



**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
February 11, 2022
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

Commissioners Present: Chair Greenfield and Vice Chair LaMere; Commissioners Nellis Freeman, Shani Kleinhaus, Anne Cribbs and Amanda Brown

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present: Council Member Tom DuBois

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Lam Do and Kristen O’Kane, Adam Howard, Megha Bansal, and Peter Jensen

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Chair Greenfield welcomed the group to the 2022 Annual Parks and Recreation Commission Retreat.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS

Chair Greenfield invited any questions or suggestions on the detailed agenda that was sent out earlier. He noted a few housekeeping matters that the Vice Chair LaMere and he had discussed. First, at the recommendation of former Chair Cribbs, the Parks and Recreation website needs a refresh and an update, so that will be a focus. They will probably set up an ad hoc group to work on that with staff. He said they will all need to do their own part in that, including submitting bios to add to the website. In addition, the new members need to be set up appropriately on the website. They also need to make sure there is a photo for everyone, and the minutes from previous meetings need to be refreshed and easily accessible as a link from the website. They also want to look at what documents and what



1 plans should be readily accessible.

2 Chair Greenfield said current terms will be ending on March 31st, as opposed to December
3 15th. They have been extended as part of the effort to align the timeframe for when all
4 boards and commission members are appointed. The first day of the new Commission will
5 be April 1st instead of December 16th, as it has been. As a result, their next retreat is likely
6 to happen sometime in May of 2023. Their next work plan, which they would be
7 discussing, will be for the 15-month timeframe as well. This is a one-time transitional
8 change.

9 **III. BUSINESS**

10 **1. Review 2021 Parks and Recreation Commission Priorities and**
11 **Accomplishments**

12 Vice Chair LaMere reviewed highlights of 2021. It was a busy time for the Parks and
13 Recreation Commission from early 2021 into early 2022. Since the last retreat on March
14 12, 2021, the Commission continued to meet remotely and held 11 public meetings. With
15 an emphasis on the Council-directed work plan, the Commission was very active. The
16 Commission held discussion and took action on 15 items. The Commission nudged along
17 recreation projects, tackled rules updates for court usage and policy updates for Foothills
18 Preserve, and provided a forum for discussion on topics ranging from fundraising to water
19 recycling, while receiving updates on aquatics and the golf course. They were grateful for
20 the guidance and regular attendance of Council Member Kou and look forward to
21 welcoming Council Member DuBois.

22 Vice Chair LaMere thanked staff for all of their hard work and all they did in the prior 11
23 months, as well as former Commissioner Cribbs and former Vice Chair Greenfield for
24 driving the many projects that were pushed forward, and for following the agendas and
25 Work Plan as best they could. He welcomed Commissioners Freeman and Kleinhaus,
26 whom they are excited to work with and share the review of their accomplishments. He
27 said they tried to align their priorities with City Council's, including maximizing
28 recreation opportunities using available resources; establishing equity access and inclusion
29 for programs, parks, and open space; promoting Foothills Nature Preserve stewardship;
30 and addressing environmental sustainability and climate change.

31 Vice Chair LaMere commented on the Commission's accomplishments for the prior year.
32 They approved a couple of Park Improvement Ordinances. The Baylands Tide Gate project
33 was interesting because they discussed it in one meeting and then there were some items
34 within the project that changed it a little bit, and they were able to push that to another
35 meeting to take action on it. Boulware Park and the other PIOs were very important. The
36 Ad Hoc committees spent a lot of time on policy updates and reviews. There was an Ad
37 Hoc Committee for the Sidewalk Vendor policy, which became a very detail-oriented



1 policy. There was continuing work with Foothills Nature Preserve. The Open Space Photo
2 and Videography policy was approved, which covers all of the parks. The pickleball court
3 usage policy was also reviewed, with its heavy usage and figuring out the right policies
4 for them, including how it affected other court users was important.

5 Vice Chair LaMere shared a summary of the projects the Commission worked on,
6 including the skateboard park, First Tee’s presentation and making a recommendation on
7 the public/private partnership on that, developing the vision for a new Palo Alto gym. He
8 said that he enjoyed the discussions and speakers who presented on sustainability at their
9 meetings. Their information gave a great overview of what the City is doing now and
10 looking at doing looking forward. These discussions included water recycling, the Valley
11 Water purified water discussion. A liaison was selected for the Mid Pen Regional Open
12 Space Hawthorne’s Area Planning process. The Commission also gave some input on the
13 Baylands Nature Interpretive Signs.

14 The Commission wrote letters and memos to the Council regarding such topics as the
15 Junior Museum and Zoo ticket price, and parkland within the NVCAP. Community
16 highlights included some ongoing projects, such as completion of the Highway 101
17 Pedestrian Bridge, opening of the beautiful Junior Museum and Zoo, and the Rinconada
18 Park project, which is almost completed.

19 The Commission spent a lot of time at their previous retreat and in one of their meetings
20 on the 2021 Work Plan. Vice Chair LaMere said he felt the Work Plan is very important
21 and helped guide what they tried to do with their agenda and their meetings. He felt their
22 meetings and discussions were very much in alignment with the Work Plan. They will be
23 using the 2021 Work Plan to inform the 2022 Work Plan.

24 On the Baylands Tide Gate Project, the Commission made a recommendation on July 27th,
25 and City Council approved it on February 7th, which successfully completed the Work Plan
26 and Ad Hoc goal, which they are very excited about. With Fund Development, they had
27 the Palo Alto Recreation Foundation and Friends of Parks present to them. The Ad Hoc
28 met a few times to discuss fundraising opportunities and to figure out how best to come
29 up with sponsorship guidelines, which is one thing they will revisit on the 2022 Work Plan
30 and see where that falls into how they move forward. There was a review of the CIP on
31 December 14th. The racquet court policy will also be revisited in 2022, but they did make
32 a recommendation with the new pickleball court rules on October 26th. Council is set to
33 review those on March 7th.

