date yet for the Council, or if it depends on when it can go to the full
17 Commission. Mr. Anderson thought they would schedule that after the Commission
18 discussion. From staff perspective, he said they are really looking at December as
19 opposed to November for the Commission to hear it, and then after that, the Council.

20 Cubberley - Commissioner Moss said many have read in the *Palo Alto Online* and the
21 *Palo Alto Weekly* that there have been some major discussions between the City Council
22 and the School Board about Cubberley. Notably, they have decided to use Cubberley for
23 a temporary school while they renovate and rebuild Palo Verde next year. The following
24 two years they will use it to house Hoover School while they rebuild Hoover School
25 from scratch. He said they promised that no current tenants will be displaced, which
26 means the reason they can't use the existing classrooms is because they are not to code.
27 They will be bringing in portables and putting them somewhere, probably the parking
28 lot, to handle all of this. They will use some of Greendell, but will not displace those
29 tenants.

30 Commissioner Moss said the last big thing is that the School Board made a
31 recommendation that they do not need the entire 27 acres for a new high school if they
32 ever want one. The new school is just a dream at this point and way out in the future, but
33 they would like to give back seven acres to the City, or sell it to the City, and only keep
34 20 acres. This would increase the City's acreage to 14 acres. He said there is a Cubberley
35 Master Plan, and when that happens, they would dust off that plan and adjust
36 accordingly. Referring back to the topic of finding a place for a gym, Commissioner
37 Moss said it would be nice if a portion of the 14 acres could be used for a gym, so that
38 they don't have to wait for everything to settle. Chair Cribbs asked Commissioner Moss

1 which Master Plan he was referring to dusting off. Commissioner Moss replied the
2 Cubberley Master Plan, the Concordia Plan, that talks about how the seven acres owned
3 by Palo Alto would be used, plus all of the seven acres they would get from the School
4 District, plus a little bit more. He thought that same plan could be used for the 14 acres if
5 this happens and could potentially be worked out with the City Council.

6 Commissioner Reckdahl added that this is a big change, but he thinks it will be more
7 compatible with their recreational uses. Chair Cribbs agreed and said it is good to know
8 that the School District has decided that neither staff housing, teacher housing nor
9 moving the District Office won't be happening at Cubberley. Commissioner Moss
10 wondered if Council Member Kou had any comments from a Council perspective. She
11 declined to comment on the subject at the time.

12 Palo Alto, City – Commissioner Reckdahl said the only thing of interest was that they
13 talked extensively about Cubberley.

14 Urban Forestry – Vice Chair Greenfield reported that on October 18th, the City Council
15 reviewed proposed updates to Title VIII of the Municipal Code, which is also known as
16 the City Tree Protection Ordinance. A small part of the discussion and action related to
17 Parks and Recreation Commission serving as a public forum for community urban
18 forestry matters and for advising Council on similar matters. He said two years ago when
19 Walter Passmore presented an Urban Forest Master Plan status update to the Parks and
20 Recreation Commission, both groups came to an agreement, in principle to do just that,
21 so Council's action on the 18th gives them the directive to move forward on it. He read
22 the Council's Action Agenda Item 13.h., "Direct staff to formalize a role in the Parks and
23 Recreation Commission on Urban Forestry Issues."

24 Vice Chair Greenfield said staff and the PRC Urban Forestry Ad Hoc had developed a
25 framework document almost two years ago. That group included Commissioner
26 Reckdahl, Vice Chair Greenfield, Mr. Anderson and Walter Passmore. It is the
27 framework for what the relationship will be moving forward. Mr. Anderson and Peter
28 Gollinger, who is the acting Urban Forester, along with Commissioner Reckdahl and
29 Vice Chair Greenfield, are the Urban Forestry Liaisons. He said they will review the
30 guidelines again, and they will go to the Directors for review. It is unclear if a municipal
31 code update will be required. Staff is looking into this. He said that may not technically
32 be required, which would allow them to move forward more quickly, but it may be a best
33 practice to update the code so that it is more specifically stated as a part of their purview,
34 as opposed to being in a catchall basket. Vice Chair Greenfield said this will be
35 happening over the next couple of months. He said they look forward to formalizing the
36 relationship and moving forward. He recently learned that the Parks and Recreation
37 Commission previously played quite a prominent role in developing the Urban Forest
38 Master Plan, including having an ad hoc dedicated to help craft the document, and he felt

1 this further illustrates the appropriateness of Parks and Recreation Commission having a
2 more formal role moving forward.

3 Chair Cribbs asked if Recreation would be adding a staff person to do this, or if it will be
4 handled by existing staff. Vice Chair Greenfield said the Acting Urban Forester would be
5 the Liaison, and Peter Gollinger is in the acting role at present. This would be the first
6 specific type of arrangement between Parks and Recreation Commission and staff
7 outside of the Community Services Department, and he thought this might require or be
8 best served by a change in the municipal code.

9 Commissioner Moss said he thought this was a major change to the Master Plan as well
10 and had something to do with the types of trees that people can plant, as was on the City
11 Council agenda item on October 18th. Vice Chair Greenfield said Council was
12 considering a major revision to the Tree Protection Ordinance, which has not been
13 substantively updated in over 20 years. He was part of a group of residents that
14 submitted extensive recommendations, which first went to the Policy and Services
15 Committee, Chaired by Council Member Kou, and from there it was recommended for
16 consideration by City Council. A final decision has not been made on the updates to the
17 Municipal Code regarding the Ordinance and the recommended changes. This will be
18 coming to the Parks and Recreation Commission as recommended by Council sometime
19 before April, when a final decision is due, likely January.

20 Council Member Kou thanked all the residents for their work on this, and said the reason
21 it is not adopted yet is that there needs to be some community engagement so that the
22 community can look at some of the changes to the Code. Vice Chair Greenfield added
23 that part of the community engagement will be coming to the Parks and Recreation
24 Commission for their input, as well as the community's input, at their public meeting.

25 Ventura Plan – Commissioner Moss asked if there was an update on when the Boulware
26 Park project will start. Mr. Anderson responded that they are looking to go out to bid for
27 the project in January or February. Commissioner Moss observed that it was supposed to
28 happen in 2021, but it will be in the fiscal year 2021, not the calendar year. He thought
29 there would be two parks done in 2021. Rinconada is started and Boulware is close.

30 **3. Update on Water Recycling and Palo Alto's One Water Plan Development**

31 Mr. Anderson introduced Karla Dailey, Utilities Acting Assistant Director for Resource
32 Management, and Karin North, Public Works Assistant Director.

33 Ms. North said Ms. Dailey would be leading the presentation, and she would help answer
34 any questions related to water recycling. She explained that Ms. Dailey is the lead utility
35 person who knows about drinking water. They are collaborating with Environmental
36 Services Division and Public Works, with Utilities, on a One Water plan, looking at all

1 water sources to potentially be used at parks.

2 Ms. Dailey began by explaining that the Utilities Advisory Commission is her normal area,
3 and Ms. North, Mr. Bobel and she have worked closely in the last several years on recycled
4 water issues. She has also worked with Mr. Anderson closely on water use in the parks,
5 particularly during the last drought, and they are rekindling those roles in preparation for
6 the current drought.

7 Ms. Dailey began by updating the Commission on the current drought. In April, the City's
8 water supplier, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), asked wholesale
9 customers to voluntarily keep water use the same as summer of 2019. The SFPUC
10 manages their system in a very conservative, responsible manner, so even though the rest
11 of the state is very dry, San Francisco system storage is in good shape. She explained some
12 of the numbers Commissioners may have heard in regard to the drought. In July, Valley
13 Water, who supplies water to most of the rest of Santa Clara County, imposed a mandatory
14 15-percent use reduction compared to 2019. She said Palo Alto does not take any water
15 from Valley Water, so there is often confusion when their system experiences different
16 conditions than the San Francisco system, which does rely heavily on the state water
17 project. That system is in a serious shortfall this year, as it is in many years that have low
18 precipitation. They are also having to rebuild the Anderson Dam for mandated seismic
19 upgrades, which is their largest storage reservoir. Without being able to use it in times of
20 drought, they are put at a real disadvantage, so they are in a much worse situation than
21 Palo Alto's own water supplier is.

22 Ms. Dailey related how, in July, the Governor declared an emergency and asked for 15-
23 percent voluntary reduction, but compared to a base year of 2020. A few days later, the
24 SFPUC mirrored this, to stay in line with the Governor, not because San Francisco's
25 system had significantly changed. In August, the State curtailed water diversions on the
26 Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, including the Tuolumme River where San Francisco
27 takes its water that it then supplies to Palo Alto. She said that on November 9th, the SFPUC
28 is likely to declare a water shortage emergency and ask for a 10-percent voluntary use
29 reduction compared to fiscal year 2019-2020. The reason for this is, in order to ask for an
30 exemption from the curtailments to diverting water from the river, there is a condition
31 upon them that they declare a water shortage emergency. She said there are a number of
32 different things going on, including San Francisco filing a lawsuit against the State,
33 claiming that the State doesn't have the right to tell San Francisco that they can't take
34 water off the river, and that the rights that San Francisco hold predate any oversight that
35 the State has. She said it is interesting that, ahead of the last storm, the State did put a
36 temporary hold on their curtailment order, so San Francisco and other rights holders on
37 the Tuolumme River were able to capture some of the rain and precipitation from the
38 storm.