34 Foothills Nature Preserve was a subject the Commission spent a lot of time on the past few
35 years. It was exciting to see many of the ideas come to fruition. Vice Chair LaMere
36 commented that there were things done earlier in 2021, January and February, which he is
37 not covering, as he is only covering things that occurred since their last retreat. There were
38 additional items related to Foothills Nature Preserve which occurred earlier in 2021, but



1 they did make another recommendation on March 23rd as well as December 14th. They
2 also recommended with the Open Space and Parks Photography and Film Policy which
3 encompasses both Foothills Nature Preserve and other Open Spaces and Parks on
4 December 14th.

5 The New Recreation Opportunities Ad Hoc was very busy. They had a youth leadership
6 update. Vice Chair LaMere said it is always wonderful to have the youth present, as with
7 all the other presenters, they sometimes forget the voice of their youth. They have
8 wonderful ideas, such as the young man who called into the Commission a couple years
9 ago which prompted them to start moving on a skatepark. He said continuing to listen to
10 the youth and tapping into their ideas can be a motivating factor for the Commission,
11 because their time goes so fast. If it takes them five years to complete a project, all of a
12 sudden the great idea that young man had at age 14 or 15, he or she may never see that, so
13 he felt they should keep that in mind as they try to push through projects and look at
14 priorities.

15 The Commission's work with First Tee continued last year, and they gave a
16 recommendation on a public/private partnership. They also recommended their vision for
17 a new Palo Alto gym which Council will review on March 7th.

18 Vice Chair LaMere said these were the actions and discussions taken from the 2021 Work
19 Plan. He said looking back on all of the discussion items was extremely informative
20 because those items often are things that provide a great education both on what their city
21 is thinking about, as well as just different policy ideas. He thought those would be helpful
22 in making the Commission more informed and well-rounded in their decision-making and
23 in setting priorities. Overall, Vice Chair LaMere felt the last 11 months were packed with
24 great accomplishments, with compliments to the former Chair and Vice Chair. He
25 concluded by stating that without the work of staff, none of this happens. They need to
26 keep staff always in mind as they develop different projects, different ad hocs, different
27 roles for what they try to accomplish. He appreciated everyone's hard work for the Parks
28 and Recreation Commission.

29 Chair Greenfield also thanked Commissioner Cribbs for leading them through the past
30 year, which he thought was very successful and they accomplished quite a bit amidst a
31 very challenging environment. He commented that meeting remotely is unfortunate,
32 especially when they are unable to have an event like an annual retreat in person, but
33 hopefully they will get there next year and be meeting in person before then. He said there
34 are tradeoffs and benefits. Some things have been easier meeting in this manner but overall
35 it would be nice to have more human interaction. He echoed Vice Chair LaMere's thanks
36 for staff and said he values the working relationship that the Commission shares with their
37 staff liaison and the rest of the staff that they work with. They are fortunate to have a
38 relationship with this dedicated group of individuals who do such an awesome job making

1 it easier for the Commissioners to continue to participate in the same manner.

2 Chair Greenfield invited comments from Commissioners and staff in looking back over
3 the record of the past year. Mr. Anderson appreciated the Commission’s hard work and
4 the accomplishments achieved together.

5 Adam Howard thanked the Commission for ongoing support and help with tough issues.
6 He said the youth appreciated Commissioner Cribbs for coming to the meetings. He
7 appreciated support with some of the tough decisions and conversations that needed to
8 take place.

9 Commissioner Kleinhaus thought it looked like a tremendous amount of work had been
10 done, and she looked forward to more. She asked if they could do some introductions, as
11 she had not met everyone present. Mr. Anderson, Assistant Director for Community
12 Services, said he helps serve as staff liaison to the Commission. Kristen O’Kane, Director
13 of Community Services, said it has been a great Commission to work with, and the breadth
14 of work they do is impressive. They appreciate the hard work the Commission does. Lam
15 Do, Open Space, Parks and Golf Division, said he also supports the Commission. Adam
16 Howard, Senior Community Services Manager, Recreation Department, overseeing youth
17 and teens, said he has done fields and courts and is currently at Mitchell Park Community
18 Center. Megha Bansal, Senior Engineer, Public Works Engineering Department, manages
19 the Parks and Bridges group within the Engineering Services Division. Peter Jensen,
20 Landscape Architect, City of Palo Alto, working with Public Works Department on
21 primarily park renovation projects and capital improvements projects. Council Member
22 Tom DuBois, Council Liaison explained his role is to mention if Council has taken an
23 official position on anything. He will primarily be listening but will be available if there
24 are questions for him or Council feedback.

25 Chair Greenfield appreciated Council Member DuBois’s approach as a listening role. As
26 they start reviewing their Work Plan from last year and moving forward to this year’s, they
27 are still going through some uncharted waters, as are other commissions. Working through
28 the process and finding the most appropriate way to develop and report on work plans,
29 they would be looking for any input and guidance Council Member DuBois would like to
30 offer, given that he had worked directly with developing the handbook providing the basis
31 for the work plans,

32 **2. Establish priorities for 2022**

33 Chair Greenfield said in the past these have been calendar year priorities, but this year
34 they would look at priorities for the next 15 months. Chair Greenfield explained that they
35 will go over where the Commission’s purpose and duties are defined and spend some time
36 reviewing highlights from the Handbook. Next would be discussion about alignment. As
37 an advisory group working directly with staff, their priorities would need to be in



1 alignment City Council’s priorities, recently established at their annual retreat, and also
2 consider staff’s priorities and their available resources. Establishing priorities, establishing
3 the ad hoc groups and liaisons, and the work plan would be interrelated and overlapping.
4 As they talk about priorities, Chair Greenfield said they would take a bottom up approach,
5 first looking at the work they want to do. This will help define what is most important to
6 them. Focusing on the projects they want to work on can be used to help inform and clarify
7 their priorities. In the process, they will look at the previous ad hocs and the work the
8 Commission has done, and consider work not yet completed. Looking at successes and
9 shortcomings would help them better refine the focus so that they can achieve their goal
10 in the specified timeframe. He defined ad hocs as a specified group identified to do
11 specific work over a defined time period.

12 Chair Greenfield turned the discussion to considering priorities, including specific areas
13 the Commission wants to focus efforts on, while considering alignment with Council
14 priorities and working directly with staff in an advisory role to City Council. Other
15 considerations would include consistency with the Master Plans which define the
16 overarching goals, or otherwise specified goals through direction from City Council. He
17 said the duties of the Parks and Recreation Commission are defined in the City Municipal
18 Code as an advisory body, focused on planning and policy for goals, services, construction
19 and renovation. Financially, the Commission can specifically review with staff. Serving
20 as a conduit to the community is a key role as well. Since staff and Council’s reach is
21 limited, the Commission is a next level that can be more in touch with the community.
22 Community members are able to reach out to Commission members as a first point of
23 contact. The Commission can be involved with community meetings on specific areas,
24 such as park renovations, dog park considerations, et cetera. The Commission may also
25 look into certain matters as directed by Council. An example is the recent directive from
26 Council to serve as a community forum for the Urban Forestry Division. Highlights of the
27 agreement, approved by Directors of Public Works and Community Services, include
28 helping to implement programs within the Urban Forest Master Plan, such as preserving
29 and growing the tree canopy in the community and fostering community communication
30 and collaboration.

31 Chair Greenfield explained the new Handbook which defines general guidelines for the
32 City boards, commissions and committees, such as standards of conduct, duties,
33 commitments, et cetera. He highlighted the item, “Creation of the Annual Work Plan and
34 Report.” The work plans are approved by Council and serve as direct feedback to progress
35 forward with the primary items the Commission will work on for the period of the work
36 plan. Regarding ad hoc committees, they are temporary committees with a specified task
37 and purpose, with a specified timeframe in which to accomplish the task, which should be
38 less than one year. One of the reasons for this is to make sure that ad hoc committees are
39 not standing committees, which would be subject to Brown Act constraints. This allows
40 for flexibility to meet regularly with a small group and not be subject to the Brown Act



1 constraints. It is a minority group of the Commission, with two or three members and may
2 work directly with staff or meet independently. The ad hocs are created by an action of the
3 Commission, with members appointed either by the chair or the action. For the Parks and
4 Recreation Commission, members are typically appointed by an action of the full group.

5 Chair Greenfield invited questions or comments.

6 Mr. Anderson emphasized, from a staff perspective, the value of the ad hocs. He said they
7 are instrumental in getting the work prepared for Commission review, doing the research
8 and assisting the staff to work through issues in great detail, and that they are a great benefit
9 to the community.

10 Commissioner Kleinhaus said she was wondering about identifying items within the Parks
11 Master Plan which may not be the highest priority for the City or easily fit into the City's
12 priorities for the year, but are things that the Commission thinks are high priority. She
13 wondered if they can still work on things for which there is a program or policy in the
14 Parks Master Plan, but the bucket they fall into are not in the current City priorities. Chair
15 Greenfield answered that if the Commission feels strongly that there is something that
16 should be a priority which is not directly addressed in the Council or staff priorities, it
17 would be something the Commission could discuss. If staff felt it was a reasonable idea
18 that could be supported, they could include it in the work plan as a recommendation to
19 Council, requesting the green light to move forward with it.

20 Mr. Anderson addressed the question, saying that everything in the Parks Master Plan is
21 fair game for including in something they do. They could have a work plan item
22 specifically dedicated to implementing elements of the Parks Master Plan. On the other
23 hand, there is the balancing act of limited resources for all the things they want to achieve.
24 Also, different items rise in priority throughout the year. There may be a Parks Master
25 Plan element that becomes high priority for one reason or another and jumps to the top,
26 but as long as they are considering the prioritization process, including everything they
27 want to achieve, the Parks Master Plan is definitely on the list.

28 Commissioner Freeman commented that they are in a fast-moving world that changes as
29 a result of effects of the pandemic, resources, et cetera and he wondered if there was a way
30 to have an addendum that might not have been part of the Master Plan or initiated from
31 the Council. He wondered if there was any kind of vehicle that adds to the Master Plan to
32 become a priority. Mr. Anderson thought there was a component of the Master Plan that
33 talks about updating it. It is a living document that is refreshed and re-analyzed. He thought
34 the timeframes for that might be spelled out in the Plan. He said it may be that they set the
35 cycle and the plan for a refresh or an addendum. Or it may be that they keep an ongoing
36 list of priorities, and re-examine them.

37 Commissioner Kleinhaus thought the timeframe was five years, and since it was done in

1 2017, it may be time to start thinking about it. She thought there were a lot of things they
2 may want to re-examine at some point, or bring to the community to examine. She said
3 that the goals in the Master Plan each have policies and programs under them, and there is
4 no clear equity among the goals. Some may get a lot of work, while others didn't get any.
5 She thought it would be interesting to have this information. Chair Greenfield felt this
6 was a good idea, relating to what is appropriate for the five-year review. He thought they
7 should consider available resources and if it is something they should begin to take up this
8 year. He thought they should at least work to create a list of things to consider to be
9 included in the living document, and also learn the process for getting updates into the
10 Master Plan as well as what a five-year review includes and at what level of detail. Since
11 they will not have answers to these questions at the retreat, it is something to revisit at a
12 later date.