1 Ms. Dailey said they don't know what the next few months will hold, whether the big
2 atmospheric river over the weekend was a sign of things to come, or whether they will go
3 back into a dry period. She said if they do continue to be dry, they will rely on their Water
4 Shortage Contingency Plan, which all urban water agencies, such as Palo Alto, are required
5 to revise at least once every five years, in concert with the larger urban water management
6 plans that they all have to have.

7 Ms. Dailey gave a high-level overview of what happens in various stages of water
8 restrictions. She said they start out focusing on their permanent water use restrictions as
9 well as doing a great deal of outreach. They then ramp up to no irrigation of turf within 48
10 hours of a measurable rain. The next stage limits turf irrigation to three days a week in the
11 summer, one in the winter. Next, it goes down to two days a week in the summer and one
12 day in the winter. At stage four, where it starts to get scary, she said there is no turf
13 irrigation allowed at all, and at stage five, no outdoor water use at all, except for trees.

14 Ms. Dailey said they have tried to do a better job during this drought with outreach on
15 helping folks take better care of their trees. She said they were not great at that at the
16 beginning of the last drought, and when the residents and businesses in Palo Alto did a
17 great job of conserving water, the trees started dying. So, Canopy helped them develop
18 some better messaging around tree care. She added that they worked closely with Mr.
19 Anderson and his team last time when they were looking at restricted days per week for
20 watering. Mr. Anderson helped them understand that the day restrictions are not feasible
21 for things like playing fields. They worked out an alternative irrigation plan where they
22 were watering as many days a week as they needed to, but with a water reduction target in
23 mind, and this worked well. She thought that, with the drought coming up, they will look
24 at this again and try to be ready for it, realizing that some of the large irrigators, as with
25 the playing fields, are doing a good job of using as little water as possible, and efforts may
26 need to be more targeted on the irrigation customers that are asked to do their fair share to
27 save water. She said one-size-fits-all type plans may not be best for the large irrigators.
28 She added that they have some tools at their disposal that they can use to determine,
29 hypothetically for a give area and vegetation type, the band of how much water should be
30 used on that particular piece of property, which could help identify the large irrigating
31 customers that may be using a little too much water. She pointed out the good news, that
32 if they reduce their water use to help out in the drought, they will also save some money
33 on their utility bill.

34 Ms. Dailey turned to the topic of the Palo Alto Water Supply Overview. She said 100
35 percent of the drinking water in Palo Alto comes from the regional water system operated
36 by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. About 85 percent of that originates in
37 the Tuolumne River, the other 15 percent from local reservoir and rainfall. Their demand
38 is about 11,000 acre-feet per year, which is about 10 million gallons per day. Currently,
39 they pay about \$2,000 per acre-foot for the water. She said staff tries to think of the ways

1 that they can use the right water quality for the right purpose when possible. She said the
2 purple pipe water is literally transported in pipes that are purple, to signify that it is not
3 potable. It is highly treated wastewater, but not high enough quality for drinking. It is used
4 for irrigating landscapes and can be used for toilet flushing, some industrial uses, and some
5 non-potable commercial uses. That same water can be further treated to make it drinking
6 water quality. Currently, the only thing that can be done with this water is called indirect
7 potable reuse, or IPR, which means the water has to be in contact with some sort of
8 environmental buffer for a given regulated period of time before it can be used as drinking
9 water. The most common buffer is to pump it down into the aquifer, give it time to flow
10 from one end of the aquifer to the other, and then draw it back out and drink it at that
11 point. Ms. Dailey explained that there are regulations in the works in California for direct
12 potable reuse. This would be taking that wastewater that has been treated to drinking water
13 quality and putting directly into a distribution system. She said that does not happen in
14 California yet, but it will happen, probably in the near future.

15 Ms. Dailey presented the challenges and uncertainties related to Palo Alto's water supply.
16 Drought related to climate change, changing regulations in the state, population, demand,
17 the economy are all uncertainties that they grapple with in the water supply planning
18 world. She explained that they are trying to look at water in the City of Palo Alto in a more
19 holistic way. They have been somewhat siloed in their planning in the past. She said her
20 group has looked fairly narrowly at traditional water supplies, such as what comes from
21 San Francisco, the groundwater they have access to in the city, and the demand side
22 management, or water conservation programs. They are trying to take a step back and do
23 a comparison between every different type of water that could possibly be used for
24 beneficial use in Palo Alto. In addition to the traditional water supplies, they are looking
25 at all of the possible different ways of reusing wastewater as well as stormwater. She said
26 using stormwater has the double benefit of keeping stormwater out of the Bay and
27 potentially helping to meet some of the water supply needs. Also, with onsite treatment,
28 some of the larger businesses in Palo Alto might want to treat some of their own
29 wastewater, or residents might want to do things such as having gray water systems at their
30 homes. She reiterated that they are trying to look at all possible worlds of water resources
31 as much as possible, and come up with a plan to address how to move forward.

32 Ms. Dailey explained that there are a number of other plans that have already been done
33 or are in process, and they don't want to reinvent the wheel or duplicate efforts. What they
34 are hoping to do is to take advantage of work that is or has been done and incorporate it
35 all into one big plan. She said they completed a plan a couple years ago, the Northwest
36 County Recycled Water Strategic Plan, in collaboration with the Valley Water. This
37 looked at all the potential uses for wastewater from the Regional Water Quality Control
38 Plant. They also have a Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan that is underway and are
39 trying to make sure the work they are doing uses information from that plan, but also fills
40 some gaps in that plan. They want to make sure that any thing they do does not contradict

1 their work around sea level rise management or flood management. Capital planning is
2 ongoing as well as green building efforts, and making sure all of those things are
3 considered. She said at the end of the process they are hoping for a 20-year roadmap that
4 will allow them to zig and zag depending on how some big milestones happening outside
5 of their control turn out, so that they are ready to implement the best water supply projects
6 possible for the city of Palo Alto.

7 Ms. Dailey listed a few of the different water resources that will be considered, including
8 SFPUC water, groundwater, basement dewatering water, as well as some high-tech
9 solutions, like atmospheric water generators that can pull water out of the air. She said
10 they do not want to dismiss any possible solutions in coming up with their plan. She
11 commented that the Parks and Recreation Commission focuses on the parks, and said it is
12 an important demand in Palo Alto with respect to water resources. There are many valuable
13 trees and community assets housed within the parks, not only the playing fields but other
14 spaces that are highly valued by the public. While there is solid evidence that the fields are
15 already being managed very efficiently, there might be some irrigated areas, including
16 Boronda Lake, which isn't an irrigated area but is a high water use asset that the City
17 manages, that might offer some opportunities to apply some alternative water supplies in
18 those areas, possibly recycled water, groundwater or stormwater. The goal is to address
19 some of the big non-potable water demands in the city and make sure they are thinking
20 about the best ways to do so.

21 Ms. Dailey shared an extensive list of the many criteria they will be using to rank different
22 water supply portfolio options. She said they have an RFP for consulting help, and in the
23 scope of work for the consultant they have also asked for help in brainstorming any other
24 criteria that they might be missing, as well as helping them come up with a methodology
25 for how to take all these factors into consideration when evaluating different water supply
26 portfolios. She said equity is one of the criteria and is one that they don't have a clear grasp
27 on how to apply it to the evaluation, but one that they feel is very important .

28 Chair Cribbs invited comments from the Commissioners.

29 Vice Chair Greenfield thanked the presenters for their detailed presentation and especially
30 the tree care messaging and the guidelines for tree watering during a drought. Given the
31 time investment required for care of this critical component of the natural infrastructure,
32 he thought the message to keep watering the trees is important. He enjoyed hearing the
33 overall idea of a holistic approach regarding water use, with Valley Water and the
34 Northwest County Recycled Water Strategic Plan on more of regional level. He wondered
35 to what extent other neighboring cities are looking at a holistic plan and how that would
36 fit into the regional picture. Ms. Dailey responded that a lot of their neighbors are thinking
37 along the same lines, but Palo Alto may be somewhat ahead of some of them. She said
38 that yesterday one of her colleagues in Mountain View asked if they could share the scope

1 of work from their RFP because they are trying to think about the same type of planning.
2 She commented that Valley Water is doing something a little different. Given that they are
3 the watershed manager, Palo Alto's One Water focus is a little different. Stakeholder
4 engagement will be very important in the process, and they will need to collaborate with
5 neighbors and other agencies in the region to ensure they are not stepping on each other's
6 toes, and considering options that are consistent with all of their objectives over the next
7 couple of challenging decades. She said the conversation is definitely being held across
8 many agencies. She said Palo Alto is a member of BAWSCA, which is a group of agencies
9 that all take water from San Francisco, and they plan to have some collaborative meetings
10 where they share ideas and information around One Water planning.

11 Ms. North interjected that the nice thing is there is the utility side for One Water, which is
12 very important, but also there is the environmental side for the green stormwater
13 infrastructure, which is a whole different group of people who they are collaborating with
14 on the stormwater piece. Then there is the recycled water piece as well, which is another
15 group they are collaborating with. She said it is complicated when there are so many
16 different entities that are involved in water, but the nice thing about Palo Alto is that, in
17 their plan, they are working together as a city, and looking at it holistically.