13 Chair Greenfield shifted the conversation to highlights of the Master Plan and alignment
14 with aspirational documents. Other plans are applicable as well, including the City's
15 overall Master Plan; the Park and Recs Master Plan, including Parks, Trails, Open Space
16 and Recreation Master Plan; the Urban Forestry Master Plan; the SCAP (Sustainability
17 Climate Action Plan); and the GSI (Green Stormwater Infrastructure) plans. He reviewed
18 the principles defined in the Parks Master Plan and said the important principles to keep
19 in mind while considering priorities include Playful, Healthy, Sustainable, Inclusive,
20 Accessible, Flexible, Balanced and Nature. Discussions of priorities should be consistent
21 with most of these principles. Specific goals called out from the Master Plan include
22 providing high quality facilities and services for the community; enhancing what they have
23 both in breadth, quality and variety of use within Parks and Rec and Open Space facilities;
24 creating environments that include regular active and passive activities to support health,
25 wellness and social connections (consistent with the City's annual priority); preserving
26 and integrating nature, natural systems and ecological principles throughout the city
27 (consistent with Council's sustainability priority); developing innovative programs,
28 services and strategies, which has been important over the past few years with new
29 challenges and the need to re-think different areas; and managing Palo Alto's land and
30 services effectively and efficiently.

31 Chair Greenfield invited comments or questions. Hearing none, he continued the
32 discussion on priorities.

33 Chair Greenfield presented the City Council's priorities for the coming year. The four
34 top-level priorities are economic recovery and transition; climate change protection and
35 adaptation; housing for social and economic balance; and community safety and health.
36 He said in looking at the priorities, there are clearly two specific ones speaking directly to
37 the work of the Parks and Recreation Commission with staff – climate change and
38 community safety and health – but it will be important to try to find alignment with these
39 priorities.

1 Chair Greenfield invited comments from Council Member DuBois.

2 Council Member DuBois remarked that there was a lot of discussion under community
3 safety and health on a wide range of topics, so this is an area where Parks and Recreation
4 work plan can really contribute, as well as climate change. There was discussion about the
5 tree ordinance, about potentially dedicating more parks space, air quality, and many people
6 spoke about noise, particularly airplane noise. Chair Greenfield asked if specific items
7 under community safety and health were listed as priorities. Council Member DuBois
8 replied it was a broad discussion and did include a lot of talk about crime under the
9 community safety piece, and funding of public safety positions, among other things. Chair
10 Greenfield said the Commission has struggled with broadness and specificity in
11 developing priorities. Council Member DuBois said the City’s work plan is much broader,
12 and the PRC work plan didn’t have to align with it one hundred percent.

13 Chair Greenfield initiated the topic of staff priorities, which became somewhat less
14 aspirational and more of a reality check in defining what is possible with existing
15 resources. Mr. Anderson shared the list of items which are above and beyond staff’s day-
16 to-day activities, but which are significant – maintaining parks and open space preserves,
17 offering recreational programs, and staffing facilities. Some of their priorities are capital
18 improvement projects, a few of which are longstanding and need to be finished, such as
19 the Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan, which started before the pandemic and
20 was derailed by a number of issues, including need to focus on higher priorities. They hope
21 to finish this soon, hopefully coming to the Commission in March and wrap it up in April.

22 Mr. Anderson went on to say they have improvement projects they are working on as well,
23 including Boulware Park, coming soon, dealing with improvements to the park expansion
24 land that was purchased and dedicated in 2020. That project will include renovating the
25 playgrounds, pathways and amenities. There will be a new restroom and a new dog park
26 associated with the project. This is another project which the Commission had already
27 taken action on by approving a Park Improvement Ordinance, which was approved by
28 Council. They are now at the stage of building them out. These include Ramos Park
29 improvement project, with new playground, pathways and restroom; Cameron Park
30 improvement, with new playground replacement; Cubberley Field restroom, a
31 longstanding project they look forward to making progress on; and the Magical Bridge
32 playground improvement, replacing existing surfacing and adding a shade element.

33 Other Parks priority projects include the skate park, which needs a push with extra staff
34 attention to get it to the next step of another community meeting. They have been working
35 on this with the stakeholder group and will bring it to the Commission for a
36 recommendation and then take it to Council. Another project is implementing weekday
37 fees at Foothills Nature Preserve. They have only been charging for holidays and
38 weekends, and will implement weekdays after some preparation. A new endeavor is to



1 develop an e-bike, electric bike, policy for Parks and Open Space. Current regulations are
2 outdated and need a fresh look at this emerging and growing activity. The First Tee driving
3 range and youth area improvement project was presented to the Commission, and they
4 have a recommendation from the Commission. It is now up to staff to take it to Council as
5 a discussion item, which will happen soon. This project is heavier in terms of staff
6 involvement, guidance and management, so as it moves forward it will take a fair amount
7 of staff resources and time.

8 Mr. Anderson shared some Recreation-focused priorities. Continuing to offer diverse
9 programs to meet enhanced needs of the community. In Aquatics, they need to hire new
10 swim lesson teachers and expand lessons and group swim hours during spring and
11 summer. They will continue their work on the Racquet Court Policy. The Pickleball rules
12 were recently updated, but there is more work to do, which Mr. Howard is working on and
13 will be bringing to the Commission. Another priority they are working on is filling vacant
14 positions. They recently filled a Supervising Park Ranger position at Foothills which had
15 been vacant for two years. Shortly after that, one of the park rangers moved on to another
16 job, creating another vacancy. A Coordinator of Recreational Programs is a position which
17 will help facilitate and support the Commission when filled, among other things, such as
18 the Community Garden program. There are two vacant Park Maintenance positions which
19 they hope to fill soon. A Program Assistant I, a Program Assistant II, a full-time Custodian
20 and a Facility Attendant are also open positions. The work of these vacant positions is
21 currently being spread over existing staff, which spreads them thinner and makes it more
22 challenging to address the previously-listed priority programs.

23 Chair Greenfield invited comments and questions of the Commissioners.

24 Regarding the electronic bikes policy, Commissioner Kleinhaus stated that it came up at
25 Mid-Pen on Wednesday, and they decided to not allow them, because of the high-pitched
26 noise in the spectrum inaudible to humans, but which causes wildlife to disappear from an
27 area. She suggested that perhaps they should not allow electronic bikes in certain open
28 space areas and asked if they were thinking about how to regulate it.

29 Mr. Anderson replied that there is currently outdated language in the regulations which
30 prohibits motorized bicycles from Parks and Open Space, unless handicapped-related. The
31 California Vehicle Code has new language, and their regulation needs to be updated, but
32 they have not looked at the issues and the policy, so they need to do this. He has been in
33 touch with Mid-Pen staff, who worked on the recent policy review, and he felt staff could
34 learn a lot from their research and conclusions. His recommendation was that they
35 eventually form an ad hoc committee to help work through this policy to create their own,
36 as well as updating the regulation. Commissioner Kleinhaus said their Board of Directors
37 did not accept staff recommendations because they thought that they were too liberal. She
38 said regulating this seems like there is a tremendous amount of work for staff, and although

1 very important, it would be a difficult thing to ask of staff.

2 Chair Greenfield agreed that it is a reasonable and important observation that staff has a
3 list of priorities they are planning to work on and given discussion of the vacant positions,
4 staff resources are limited right now, more so than usual. If things go well, they may be
5 less limited going forward, but they have to get there first. Regarding the e-bike discussion,
6 he said it is a policy area that has never been specifically addressed in terms of Parks and
7 Open Spaces. It is something that makes sense to him to address as a Commission. It won't
8 be an easy project and not a one-year project, so they may look at it in terms of scoping
9 things out during the first year to better define what they are aiming for.

10 Commissioner Freeman added that it is a great report and it is nice to see many things
11 happening. Staff has many challenges, especially with filling the vacant positions and
12 competing with other cities in recruitment. Regarding e-bikes, he said the fact that they
13 are trying to be proactive and stay ahead of something that is in the environment, getting
14 a lot of growth and momentum, it was nice to know they are somewhat in front of it. E-
15 bikes are starting to become the norm, so he thought it would be a great effort.

16 Chair Greenfield also saw the size and speed of e-bikes increasing, with more of the
17 monster bikes with big tires, going faster. He said there are obviously ranges of e-bikes
18 and different uses and nuances to consider when developing a policy.

19 Chair Greenfield welcomed Commissioner Brown who joined the meeting, and updated
20 her on the discussion. He invited further comments of the Commission.

21 Commissioner Cribbs asked whether there was a timeline on filling the vacant positions,
22 and also whether there have been resignations as well. Mr. Anderson responded that the
23 timeline is tricky. The vacant positions are for community services which predominantly
24 fall into the Park and Rec category; however, it is across the board throughout the City, in
25 different departments, many of which Parks staff rely upon, including to fill their positions.
26 For example, Human Resources is understaffed and struggling, which expands the typical
27 timeframe for filling a position. It may have been three to four months in the past, but is
28 now closer to six. They were given the opportunity to prioritize certain positions, but those
29 get counter-balanced with the entire City, so it is difficult to give an accurate timeframe.
30 He thought in the ballpark of four to six months may be realistic. In terms of resignations
31 within Community Services, he said there have been some resignations, as well as others
32 leaving for jobs elsewhere.

33 Commissioner Kleinhaus thought there was a component of a native plant garden in the
34 Ramos Park Improvement Project, where it shows playgrounds, pathways and restroom,
35 Mr. Anderson confirmed this is the case. Commissioner Kleinhaus asked that native
36 planting be specified in the item.

1 Chair Greenfield was pleased with the interaction in this section and added that
2 everything they are talking about was meant to be collaborative in the manner of how the
3 Commission operates, in which everyone has a voice. He continued the discussion, adding
4 that as they consider priorities to keep in mind three pillars of the Commission, which are
5 Open Space, Parks and Recreation, so as they consider priorities, they should consider
6 which priorities fit into each area. Also, they should consider the alignment of the three
7 pillars with the Council priorities, focusing specifically on Climate Change Protection and
8 Adaptation and Community Safety and Health. He said as they consider prioritization of
9 what they will select as their focus, it is clear that they have resource limitations. Normally,
10 when resource limitations are considered, it is financial resources that come to mind. As
11 they look into the aspirational Master Plan, there are many projects and great ideas that
12 have been lacking funding in the past. He said a more immediate constraint currently is
13 staff resources, so they need to be careful to make sure the Commission is making things
14 easier for staff on a net basis, with the goal of a net positive, so that staff is getting more
15 out than they are putting in, based on their recommendations and the policies and projects
16 they are working on.

17 Chair Greenfield said as they consider priorities over the past year and new priorities, it
18 is helpful to look at the work done in detail. Priorities for the past year included
19 maximizing Rec opportunities with available resources, equity access and inclusion for
20 programs, Parks and Open Space; Foothills Nature Preserve stewardship; and
21 environmental sustainability and climate change. The end goal of their action was to add
22 their priorities for the coming year. Looking back at the past priorities there is generally a
23 recommendation that something shouldn't continue as a priority for more than three years,
24 so they would look back at the Commission's ad hocs and use that to review which projects
25 would be their priorities for the coming year.