18 Vice Chair Greenfield asked if the structure within the Public Works Department is
19 changing at all, or if change is envisioned to create a more holistic, less siloed, approach.
20 Ms. North said the current structure is that everything related to wastewater and
21 stormwater is under the Environmental Services Division, within Public Works. Drinking
22 water is under Utilities because they actually run and operate their own utility. She said
23 the nice thing about Palo Alto is they collaborate and work together, and it is one city
24 function. Even though they are in different departments it doesn't mean they aren't talking.
25 She said Ms. Dailey and she get along well and are working on this together. Water is a
26 chapter in the Sustainability Climate Action Plan, and that brought all of them together to
27 come up with the idea for this One Water plan. Ms. Dailey said in a lot of cities, such as
28 Mountain View, they don't have a wastewater treatment facility in their city, so even
29 though they are in different departments, they have a huge advantage over some other
30 cities, and they frequently cross-collaborate. She said it is a very non-siloed relationship,
31 to the extent that it can be, within a structure like Palo Alto's.

32 Vice Chair Greenfield asked if there are any near-term updates that members of the public
33 will see as a result of their efforts. Ms. Dailey answered that part of their scope of work is
34 to hold public meetings and gather public input, and since they don't have their consultant
35 onboard yet, they are unsure what those will look like, but there will be opportunities for
36 the public to be engaged in the process all along the way. She mentioned that One Water
37 is one of the key actions, one of seven chapters, in the City's larger SCAP, and One Water
38 is probably the highest profile, key action in the water chapter. It is a high priority for the
39 Director of Utilities, the Director of Public Works, the City Manager, and all the way up

1 the chain. It is something they will be dedicating the resources to get it done.

2 Vice Chair Greenfield asked if there would be changes that the community would be
3 impacted by, as opposed to public outreach. Ms. Dailey said not immediately. Mr. Phil
4 Bobel interjected to remind the group of the \$16 million out of the water district to build
5 their first advanced wastewater treatment plant, where they are producing a much higher
6 quality of water and augmenting their current recycled water so that it will be less salty,
7 and better. He said he hopes that plant will be operational in less than two years. They are
8 in Design on it now, and he was excited to say they will be the second facility after San
9 Jose in their part of the world to have such a facility. Ms. North said most of that water
10 will basically produce enhanced recycled water for existing recycled water customers.
11 Within Palo Alto, that will be the golf course in Greer Park. She said the majority of that
12 water does go down to Mountain View, because of their transition lines of where the water
13 goes. They looked to the Northwest County Recycled Water Strategic Plan for a few
14 different pipeline options within Palo Alto, and at this point they haven't been bringing
15 anything forward to Council to expand that, but it is part of the discussion in terms of using
16 the right water in the right place. Vice Chair Greenfield thought this was great, and good
17 information that the Commission could use to help with community awareness of the
18 things they are doing for the city. He asked about the management of the fields and
19 wondered if that was in respect to water usage. Ms. Dailey said that it was appropriate,
20 given the various levels of drought they are in.

21 Commissioner Brown asked about the focus on water conservation for property owners
22 or residents, since the parks do such a good job. She was aware there are incentive and
23 rebate programs available for drought tolerate landscaping and wondered if they are seeing
24 customers take advantage of those programs, or if an additional incentive or permit
25 streamlining is under discussion. Ms. Dailey said they did increase their landscape
26 participation through the Valley Water rebate incentive. She said Valley Water administers
27 most of their water conservation programs, and they rely on them to get participation data.
28 She was not sure whether there has been an uptick in participation in Palo Alto, as there is
29 a bit of a lag in getting the data, but she thinks there probably was an uptick. She said they
30 do have an online store, where they are giving away showerheads and faucet aerators and
31 other less expensive devices, and they have been overwhelmed countywide with interest
32 in those devices. Regarding targeting other customers with respect to irrigation she
33 reiterated that they are looking at other large outdoor irrigators in Palo Alto, as opposed to
34 the parks. They have a tool available to those large, mostly commercial, customers who
35 have large landscape areas, and they can foresee using the tool to determine what the ideal
36 water use should be for their property, because some of them look like they could make
37 some improvements. She said those are the customers they want to work with, and time is
38 of the essence right now, to work with them and see if they can help them do a little better
39 with water use on their large, irrigated areas.



1 Commissioner Moss asked what the plan is for the large customers, like Stanford fields
2 and golf courses, the Palo Alto Country Club Golf Course, Mitchell Park, and the other
3 ten parks that all need the purple pipe water, not to mention the big residential properties.
4 Ms. Dailey responded that they do not supply water to the Stanford fields, and the Stanford
5 golf courses use groundwater. Palo Alto Golf and Country Club does use Hetchy water
6 and did a great job during the last drought, asking how much water they needed to save,
7 and then surpassing the number they were given. She said they've had this potential
8 recycled water pipeline plan for many years, and it would supply more of their own parks,
9 like Mitchell Park and could potentially go all the way to the Palo Alto Hills Golf and
10 Country Club, perhaps even up to Foothills Park. The project was analyzed in the
11 Northwest County Recycled Water Strategic Plan, and analyzed a step further with a
12 business plan around the project. She said it has been analyzed thoroughly, but Council
13 didn't feel comfortable moving forward with the project without stepping back and
14 looking holistically at all the different options for water. She explained that the original
15 impetus for the One Water plan came after they took the pipeline idea to Council. The
16 Council thought it was interesting, but wanted to know what all the other possible
17 alternatives were that they should look at before spending \$50 million building a pipeline
18 through Palo Alto.

19 Commissioner Moss suggested that there is also the School District. He said that would be
20 a tremendous opportunity, and he hoped the City Council would take it up again in the
21 near future, especially as the drought gets worse. Ms. Dailey said they would be looking
22 at it and all of the other alternatives they have identified. She said one possibility is that
23 the Council might decide that waiting for direct potable reuse makes more sense than
24 building a recycled water pipeline, because that water could go directly into the
25 distribution system already in the ground, and a big expensive pipeline would not need to
26 be built to deal with it. She said it's fairly obvious what some of the tradeoffs might be for
27 Council to consider.

28 Commissioner Reckdahl said he is on the Housing Element Work Group, and they are
29 looking at adding 6,000 units in the next eight years – 15,000 people and 25 percent
30 population growth. He is worried about how they will provide water for all those people.
31 Regarding smart meters, he said he has heard the best bang for the buck for conserving
32 water is to find leak detection, and smart meters are a good way to do that. He said smart
33 meters went to Council a couple weeks ago, and he wondered if that was just electrical or
34 if it included water meters. Ms. Dailey that water meters were included. Commissioner
35 Reckdahl asked if she thought it will be effective in finding leaks. Ms. Dailey said it will
36 help, and they have a tool they're hoping to launch in the next few months, home water
37 reports, that can also help detect leaks. Although the data is not as granular without the
38 smart meters, it will help them detect water use patterns that might indicate a leak. Smart
39 meters will be a major boon in helping people identify leaks early and get them fixed, and
40 save water and money.

1 Commissioner Reckdahl asked water percentage of water is currently used on landscaping.
2 Ms. Dailey said she could get back to him on that, but she estimated around 40 to 50
3 percent. Commissioner Reckdahl said when they did the Mitchell Park Community Center,
4 they dual-piped it, and he wondered if that was still being done. Ms. North said it was
5 something that the City of Mountain View has done, since they have a lot of infrastructure
6 for recycled water there. They are requiring anything over 25,000 square feet to dual
7 plumb. It gives an option in the future whether to use a recycled water pipeline, or if
8 stormwater is captured, it can be used for irrigation or for flushing. Ms. Dailey felt that for
9 the future it makes sense, because it keeps options open and it is a lot cheaper to dual pipe
10 a new building than to retrofit an existing one. She said they do have a recycled water
11 ordinance on their books, but the threshold is high for requiring dual plumbing, so it
12 doesn't usually get triggered with Palo Alto. It was lowered a bit in the last round of
13 building code modifications but it is still pretty high. She said in a recycled water deemed
14 area it is lower. However, the City doesn't have a lot of pipeline, so if it makes more sense
15 to purify the water and potentially do direct potable use, then they don't necessarily need
16 to dual plumb everything. She said they are struggling a bit in terms of what their path
17 forward should be.

18 Commissioner Reckdahl said at one time purple pipe was a hot topic, but it seems to have
19 cooled off. The cost of laying pipe is expensive. He remarked about Stanford sending their
20 waste to Palo Alto. Ms. Dailey said that is true, but they do have their own water utility
21 there. The purple pipe extended was for the Stanford research Park, but not the campus,
22 and not their golf course. Ms. North said Stanford is not purple pipe yet. It was in the
23 proposed Phase III of the pipeline, a pipe by Mitchell Park and then to Stanford Research
24 Park, but that's still what they've done the business plan on, and what they've been doing
25 analysis on. Commissioner Reckdahl asked if there were talks with Stanford for purple
26 pipe water, because they lost their purple pipe and have purple pipe there that they are
27 running drinking water through now. Ms. North said they may end up using a satellite
28 treatment where they take water from their existing wastewater collection and have a small
29 research Codiga Center that they may end up utilizing for purple pipe in the future. They
30 also have a lot of stormwater capture that they could utilize for their purple pipe system.
31 They're working on it through their own sustainability and water folks as well.