26 Chair Greenfield shared the chart of where they were last year. The chart was updated
27 after spending some time with the Vice Chair, staff and others considering what they might
28 want as a starting point for next year. His feeling was that they didn't need to have an ad
29 hoc for Foothills Nature Preserve in the coming year, but moving that to a liaison role
30 would probably make more sense given that major work has been done in terms of
31 recommendations sent to Council. Looking to better design a specific ad hoc focus for the
32 next 15-month period, he said the CIP Review is done on a short basis every year, over a
33 shorter period of time, as well as information trying to project a time period when
34 something would be addressed. The rough draft of what could be done with ad hocs
35 included addition of an e-bike policy ad hoc to develop a scope for e-bike usage in Park
36 and Open Spaces was touched on. They also thought it would be appropriate to include an
37 ad hoc to make a recommendation regarding potentially rededicating the Byxbee Park 10
38 acres that were part of Measure E, which undedicated the area for potentially putting in an
39 anaerobic digester. Also, a website refresh was listed as an ad hoc. It would not become
40 part of the Work Plan, but would be something that two to three people could be working



1 on.

2 Chair Greenfield invited comments from the Commission on the proposed starting point
3 for ad hocs for the coming year.

4 Commissioner Brown noted in regard to Website Refresh that Communications was listed
5 under Funding Opportunities so she recommended thinking about somehow consolidating
6 those, to avoid duplication of efforts, because it would essentially be two groups working
7 on communications. Chair Greenfield thought the Website Refresh would be at a higher
8 level, looking at the website as a whole, looking at other commission websites within the
9 City or potentially other cities. Looking at what is obsolete and doesn't belong, what they
10 want to add. He said Funding Opportunities is an important area they will want to have
11 included in the website update, but as a fairly small subset. He said it was a good point to
12 consider.

13 Chair Greenfield invited further comments from the Commissioners.

14 Commissioner Cribbs commented she was glad they were continuing to have the Funding
15 Opportunities because she continues to have faith the community that if there is a need
16 that is evidenced that they can find a way to do accomplish it, despite the lack of City
17 budget and staff resources. She felt it was an important ad hoc to continue, although she
18 acknowledged that they don't want ad hocs to go on forever. She felt that defining the role
19 a bit tighter might be good. She said she was always happy to see Recreation Projects
20 continuing, along with the Racquet Court Policy. Regarding Park Amenities, she thought
21 they had made a lot of progress so it may be good to have a scorecard about timelines, et
22 cetera, that the ad hoc could work on. She said she liked all five of the suggested ad hocs.

23 Chair Greenfield wondered if they needed an ad hoc for Park Amenities or whether a
24 liaison role would be sufficient. Commissioner Cribbs thought it was a good question for
25 staff, but felt that a lot of that is currently in progress and funded, and if there were
26 timelines and a scorecard so that they could just applaud the fact that they are making
27 progress on the renovations, it could possibly move to a liaison role. Mr. Anderson said
28 there were some achievements coming for the Dog Park. Boulware will be adding a new
29 one, which is great, because they don't do that very often. Advancing other dog park-
30 related things such as the off leash program they talked of, which didn't made much
31 headway, an ad hoc would probably be helpful, although it could be revisited next year.
32 He thought the Restrooms were dialed in fairly well, with four on the agenda, so an ad hoc
33 was probably not necessary to help with that. Park Amenities, for things such as benches,
34 et cetera, he thought a liaison role would be fine, but he was open either way.

35 Commissioner Cribbs asked for an opinion on having a liaison role for the Dog Park
36 specifically so that the dog community has a contact, especially since the one at Boulware
37 is set to be done and there is a little bit of funding for renovation of others, but she didn't

1 foresee other dog parks being redone in the near future for which an ad hoc would be
2 needed. Chair Greenfield was also thinking of moving this to a liaison role, so that there
3 would be a dog park-specific one and perhaps a restroom one, although Park Amenities
4 could include restrooms and benches.

5 Commissioner Kleinhaus referred back to the goal, “Preserve and integrate nature, natural
6 systems, and ecological principles throughout Palo Alto.” She suggested that one way to
7 do that would be looking at Green Streets and the Urban Forest together. She thought it
8 felt well within what they are asked to do under the City Council Sustainability and Health
9 goal. She said bringing nature to the city is something they can do, along creeks, planting
10 native trees and other things that could be looked at and other groups to work with such as
11 the people working on bicycle connectivity. She thought there were connectivity issues
12 that could be looked at comprehensively, which she is interested in. She said there is a lot of
13 work being done in other cities in connection with that.

14 Commissioner Kleinhaus said another goal she would like to see as a staff priority is
15 completing Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan, which has been sitting on the
16 back burner. Under Park Dedication, she expressed interest in looking at the ten acres.
17 There was a City priority in which one of the programs was to look at all the other types
18 of park-like land that the City owns, to see which ones could be dedicated as parkland. If
19 the Commission was going to look at Park Dedication, it might be good to expand it to the
20 other properties in City ownership that could be dedicated.

21 Chair Greenfield said there has been a Park Dedication in the past that has reviewed
22 opportunities, as Commissioner Kleinhaus suggested, which is partly why he suggested
23 calling it the Park Dedication ad hoc, rather than limiting it specifically to Byxbee Park.
24 He thought the focus with the ten acres could include considering other opportunities
25 within the city. On the BCCP, it is on staff’s plan, and set as a liaison role.