32 Commissioner Reckdahl noted that San Antonio Recycling Center was talked about last
33 week and asked if that is Valley Water's Phase 1 of their project. Ms. Dailey said that is a
34 separate project. Part of the agreement was that they received the \$16 million for the salt
35 removal facility, and another aspect of the agreement was that Valley Water has the option
36 to take about half of the effluent from their wastewater treatment plant and use it in other
37 parts of the county. They are looking at a lot of options, but one thing they are considering
38 is building a regional purified water facility at the old Los Altos Treatment Plant site, at
39 the end of San Antonio Road, near the Baylands Trail. Ms. North said they presented there
40 last month and have been to a lot of meetings in between. Ms. Dailey said it is one of the

1 things they need to consider in the One Water Plan, whether Valley Water does exercise
2 that option or not, and what impact it would have on the options that are available to them.

3 Commission LaMere said he hasn't noticed in a couple of years, but he used to walk
4 around his neighborhood and see new constructions, and they would be pumping water
5 from the basements and running fire hoses, and it would just go into the storm drains and
6 into the Baylands. He wondered if that would still be occurring, as it seemed like quite a
7 bit of water would be pumped from the basements and would run for several days. Mr.
8 Bobel said they have regulations that cover that, but doesn't prohibit it. It makes the
9 contractor and owner choose one of two options and try to minimize the amount of water
10 they are pumping out. The monitor it and try to get them to minimize the amount of water,
11 but there is no way short of not allowing basements. They have to do some of that to build
12 a basement. Usually, it's longer than three or four days. For residential they are trying to
13 limit it to two weeks, but for big commercial operations it will take at least a year.

14 Mr. Bobel said that a lot of water goes to the storm drain. In a typical year it's about 40
15 million gallons, which sounds alarming to many people, but trying to do something useful
16 with it is difficult. It is short term. They put a certain amount of it in trucks that were
17 required to take a truck a day and water trees at the direction of our Urban Forester, but
18 this is a small fraction of the total. He said it is such a large amount that comes in a short
19 period of time that it would be very difficult and expensive to try to get that to a better
20 location with trucks. Commission LaMere asked if 40 million gallons is a lot of
21 groundwater to lose or not. Mr. Bobel said it is hard to know, and they don't have all the
22 answers. They do know that it appears to rebound, especially in a normal wet season,
23 which they haven't had lately, but it does not appear that it is having a long term impact
24 on the groundwater. He said this is shallow groundwater, a different aquifer than the City
25 of Palo Alto's emergency wells tap into. The emergency wells go down hundreds of feet,
26 and they don't think they are affected by pumping of the shallow groundwater.

27 Commission LaMere asked if the pumping of the water has any impact on the surrounding
28 trees or vegetation. Mr. Bobel replied that they have thought about that and talked about
29 it. Their former arborist's opinion was that the average tree is drawing water from the first
30 three or four feet, and not significantly below that. The current forester agrees with that
31 assessment, as have others. He said the groundwater table that most people are pumping
32 is at least 10 feet deep, sometimes 15 feet deep, and this is not always the case. Closer to
33 the Bay, the shallow groundwater is fairly high and could impact trees, so they have to be
34 careful, but in the last couple of years, the basements have been closer to Middlefield,
35 where the groundwater is 10 to 15 feet deep, and they don't think it's really being utilized
36 by trees.

37 Chair Cribbs was glad to hear about the good work on the playing fields, and said they are
38 getting a lot of comments about the shape they are in right now, and she said she is



1 interested to know if there is anything from a water perspective that they should be, or
2 could be, doing to help the playing fields be in better shape. Mr. Anderson responded that
3 it is not so much the lack of water that has put some of the fields in less than optimal
4 condition. Rather, it is typically excessive use and also scaling back of some of the extra
5 renovations that they were doing before budget cuts. He said particularly Cubberley is one
6 example of where there is a change which is directly tied to that, and not for lack of water.
7 He said the AIP, the alternative irrigation that Ms. Dailey described that they had
8 implemented in the previous drought, was really about prioritizing water for high-use, very
9 important areas like a playing field, where safety is a concern, and being more conservative
10 in more ornamental, aesthetic grass areas. He said they still do that. While they are prudent
11 with water all the time, right now they are prioritizing use in the playing fields, keeping
12 the turf alive, and minimizing in other areas where it's really aesthetic, so there may be a
13 lot of brown turf in those areas. He reiterated that the playing fields are being adequately
14 watered; they just need more renovations and rest.

15 Chair Cribbs asked how much rain they got in Palo Alto on Sunday. Ms. Dailey said she
16 saw 2.12 inches at the station near the Bay. Chair Cribbs said it was good to see the rain.
17 She thanked Ms. Dailey for her input and the Commissioners for good questions. They
18 appreciate the work their team has done for Palo Alto.

19 **4. Update on the Status of Measure E Area at Byxbee Park**

20 Mr. Anderson handed the presentation over to Karin North, Public Works Assistant
21 Director, and Phil Bobel, Public Works, Management Specialist.

22 Ms. North explained that the Measure E area is adjacent to the wastewater treatment plant
23 in Byxbee Park, the former landfill. Mr. Bobel gave the presentation on this item. It is ten
24 acres of Byxbee Park which was de-dedicated and removed from parkland on November
25 1, 2011. The anniversary of that is next week, on November 1st. The objectives on this
26 item include a reliable long-term solution for organics, which are of three types – solids
27 from sewage treatment, food scraps that are now composted, and yard trimmings – green
28 materials from residential and commercial sites. Another goal is to reduce landfill disposal
29 of those organics, as well as greenhouse gas, because when they go into a landfill they
30 produce a certain amount of methane. They try to capture the methane, but it is far from
31 perfect, and methane is a much stronger greenhouse gas element than carbon dioxide.
32 Another major factor was to allow them to phase out the incinerator for the biosolids from
33 the sewage treatment. They have done that anyway; two years ago they finally got an
34 alternative technology and no longer run the incinerator.

35 Mr. Bobel shared the key features of Measure E. First, Measure E removed the ten acres
36 from parkland for a period of ten years. At the end of the period, as early as November 2nd,
37 the Council could redesignate the ten acres as parkland, because they have not moved
38 forward with a project. The use of the land was very specific in Measure E, It was for the

1 treatment of the three organics streams mentioned, using biological or equivalent
2 measures, so they were very specific in what they could do with Measure E. If they wanted
3 to do something else with it, it would have to go out for a vote again, and the residents
4 could qualify something for the ballot like they did originally, or City Council could put it
5 on the ballot, but the use could not be changed without a vote of the residents.

6 Mr. Bobel said Measure E was approved by 63 percent, which he thought was amazing.
7 They did not approve a project, but simply removed it from parkland for ten years while
8 they could work on a project and get it approved that fit the scope of Measure E. He said
9 they have tried to do this, and have had two RFPs which did not determine that those
10 projects would be cost effective or even possible, so the ten acres has gone unused and
11 remains as it was ten years ago.

12 Mr. Bobel showed a map and photos of the ten acres on the map, showing the landfill area
13 and old compost operation. He said that the entire area, including the Measure E site, has
14 been capped with approximately four feet of soil, and the area is a maze of pipes removing
15 the methane and removing water so it doesn't transmit pollutants downward, and removing
16 stormwater off to the side so it doesn't erode the facility. He pointed out that part of the
17 ten acres cuts into a steep hillside. He said it was never a great idea to try to build a
18 treatment facility on a hillside of garbage. The lower portion of three to four acres is fairly
19 flat and would be much more aligned with building something on it. When the two RFPs
20 failed to result in successful projects, several of the proposers tried focusing only on those
21 three to four acres. Even so, it did not appear feasible. He showed that if they were to try
22 to use the entire ten acres, it would be necessary to cut into the refuse, the garbage, making
23 for a difficult and expensive project, which is one of the reasons they did not go forward
24 with ten acres.

25 Mr. Bobel discussed the future possibilities of the ten-acre site. The two RFPs from
26 approximately eight years ago concluded that a facility was not cost effective. Also, it
27 would have been an experimental facility, because no one has combined those three waste
28 streams into a single treatment facility - biosolids, greens from gardens, and food. He said
29 nobody has yet come up with one treatment process to do all three. Not only was it not
30 cost effective, but they would have essentially been doing an experiment and a research
31 project. However, the good news was that they have taken those three streams and handled
32 them separately nearly as envisioned, just not within Palo Alto, which was the goal for the
33 people that passed Measure E. They wanted the treatment to occur in Palo Alto and not
34 have to transport it offsite. They are doing what was envisioned. The biosolids are being
35 converted to compost and an agricultural product and being used in the Central Valley,
36 fairly close to Palo Alto. The food scraps are going to a facility that Green Waste runs, and
37 the ultimate disposition is the production of compost, which is also true of the green
38 material from gardens. All are either producing compost or a soil supplement for
39 agriculture. The compost can also be used for commercial operations such as adjacent to

1 freeways.

2 Mr. Bobel said that it is now possible for the Council to return the area to parkland. If they
3 take no action then many possibilities remain open. With new technologies, he said it may
4 be possible to do what was originally envisioned. It may be possible that there is another
5 vote of the public to do something different with it, and that passes. Another possibility is
6 that the County Water District wants to build a county-wide facility to produce drinking
7 water quality water, and their second preference for a site would be the Measure E site.
8 Lastly, he re-emphasized that the ten acres could not be used, except as exactly prescribed
9 in Measure E, without a new vote of Palo Alto residents.

10 Chair Cribbs invited members of the public to speak.

11 Shani Kleinhaus said she participated in small groups that evaluated the submissions on
12 the RFP for the composting plant. She said the combination of three streams was never
13 feasible or a wise idea when looking deeply into composting. She said composting is better
14 handled in different streams. Otherwise, the result is the lowest common denominator. It
15 would require use of a lot of water, and the temperature is not right for the different streams
16 in the same way. Some can't be handled by human hands. She thought it was a nice idea
17 but not feasible, and now obsolete. She said there are always people wanting to do
18 something with parkland and ideas of how parkland can be used for something better, and
19 she felt they should protect and be very careful of them. Even before COVID and the Parks
20 Master Plan, there was a lot of interest in access to nature and recreation areas. With
21 COVID, that increased and is needed more than ever. Ms. Kleinhaus shared that she has
22 participated in other parks master plans in other cities and attended a lot of meetings of
23 parks and recreation commissions in the area, and everyone is struggling to provide
24 residents with enough active and passive recreation and access to nature. She
25 acknowledged things that Palo Alto can do and have done better than others because
26 they've reserved more land than many other cities. Some cities just don't have any land
27 reserved. They rely on school districts, and the schools district are now fencing their parks,
28 because of the security issues, so the neighborhoods suddenly have no parks. She,
29 therefore, felt it was time for the Measure E site to go back to parkland. She felt that it was
30 Commission's prerogative and responsibility to recommend this to City Council, to
31 rededicate the ten acres to parkland as soon as possible. She said it should have been
32 parkland all along, and recommended to not give an inch.

33 Hearing no other public speakers, Chair Cribbs invited comments from the
34 Commissioners.

35 Commission LaMere said he had no further comments or questions. He appreciated the
36 information, because he didn't know much about Measure E, and this was very helpful.

37 Commissioner Reckdahl mentioned purified water and wondered why it was not chosen,

1 as opposed to the San Antonio site. Mr. Bobel said he thought the main reason was that
2 the water district knew that it would require a new vote of residents, which was uncertain.
3 Commissioner Reckdahl wondered if it could have been functionally possible to put the
4 purified water there. Mr. Bobel thought it would have been. Commissioner Reckdahl
5 asked, if the area was made parkland again, if it would preclude advanced water treatment
6 at the site, or if the site could be reconfigured to have direct potable reuse from it. Mr.
7 Bobel said he didn't think it could be used if returned to parkland, but another possibility
8 would be to return most of it – the hillside, basically – to parkland, and then use the flat
9 area, which would require a vote of the residents. He said focusing on the three or four flat
10 acres would be more doable. Commissioner Reckdahl asked, if they wanted to put a direct
11 potable reuse facility in that general location, near the treatment center, if there were
12 options other than this ten-acre area. Ms. North responded that it would depend on the
13 size. She said the 25-acre facility treats about 21 million gallons of water per day, and they
14 are maxed out and currently rebuilding the whole facility. They are taking one portion
15 down, while running and operating the plant 24 hours a day. They don't really have space
16 to build another large purification facility within that existing footprint. They took the one
17 portion of the plant that wasn't utilized for the small salt removal facility, to produce an
18 enhanced recycled water site, but not for purification. They are really looking at the LATP
19 site with Valley Water.

20 Commissioner Reckdahl said it sounds, then, like there is no other use that they would
21 have for the Measure E land. Ms. North replied that regulations can change for the plant.
22 For example, she never thought they would rebuild their facility for nutrient removal,
23 which is what they are currently doing, and there may be other contaminants that may
24 require them to upgrade their sewage treatment plant in the future, so it's always good to
25 reserve a little space.

26 Commissioner Moss commented that the Commission wouldn't be having the
27 conversation if he hadn't heard through the grapevine from Enid Pearson and Emily
28 Renzel about eight months ago reminding him of this date. He gave them a shout-out for
29 bringing it up. Mr. Bobel said they are going to bring it up, and directly to Council as well,
30 and they haven't forgotten about the date.

31 Commissioner Brown said she had not been familiar with the intention for the site, and
32 considering the original use for the site permitted by Measure E, she thought of SB 1383.
33 She wondered if the output of the treatment facility, if it were possible could help comply
34 with SB 1383 requirements for compost and mulch. Mr. Bobel said he thought it would.
35 Given that the renewable energy offset requirements are not really realistic for the next
36 five years, but every jurisdiction is required to buy significant amounts of compost and
37 mulch, and there is no facility on the peninsula, Commissioner Brown wondered if it might
38 change the economics and should possibly be considered in the future. Mr. Bobel said they
39 are making compost out of all three streams now. He said there are other aspects of the bill

1 where they will have to do some things, but making compost with their products is not one
2 of them, as they are already doing that. Commissioner Brown said every jurisdiction, city,
3 county and agency is going to be trying to buy mulch and because they're legally required
4 to buy that amount and will be fined on a per-day basis for not doing so. It is creating a
5 market storm for compost and mulch, and she thought it might be a potential option or
6 opportunity to solve a problem that has popped up because of the bill. Commissioner Moss
7 asked her if she was suggesting expanding the current compost production, using the ten
8 acres to make the existing facility bigger. Commissioner Brown said she was just noting
9 the huge, state-mandated market for the purchase of compost and mulch beginning January
10 1, 2022, that should be considered. Mr. Bobel said they, too, have to deal with that. He
11 said they are producing compost, but at that point, they will lose control of it, and it's not
12 theirs anymore. It's Green Waste's, or the two facilities that take their biosolids from the
13 treatment plant. But it is their stuff, and they will have to comply with the same use
14 requirements as everyone else, so she raised a good point. Ms. North added that they are
15 going to Council on Monday in regard to the SB 1383 issue. She said Council Member
16 Kou will hear about it, as an action item.

17 Vice Chair Greenfield asked what the history was of de-designating parkland in the city
18 and if any staff members know how often this has happened in the City's history. Mr.
19 Bobel said it has not happened via a vote. He could not speak to whether Council has done
20 it, but a vote is not the only way it could occur. His understanding was that Council could
21 do it as well. He said it is the only time that a vote occurred and it was removed by way of
22 a citizen initiative. Vice Chair Greenfield said his understanding was the Council can vote
23 to dedicate parkland, but parkland can only be un-dedicated by a public vote. Mr.
24 Anderson said this is correct. Vice Chair Greenfield said that is the current ordinance,
25 although there may have been a time in the past when that was not the case.

26 Vice Chair Greenfield asked Mr. Anderson to speak to the value of the parcel for open
27 space conservation or recreation purposes. He wondered if there was a trail going around
28 the base, and if the upper areas were inaccessible. Mr. Anderson said there are no trails
29 going through the 10.5 acres. There is a large service road that is used as a trail at the base
30 of the 10.5 acres, and is partially on it. Mr. Bobel said the service road cuts all the way
31 through the rectangle and continues and people do use it as a trail. In his judgment, it is
32 not a particularly popular trail because it goes right by the sewage treatment plant and there
33 is some of the flare of the methane from the landfill. It also goes past the post-closure
34 maintenance facility. The access road is for the people working there to get to their work
35 area. However, he said, people do use it, because it does make a loop if someone wants to
36 make the largest loop possible. Vice Chair Greenfield thought it was fair to say the current
37 public perception is that the Measure E area is part of Byxbee Park. Mr. Bobel thought
38 that most people don't know that it is not. There are no signs to indicate this. Vice Chair
39 Greenfield said if it had ended up being developed as intended, he asked what the impact
40 would have been to the public, if the path would have been re-routed. Mr. Bobel said they

1 would have had a fence around the facility, so they would have created a trail around it,
2 with probably a different access point for vehicles. Commissioner Moss added that if and
3 when they develop the radio station land it will become a much more important
4 throughway. Even though it's not as useful today, it may become much more useful in the
5 future. Mr. Bobel concurred and said Shani and Emily and Enid would argue that a little
6 to the northwest of the corridor where the service road is, there is a corridor of vegetation
7 that is used by animals to go from one part of the Baylands to another. Vice Chair
8 Greenfield said that is very helpful, and thought that there are undoubtedly community
9 members who will raise the issue. He commented that it was an unusually divisive matter
10 in the community ten years ago, when traditional allies found themselves on opposite sides
11 of the issue.

12 Chair Cribbs and Mr. Anderson thanked Ms. North and Mr. Bobel for coming to speak to
13 the Commission. She said they are always looking for parkland to preserve and save and
14 take care of.