26 Commissioner Kleinhaus responded that she is not sure what a liaison is, versus an ad
27 hoc. Chair Greenfield explained that the way they have defined ad hocs is that it is a
28 committee that will work on something that is part of the Work Plan submitted to the City
29 Council for approval, something with a specified timeframe and a specific goal and focus,
30 not something that would be there year after year. It is not a catchall for multiple issues
31 that would become more of a standing committee. He said the liaison roles are typically a
32 single person, one who interacts with a certain group of stakeholders in the city, attends
33 the meetings and reports back to the Commission. A liaison can have a variety of different
34 roles depending on the topic. For example, a Dog Park Liaison would be a conduit to the
35 dog park community. The Field Users Liaison might work with stakeholders and soccer
36 clubs and baseball organizations, in terms of issues they have with fields. In many cases
37 they try to be a point person that relieves some of the burden on staff in terms of
38 community outreach. With respect to BCCP, a liaison would be someone to be the point

1 person to help the project get across the finish line, that staff can work with. In some cases
2 it may be helpful for staff to speak with a Commission member before bringing an item to
3 the full Commission to get a first pass of questions and a focus.

4 Commissioner Kleinhaus thought, in light of this explanation, her previous opinions might
5 change. Chair Greenfield responded that the meaning of her idea of bringing nature to the
6 city may need to be clarified, but it might be something that could be a project with a
7 liaison working with staff in developing ideas to bring to the Commission for
8 consideration, and then potentially creating an ad hoc and Work Plan item. Commissioner
9 Kleinhaus said that native plants and trees in parks is really looking at other things. She
10 said the BCCP didn't need to be there because that would be a liaison role. Chair
11 Greenfield said that is the recommendation.

12 Commissioner Freeman said in looking at the e-bike policy, he wondered if it incorporated
13 the growth in electric scooters and if they are able to ride those in the parks, since they are
14 probably pretty fast as well. He wondered about changing the title on this to cover different
15 types of electric modes that could be used in parks, whether bike or scooter. Chair
16 Greenfield responded their focus is definitely on parks and open space areas, as opposed
17 to streets and sidewalks, which is out of their purview and is part of the Department of
18 Transportation. Mr. Anderson thought that it should be added, and thought it could be for
19 e-bikes and other things motorized. The existing regulation is outdated, but does call out
20 electric motorized bikes and also mentions scooters, so he felt they could look
21 comprehensively at the ordinance, which is broader than just bikes. Chair Greenfield
22 mentioned Segways, which Mr. Anderson said would also fit in that category.

23 Commissioner Freeman suggested, under Recreation, that another area that continues to
24 grow nationwide is pickleball. Though there is pickleball in one location, there might be a
25 need to cover some of the other communities. He wondered about adding that as one of
26 the items under Recreational Projects, or if it would fall somewhere else. Chair Greenfield
27 thought one thing to look at was the "Projected Duration" column and that the Racquet
28 Court Ad Hoc is policy-focused and something they will look to wrap up in the first half
29 of this year, as with Funding Opportunities, which is looking at a narrow focus, to finish
30 and get some ideas posted on the website and disseminated to the public. He said
31 Recreation Opportunities is a broader ad hoc. They may need to refine the definition, but
32 something like additional new courts would certainly apply to that ad hoc. He agreed it
33 would be something appropriate for this Recreation Opportunities Ad Hoc to include in
34 their focus, but it would be separate from the Policy Ad Hoc, so having two separate ad
35 hocs is appropriate, although he was open to other opinions.

36 Chair Greenfield asked if the Commissioners leaned toward not having a Park Amenities
37 Ad Hoc.

38 Council Member DuBois suggested making Park Dedication more broad. Byxbee Park is



1 important, but other park opportunities are also important. Otherwise, he felt the
2 Commission’s direction seemed very logical.

3 Commissioner Kleinhaus brought up lighting as an emerging potent pollutant that is
4 impacting ecosystems and human health in teens. Outdoor lighting has been connected to
5 mental health issues, such as anxiety. She said she was not thinking there was something
6 they could do about it, because it is not necessarily only in parks; however, there is more
7 and more interest in more lighting on trails and allowing extended use. The extended use
8 is also causing harm. She thought there were discussions in Palo Alto in the past in this
9 regard, but they died off. She wondered if the Parks and Recreation Commission had any
10 interest or jurisdiction, or should just be aware in case something comes up that they should
11 look at it. Chair Greenfield wondered if there was some way to combine the two items
12 Commissioner Kleinhaus had brought up – bringing nature to the city and the outdoor
13 lighting, as sort of a naturalist overview focusing on ensuring that impacts to the natural
14 environment are properly considered, as well as growing the natural environment and
15 extending its reach. He was not sure if there was a liaison role that could be developed to
16 work with staff. Perhaps it would be related to the Sustainability Liaison role, which is
17 also somewhat ambiguously defined.

18 Commissioner Kleinhaus thought putting it with Bringing Nature to the City would be a
19 good idea. Commissioner Brown thought these concepts would fall under the
20 Sustainability Liaison role, especially with the SCAP going on right now, in which there
21 are a lot of policy changes and opportunity for community engagement around them. She
22 felt the ad hoc role should be reserved for specific projects that arise from the liaison role
23 that have a set timeframe and objectives, and require the input of other committee members
24 on that ad hoc, versus a smaller project that can be done just with the liaison and staff. For
25 example, the sensors at Rinconada Pool is something that Commissioner Cribbs and staff
26 handle and doesn’t need to be a full ad hoc committee. Some projects need a little more
27 specifics and identification of resources required and a timeline before they should rise to
28 an ad hoc committee level. Chair Greenfield agreed and thought they did not have enough
29 at this point to define a specific role for an ad hoc, although he appreciated Commissioner
30 Kleinhaus’ interest in the topic and that it fits within the scope of the Commission, but
31 looking at it as a liaison role initially, working with staff on something that could become
32 an ad hoc would be appropriate. He advocated moving the idea to the liaison list.
33 Commissioner Kleinhaus said since the SCAP is focused primarily on electrification, this
34 probably would never float beyond the bottom of their priority list. She said it is one of
35 the primary goals in the Park Master Plan, and there are a lot of policies and programs
36 associated with it that have not yet been addressed, so having it as a liaison to
37 Sustainability doesn’t actually address it and is basically saying it’s not going to happen.