15 **5. Create an Ad Hoc Committee for the Measure E Area at Byxbee Park**

16 Chair Cribbs remarked that they must ask permission of the Council to have an ad hoc, so
17 rather than remove it from the agenda, she asked Mr. Anderson to perhaps find out whether
18 they can have an ad hoc or not, and they will decide after that. Mr. Anderson felt it would
19 be worthy of discussion to confirm that the Commission generally supports the idea and
20 then, if that is the case, staff would pursue whatever method Council would like for them
21 to do those check-ins. He said that this would be in addition to the work plan. It is not on
22 there yet, and they would need to ask Council first. He felt that the Commissioners should
23 talk it through and make sure they were likeminded that this is worthy of creating an ad
24 hoc, and that there are Commissioners interested in serving on it.

25 Chair Cribbs asked the Commissioners to indicate their interest in pursuing an ad hoc.

26 Vice Chair Greenfield felt in general they do not have much guidance from other staff
27 departments and City Council on the process for adding items to their work plan, so it
28 would be an opportunity where they could consider an action requesting that this item be
29 articulated and added to their work plan, and potentially create an ad hoc to support the
30 work plan. He felt it should be something simple, noting that Council has the option of
31 redesignating the Measure E ten acres as parkland, and Parks and Recreation Commission
32 would like to review future possibilities for the site and make a recommendation to the
33 City Council.

34 Commissioner Moss thought it was a great idea, but it is putting the cart before the horse
35 and that they need to wait and see what the City Council decides to do. Since they may not
36 see the ten acres go back to parkland, he preferred to postpone the discussion until after
37 Council makes that decision, which he hoped would be in the next month or two.

1 Commission LaMere agreed with Commissioner Moss, in terms of waiting to see what
2 direction Council goes.

3 Commissioner Brown agreed with Commission LaMere and Commissioner Moss.

4 Commissioner Reckdahl saw no compelling reason to not make it a park, given the
5 previous discussion, but he would also like guidance from Council, so would prefer to
6 wait.

7 Commissioner Moss asked when they could make an action to indicate to the Council that
8 the Commission fully agrees that it should be returned to parkland. Mr. Anderson said the
9 action is specifically to create an ad hoc, so he did not think they could make a
10 recommendation to rededicate it to parkland. He said they need to figure out the
11 methodology about how to add things to their work plan and how to ask that of the Council,
12 whether it is by a consent calendar item, because as far as he knew, no other Commission
13 has done it.

14 Chair Cribbs said her concern is the process. If they wait and the Council decides to not
15 return it to parkland, and doesn't get a chance to hear what they think, and they're
16 protecting the parks and parkland and trying to increase the amount of parkland, she
17 thought it would be better to at least see if they could get permission to have an ad hoc.
18 She said the other question was whether there are people interested in serving on an ad
19 hoc, if they were able to create one. Vice Chair Greenfield responded that based on what
20 he hears the other Commissioners saying, they would like to wait and see what Council
21 does before requesting to comment on this. He hoped that City Council would not decide
22 without making a referral to the Parks and Recreation Commission, as it would seem
23 appropriate that they would want their feedback on this. Also, he thought it was appropriate
24 to request the opportunity to provide feedback. He thought if the Commission feels it is
25 something they should comment on, then they should not take staff time and dedicate
26 resources on it until they get a green light from Council to add it to their work plan, but
27 voicing their desire to comment on it and asking for a green light from Council to do so
28 seemed more appropriate than waiting to see what Council does, without knowing what
29 their timeline is.

30 Commissioner Reckdahl inquired what scope they think an ad hoc would be dealing with.
31 He questioned whether it would be determining whether or not it should be parkland, or
32 looking at what they would do with it if it did become parkland. Vice Chair Greenfield felt
33 it should be partly determining whether it should be parkland. He thought it appropriate
34 for the Commission to review all the possibilities for the site, the prominent one being
35 recommending rededicating it as parkland, but in order to make an informed decision about
36 whether to move forward with that, they need to consider what the other possibilities are.
37 He thought this would seem like valuable assessment to provide to City Council to help
38 them make a decision.

DRAFT

1 Commissioner Moss felt it was out of their purview to consider what else could be done
2 with the land. He felt it would be strictly to use it as parkland, and the ad hoc would only
3 be to explore what they would do with it as parkland. Vice Chair Greenfield said what he
4 was suggesting was to make a recommendation whether they thought City Council should
5 rededicate the land as parkland or not. Commissioner Moss wondered if there was any
6 question about that. Vice Chair Greenfield said perhaps not, but to make a balanced
7 decision, they should consider all the information in front of them.

8 Chair Cribbs felt they should just ask Mr. Anderson to ask the question of whether Parks
9 and Recreation Commission can create an ad hoc to talk about Measure E, and see what
10 the answer is. When the answer comes back, if nobody wants to serve on the ad hoc, that
11 would be their answer. Vice Chair Greenfield offered that he would be interested in serving
12 on an ad hoc. Chair Cribbs asked Mr. Anderson if he could do this without expending a
13 lot of staff time. Mr. Anderson said he could and would work on it, because they need to
14 figure it out what the methodology would be anyway, but he also wanted to defer to
15 Council Member Kou. Chair Cribbs asked Council Member Kou to give her opinion in the
16 matter.

17 Council Member Kou shared that Council had stated that they would prefer to have
18 referrals given to the Commissions, rather than the Commissions taking on extra. With the
19 ad hoc committee, she thought it would be best for Mr. Anderson to find out before moving
20 forward on it. Mr. Anderson said he will look into it, and report back at the next meeting.
21 Vice Chair Greenfield asked Council Member Kou if she meant that the City Council does
22 not want any commissions to request to add work items to their load but rather just be in
23 a position of directing the commissions to do things. Council Member Kou said, if she
24 understood correctly based on the new procedures and protocols, there is a work plan that
25 is to be submitted by each of the Commissions and Boards to provide a work plan to
26 Council. She said the Council is also looking at staff time and shortages right now, and
27 they are a little more cautious about how much more to add to the workload. Since this is
28 at the end of the year, she thought perhaps it would best be further developed and further
29 clarified through staff whether it's okay to add more to the workflow right now.

30 Vice Chair Greenfield said he appreciated that there are a lot of gray areas in this process
31 and they have received very little guidance on how to create their work plan to start with,
32 what should be in it, and regarding ad hocs as well. He said there are provisions within the
33 BCC manual stating that updates to the work plan can be made by request to City Council,
34 so this is such a request that he felt would be appropriate. He suspected that there may not
35 be any precedent for this from any of the BCC's yet, so they are treading some new water.
36 Regarding the timing, he appreciated that they are coming close to the end of the year, but
37 the new work plans aren't due until May 1st. This year the work plans were reviewed and
38 accepted by City Council in June. With that in mind, he felt it would be appropriate to look
39 at how to add something into their work plan, so that it is in place, and they can move

1 forward with it early next year.

2 Council Member Kou felt it would be best if Mr. Anderson could just inquire and then
3 come back next month. Chair Cribbs said she thought this was the intent they were getting
4 to, for Mr. Anderson to make the inquiry and see what happens. They are all learning how
5 to live with a work plan, and with COVID on top of the work plan, but it will all shake
6 itself out.

7 Vice Chair Greenfield explained that the reason he indicated he would be interested in
8 serving on an Ad Hoc is if there is no one on the Commission that wants to serve on an ad
9 hoc, they should not request to form an Ad Hoc.

10 **6. New Rules for Pickleball Courts**

11 Mr. Anderson introduced Adam Howard, Community Services, Senior Manager.

12 Mr. Howard led a discussion on the possibility for new rules for pickleball courts. He
13 began by sharing the background of this item. In 2019, the Parks and Recreation
14 Commission recommended that the City Council adopt a Park Improvement Ordinance to
15 create a designated pickleball space in Mitchell Park. When they created the courts, the
16 court rules did not change, so all of the spaces have been operating under tennis court
17 rules. This was in order to move the process along and observe how things worked out
18 before jumping to new rules without fully understanding how the courts would be used.
19 There were two small paddleball courts which were underutilized, so they changed the net
20 height and repainted them to be better used for pickleball. They then bumped out an area
21 outside of what was Tennis Court 5, which allowed for two additional pickleball courts.
22 They also turned Court 5 into designated pickleball courts, which allowed for four
23 additional courts. At that time they also dual-striped the two remaining courts so that they
24 could be used either as two tennis courts or seven pickleball courts. Mr. Howard said they
25 did not update and create pickleball rules at that time, because they wanted to watch and
26 see how things worked. He said they did wait longer than they wanted because of COVID,
27 which created approximately a year delay in the process.

28 Mr. Howard said staff has worked with the Palo Alto Pickleball Club, a prominent
29 pickleball community in Palo Alto. There are over 700 members of it currently, and over
30 50 percent are Palo Alto residents. The Ad Hoc worked on this project, Commissioner
31 Reckdahl and Commissioner Brown, and what they wanted to do was create rules that
32 better directed the game of pickleball to try to ensure that they had a high utilization of
33 court space for the pickleball community. One of the biggest changes they prioritized was
34 that, with current tennis court rules, there is over an hour of wait time if the courts are full
35 and others are waiting, which creates a long wait time. Also, there is very little rotation
36 when it comes to tennis courts. The tennis players say if someone else shows up and
37 someone is waiting, they will not wait the hour. Since that won't work with the pickleball

1 courts, they were trying to create rules that were more fast-paced and allowed for more
2 rotation.

3 Mr. Howard said that the first new rule was that courts are open on a first come, first served
4 basis for both doubles and singles. The reason this was spelled out is that current play,
5 especially within the Palo Alto Pickleball Club, is that they play doubles when the courts
6 are full, because that is the way to get the most people on the court and how to get the most
7 utilization of it. They also understood that if two people come out that aren't familiar with
8 the club, they should be able to play a game on their own without having to possibly team
9 up with two other people they don't know, so it is spelled out that both doubles and singles
10 could play.

11 Secondly, if all the courts are full with people waiting, there will be a 20-minute time limit,
12 and players can rotate back onto the courts as many times as they desire. He said 20
13 minutes was a short amount of time, and he worried that for a family of four that came out
14 to play, 20 minutes is not a lot, but he felt with the high utilization of the courts and the
15 option of rotating back on, and there is a good rotation system, the 20 minutes would still
16 work for that family. They could go out, play for 20 minutes, take a break and get back on
17 to another court. Mr. Howard said they felt it was a good middle ground in terms of wait
18 time.

19 Next, because they want so much utilization and rotation, they put in the rules how to do
20 that. So, when courts are full, waiting players will put their paddles next to the court in
21 use, and when the time expires, the players will rotate off. If there are four paddles down,
22 all players will leave the court to those waiting. If there are two paddles down, the winning
23 team may stay on, or the waiting team may choose to play singles. Mr. Howard said he
24 discussed with the Ad Hoc the idea of three paddles down, wanting to make sure that if a
25 group of three came out they still had the opportunity to play. However, the more they
26 talked about it, the more they decided it might be putting too much information on the
27 sign. The Palo Alto Pickleball Club has communicated that putting three paddles down
28 would not be best practice in the pickleball community. Mr. Howard said since he has not
29 played much pickleball, he felt it important to listen to their feedback. There was also the
30 thought that there might be confusion – a party of two putting down their paddles who
31 want to play by themselves, and a third random person putting theirs down, and then
32 there's a group of three, which would be confusing, so the recommendation is to exclude
33 that part.

34 The next rule referenced double stacking of paddles, which refers to playing a game while
35 having a second paddle waiting on another court, and this is not allowed. Mr. Howard said
36 that the rules will be self-policed, but he thought if they were clear, concise rules on what
37 can and cannot be done, it would be helpful. The new rules will be in addition to existing
38 rules that are already on the courts. These include that an individual may not hold a court

1 when players are waiting. Court shoes only are allowed, no cleats. No wheeled vehicles
2 are allowed inside the fence. City permits and recreation programs have priority over drop-
3 in play. No private lessons are permitted. Mr. Howard said the Palo Alto Pickleball Club
4 was in agreement with all of the rules.

5 Chair Cribbs invited comments from members of the public.

6 Monica Williams, President, Palo Alto Pickleball Club, spoke on behalf of the club
7 members regarding the new rules. She thanked the Commission for adding the item to the
8 agenda and the Ad Hoc Committee for their work. She said they support the rules and
9 believe they will enable the pickleball community to continue to flourish. She thanked
10 them for removing the three paddles down clause. She said they need rules that are easily-
11 understood and fair to everyone, and the rules presented are excellent

12 Chair Cribbs invited comments from the Ad Hoc Committee.

13 Commissioner Brown said it was always the intent to create pickleball-specific
14 regulations, and they did a good job of incorporating elements from other jurisdictions by
15 doing a quick scan of other rules that are out there, as well as customizing them to Palo
16 Alto based on what has been seen in practice. The COVID delay allowed for more time to
17 observe how the rules would play out. She thanked the Pickleball Club for their input.

18 Commissioner Reckdahl thanked Mr. Howard for his considerable work on this project.
19 He said he likes the rules and thinks they will help the community. He expressed some
20 hesitancy regarding the 20-minute rule, as he could imagine some games taking 25.
21 However, the courts are a scarce resource, and he thinks the higher turnover will be a good
22 thing. It will keep people focused, and they will know that they can't lollygag since they
23 only have 20 minutes, so overall it makes the best use of the courts.

24 Chair Cribbs thanked Commissioner Brown and Commissioner Reckdahl for serving on
25 the Ad Hoc and Mr. Howard for working through it.

26 Commissioner Moss said he understands omitting the three paddles down and thought they
27 could either go to two paddles or to four paddles if they want to drag another person in
28 with their three. Regarding the 20-minute rule, he said if there is a long game, especially
29 for less skilled players, he doesn't know what will happen, whether people will kick them
30 out, or let them take a few more minutes to finish the game. He felt leaving it this way will
31 leave it up to the Club or the other players to decide.

32 Vice Chair Greenfield thanked Mr. Howard, the Ad Hoc, Monica Williams and the Palo
33 Alto Pickleball Club for their work. He said they have a strong pickleball culture within
34 the community, and trusts that if they have been consulted in what has been put forward,
35 including striking the three-paddle down rule, then he supports it. He appreciated

1 Commissioner Reckdahl’s hesitation about the 20-minute rule, but thought, given the
2 strong pickleball community and culture, if there is a game that needs to finish
3 appropriately, then the players waiting may have the option of allowing that to happen. He
4 questioned whether there is ever a case that there are so many people waiting to play that
5 they would want a second set of four paddles, or two more paddles down for the game
6 after the next game, whether that would be appropriate to include, or if it is never an issue.
7 Mr. Howard said they discussed that, and in most cases where that happens, there is
8 another row of paddles, and they create a line. He wasn’t sure they felt the need to put that
9 in the rules. The rules don’t say that only one group can be waiting, so he didn’t personally
10 feel the need to say that more than one group can be waiting. There have been times when
11 multiple groups are waiting. Commissioner Reckdahl felt it was implied that there could
12 be multiple sets of paddles. Vice Chair Greenfield said the way he read it he didn’t feel it
13 was implied and thought there could be a simple update to the language to say that multiple
14 sets of waiting players. He was interested in what Ms. Williams’ opinion would be in that
15 regard.

16 Ms. Williams said it would never be a problem because until 3:00 p.m. they have 15 courts
17 and people tend to place their paddles down, obviously, on an empty court. She said at
18 nighttime there are more people, but the pickleball way is not to put extra paddles down
19 more than the number of people who want to take that court, so the rules are excellent as
20 they are, and everybody will understand them as they are. She thought if you start putting
21 more paddles down, it could be very confusing. Vice Chair Greenfield said that makes him
22 wonder if they should make it more clear that it is just for the next game. Chair Cribbs
23 said, looking at the rules, they are simple, and she can understand them. She felt if this
24 didn’t work out, they could always come back and revise them. For now, she felt they were
25 good. She was happy to see the three paddles go away. Vice Chair Greenfield was
26 agreeable to this.

27 Commission LaMere commented that he is in support of the rules and appreciates the work
28 by staff and the Ad Hoc group, being able to get the stakeholders involved. He was in
29 favor of simpler rules. When playing any outdoor games on courts it comes down to people
30 doing the right thing and a bit of a social contract, and people having a good conscience
31 about how to play. He liked the framework of the rules and the simplicity of them.

32 Chair Cribbs noted the spirit about the pickleball members and players and how gracious
33 they are toward each other.

34 **MOTION**

35 Motion to recommend sending the new pickleball court rules, except omitting the three-
36 paddles-down rule, to Council to be included in the Field Use Policy was moved by
37 Commissioner Reckdahl and seconded by Commissioner Brown. The motion passed, 6-0,
38 by roll call vote.



1 Commissioner Moss asked if this would go to the City Council or the City Manager. Mr.
2 Anderson said it would go to the City Council. Commissioner Moss asked if it was possible
3 that in the future, this level of detail would not go to the City Council. Mr. Anderson said
4 they could check with the Attorney’s Office on this, but since the court usage policy had
5 gone to Council before, changes right now are appropriate to go back to them.

6 **7. Court Usage Policy**

7 Mr. Howard said this was an introductory conversation when they made the new courts,
8 and there were some policy decisions made at that time that they planned to return to and
9 see how things were working, specifically around the multi-use courts and the split that
10 was created for tennis priority versus pickleball priority. He reminded the Commission of
11 Courts 6 and 7 at Mitchell Park that are dual-striped so that there can be two tennis courts
12 or seven pickleball courts. The rules provided tennis priority on those two courts seven
13 days a week, 3p.m. to 10p.m., and they provided pickleball priority seven days a week,
14 8a.m. to 3p.m. If the court is empty, anybody can use them. If there are people from both
15 sports there, then the court goes according to the priority time as to who gets the space
16 first.

17 Mr. Howard said staff felt this was the time to start looking at how this is working out and
18 how the courts are being used, as well as all of the lit courts in Palo Alto. He thought this
19 was a good time to do this, with daylight saving time coming up. He did not have data as
20 to what this looks like currently, but wanted to advise the Commission and the public that
21 they will be starting to look at this. He also wanted to get the Commission’s input about
22 what information they would like to see, whether the policy needs to be changed, or what
23 “working” looks like for everybody. He said they had planned to do this at the one-year
24 mark, but that was not a good time, so they wanted to get to this now and hear from
25 Commissioners about specific data they would like to see, and questions for him to answer
26 when he brings this back. He said one thing staff would like to do is go out and get
27 headcounts about who is using the courts, the lit courts, to try to paint a picture of how
28 nighttime usage looks on the public courts in Palo Alto.

29 Chair Cribbs invited comments from members of the public.

30 Jocelyn Tseng [phonetic] said she is a pickleball player during days and sometimes at
31 night. She said it is quite amazing how much the sport has expanded and grown during the
32 pandemic. She said it has been her experience that at nighttime there are huge numbers of
33 people playing on the lit courts on the pickleball side, and it has caused a lot of waiting
34 during those times. She hoped that the Commission would take a look at where
35 pickleballers are able to play during this time and at how much the game has grown. She
36 said it seems that the popularity has outstripped the resources, and particularly in the
37 evenings there is a lot of disparity between the number of pickleball players who are
38 playing versus the tennis players. She said it would be a good thing if they could somehow



1 alleviate the pressures of the popularity.

2 Chair Cribbs invited comments from the Ad Hoc Committee members.

3 Commissioner Brown supported Mr. Howard’s comments about getting some data and
4 headcounts. They were interested in their discussion about looking at the lighted courts
5 around town. People like to go to courts close to their house or close to where they work,
6 so considering all of that in the analysis. She thought the timing, with daylight saving time
7 coming up, is perfect to be able to get some good information.

8 Commissioner Reckdahl said whenever he goes through Mitchell Park, there always seems
9 to be a crowd around the pickleball, so he thinks they are not serving the pickleball
10 community as much as they should, and he would like to see a better headcount.

11 Commissioner Moss commented that they might kill the golden goose if they try to
12 squeeze too many more people onto the courts. He encouraged the pickleball community
13 to get other cities to add courts so that they don’t totally wreck what they have. He said he
14 lives close to Cubberley and would like Mr. Howard to look at whether or not they could
15 resurface the Cubberley courts, even though the whole Cubberley site is in limbo. He felt
16 it would probably be very inexpensive to resurface the courts, and they talked about the
17 fact that it is possible to put temporary lights onto to the Cubberley courts, like \$1,000 per
18 light per month, approximately. He encouraged the City to look at the possibility of
19 lighting and resurfacing Cubberley, and also remarked that none of the schools have
20 lighted courts, and maybe the temporary lighting could be used there as well. He
21 encouraged the Commission to look at all of those options.

22 Chair Cribbs said she has heard good comments about the temporary lights in Cubberley.
23 She assured them she didn’t think they would kill the golden goose, because so many cities
24 in the Bay Area and beyond are maintaining and creating pickleball courts, and lighted
25 ones, not just in Palo Alto, but it is spreading everywhere.

26 Commission LaMere said it was exciting to see how much use the courts are getting. He
27 agreed with the Ad Hoc and Mr. Howard about needing to collect data before they can
28 figure out the best path forward, and to be able to see how the courts are being used in the
29 other areas with the lights. He was excited to see if they can collect the information, and it
30 is a perfect time, with daylight saving time starting. He appreciated the hard work on this.

31 Vice Chair Greenfield asked for clarification on how the rules work right now. If tennis is
32 being played on a court during pickleball priority time, he wondered how long the tennis
33 players are allowed to continue before they have to vacate for pickleball use, and vice
34 versa for pickleball during tennis time. Mr. Howard said they should vacate as soon as the
35 priority sport arrives if all other courts are full. Vice Chair Greenfield said it’s not a 20-
36 minute time, or one-hour time, but basically pack up your things, finish the ball in play, et

1 cetera. Mr. Howard said that is correct. Vice Chair Greenfield asked if there is any
2 information on how well that works or if it is ever contentious. Mr. Howard said there
3 have been no formal complaints. When it is most clearly an issue is in the evenings. He
4 does hear from pickleball players that it's frustrating to have eight or twelve people have
5 to get off the temporary courts in order for two people to play tennis. However, the
6 pickleball community, from what he has heard, has always been very good about doing
7 just that and respecting those times. He typically does hear about it, however. and they do
8 get removed because there are no other lit tennis courts at Mitchell. Vice Chair Greenfield
9 said he assumed the tennis players would go to an open court if possible. Mr. Howard said
10 yes, and this is on the signage, that all other courts have to be used first, before they come
11 to the multi-use courts, for both sports. Vice Chair Greenfield thanked Mr. Howard for his
12 efforts and said the data is important. It is easy to appreciate the pickleball community and
13 how much it has flourished. He said the numbers speak well, but in terms of how many
14 people they get on a court, it's very easy to see and understand. At the same time, they
15 need to hear from the tennis community, and if looking at increasing access for pickleball,
16 of course, they need to understand from the tennis community what the best compromises
17 are that could potentially be made.

18 Chair Cribbs said she is excited to see the data when it comes back and see what the court
19 usage is and then discuss if there's anything that the community can do to help both tennis
20 and pickleball people get the access that they need.

21 **VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR THE NOVEMBER 17, 2021 MEETING**

22 Mr. Anderson said there are a number of potential items, including the court usage and
23 Friends of Palo Alto Parks and Rec Foundation possibly in December. Chair Cribbs
24 thought that would maybe tie into the fund raising plan they are working on, and if that
25 could come together with the Friends of the Park as well, it might be a good thing for a
26 discussion. Mr. Anderson asked her if it would be November or December. Chair Cribbs
27 thought November, but was not sure. Vice Chair Greenfield said it sounds like if they
28 could get the gym and fundraising into November, it would fit in the schedule the best.
29 Vice Chair Greenfield said he understood the annual Aquatics update is being pushed out
30 to January. Mr. Anderson said they were thinking that they would have the golf update at
31 the same time, from Mr. Do, but it doesn't have to be that way. Vice Chair Greenfield
32 asked if there would be any value in hearing from the vendor. Mr. Anderson said possibly,
33 and that they just got a new general manager. As that person gets settled and develops their
34 program it is possible they could incorporate him into the presentation. He will work with
35 him on that. Chair Cribbs thought this was a good idea.

36 Vice Chair Greenfield mentioned that the Tree Protection Ordinance review would be
37 coming up, perhaps in January.

1 Commissioner Moss asked for an update on the CIPs sometime – perhaps December or
2 January – the process and what needs to be done. Mr. Anderson said they are still waiting
3 for direction from the Administrative Services Department, who provides the guidance
4 and timeframes for when each department is to submit their capital budget requests. He
5 said it is iterative. He suggested that they meet with the Ad Hoc and share an early iteration
6 of what the Department is thinking about for priorities for that five-year cycle. They will
7 then come to the full Commission in December or January. Mr. Do agreed and said he
8 thought they would meet with the Ad Hoc in the second week of November to
9 preliminarily discuss new items, since they don't know the direction at this point, but they
10 could shuffle and re-prioritize what is currently in the five-year plan and see if there is
11 value in defining an earlier for the funding.

12 Mr. Anderson said the December meeting would be potentially for coming back with the
13 court usage, per a message from Mr. Howard.

14 Vice Chair Greenfield asked when the CIPs come to the Commission, and if it is a
15 discussion item for making recommendations to staff for the budgeting, or if it is an action
16 that goes before the Council. Mr. Anderson said it is just for guidance to staff on priorities.
17 It is very iterative, with back-and-forth and changes so often that it is hard to have a
18 preferred recommendation. He has never seen that happen in his time with the City.
19 Commissioner Moss felt you have to decide what the possibilities are and then find out
20 about the budget and then possibly re-prioritize, and it will be a back-and-forth for a couple
21 of months, and then finalized somewhere around March. Mr. Anderson said this is correct
22 for the most part, although there are elements that are a little out of their control, and the
23 other department that leads the endeavor is under different constraints, occasionally
24 making the turn-around time very fast. He said they do the best they can. He said Mr. Do
25 and he will do the prep work with the Ad Hoc so that they get a chance to discuss it with
26 the PRC and have a public discussion as much as possible.

27 **VII. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

28 Commissioner Moss said he got a lot of feedback from his opinion piece in the Palo Alto
29 Weekly, October 1st, hoping that people would try to apply for a Commission position. He
30 was glad that there is good interest in the community. He commented that if the Parks and
31 Recreation Commission has enough people applying and other commissions don't, he
32 wondered if the City Council can choose people for the Parks and Recreation Commission
33 without waiting for the other commissions. Mr. Anderson thought this was a good question
34 for the Clerk's Office, and he will check with them. Commissioner Reckdahl said this has
35 happened in the past. They've had enough for one commission and will vote on those, and
36 then push out the other ones. Commissioner Moss was trying to figure out if there will be
37 enough to decide in December, or not until January or February. Chair Cribbs thought

1 there were six so far, and thinks they're doing well. She added that everyone knows that
2 this is the fun Commission. Vice Chair Greenfield was quite sure there are more than six.

3 Chair Cribbs asked Mr. Anderson to mention the film festival going on in the city. Mr.
4 Anderson did not have his notes, but said he will send it out in a special email to the full
5 Commission with all the details. Chair Cribbs said there are a couple evenings left. It is in
6 Mitchell Park in East Palo Alto and very widely acclaimed. It has been going on for 20
7 years, and is probably a very well-kept secret. She said it is being heavily covered in the
8 *Palo Alto Weekly*.

9 Council Member Kou affirmed this is a very fun committee.

10 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

11 Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Reckdahl, seconded by Vice Chair Greenfield.

12 Meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.