38 Chair Greenfield said the Sustainability Liaison has in the past been someone liaised with
39 staff. In the past, there were a number of presentations and updates on GSI, on Urban



1 Forestry, on the SCAP itself, on sea level rise. The liaison role could be defined to be
2 whatever they want, and, as she pointed out, the overall SCAP focus is electrification
3 which doesn't fit so much with what they Commission is doing, but that doesn't mean that
4 the Parks and Recreation Commission's Sustainability Liaison couldn't be more focused
5 on the natural elements. Commissioner Kleinhaus said she didn't understand how the
6 liaison influences what the other groups are working with and bringing back to the
7 Commission.

8 Mr. Anderson said, regarding how to include things like bringing nature to the city and
9 addressing lights, he thinks of sustainability in a much broader context and wouldn't limit
10 it to any one area. For a liaison role it is wide open, so it could include all of those things.
11 He suggested regarding bringing nature to the city, one way to address it would be to make
12 it an ongoing thing, looking for opportunities, calling out issues that are observed or
13 reported from the community, and working with staff on those. Another way would be for
14 the point person on Park Improvement Project review to raise those items. Asking, "What
15 are we doing for native plantings in here?" "Are their native trees addressed?" "Are we
16 addressing native species?" "How about lighting?" That kind of focused view on every
17 project that it brought, with the special attention of a liaison, would fit well.

18 Commissioner Kleinhaus said one of the three maps in the Parks Master Plan looks at
19 connectivity in terms of the Urban Forest, in terms of pollinator corridors. The map looks
20 not only at parks, but also areas near creeks, trees on streets, et cetera, to bring nature's
21 fingers and patches into everywhere in Palo Alto. She wondered if and how that would
22 ever materialize. The liaison role sounded good as described, but it doesn't really look at
23 the whole fabric of a city. She didn't know if it was something they could even do. Chair
24 Greenfield thought part of the liaison role in working with staff is to help determine what
25 can be done and answer some of Commissioner Kleinhaus' questions. Starting off with a
26 liaison role to research and investigate further would be the right approach.

27 Vice Chair LaMere thought it was important to keep in mind as they go through this with
28 their priorities, how many ad hocs they can manage, how many staff can handle, and their
29 own commission of six members. He thought as they come up with ideas and priorities, it
30 was important to keep that in mind as well. They will need to agree on priorities and what
31 can be accomplished.

32 Chair Greenfield concurred and asked for the Commissioners' thoughts on Park
33 Amenities in terms of trying to limit their ad hocs. He asked if they should move forward
34 for the time being with a Dog Park and a Park Amenity Liaison. Commissioner Cribbs
35 thought they should try that, and they could always revisit it if it's not working. There was
36 no opposition expressed to this. Chair Greenfield summarized that the ad hocs they were
37 then focused on included CIP; Funding Opportunities, publishing and communicating
38 tools; Recreation Projects, which needs more focus on how to define it to be achievable

1 within 15 months; Racquet Court Policy, which will be disbanded once the policy update
2 recommendation goes to Council; the e-Bike Policy, possibly with an updated name; Park
3 Dedication; and Website Refresh.

4 The Commission discussed more appropriate names for e-bike policy, including
5 Motorized Mobility and Motorized Conveyances. Chair Greenfield asked if people would
6 know what motorized conveyance meant. Commissioner Freeman thought someone could
7 easily think of a small motorbike as a conveyance. He said they might just make it e-bikes
8 or scooters. Chair Greenfield said there are scooters and skateboards and one-wheeled
9 devices, and thought maybe Electric Conveyances Policy would work, because they are
10 not talking about a gas-powered device. Commissioner Brown thought it would be fine.
11 Chair Greenfield said if nothing else, the name will serve to educate when people ask
12 what it means.

13 Chair Greenfield moved to discussion on liaison roles. He shared a list of proposed
14 liaisons, based on conversations with staff and the Vice Chair. The proposal would fold
15 the Baylands 10.5 Liaison into the Rec Projects Ad Hoc. Commissioner Kleinhaus
16 interjected that when the City did the outreach on the 10.5 acres, there were equal numbers
17 of people who asked to make part or all of it into a natural area. Given that the loss of
18 habitat on the golf course has been tremendous and that one of the goals of the project on
19 the golf course was to increase habitat and that did not happen, she thought that the 10.5
20 acres should have both the natural habitat restoration aspect and recreation aspect,
21 probably 50/50. Chair Greenfield felt that might be getting too far in the weeds. He said
22 Baylands 10.5 is not specifically a recreation project but something to consider all
23 potential uses. He asked if they should keep it as a liaison role, since the likelihood of
24 something coming in the next year doesn't seem high at present.

25 Mr. Anderson said this was a challenging one. The 10.5 acres, the First Tee and the
26 Skateboard Park all fall into categories of large projects that require a lot of public
27 outreach, staff time and funding to make progress on. He said it was possible they may get
28 to the 10.5 Acres this year, depending on how things shift, and direction from Council
29 once items like the gym occupy their attention for discussion and direction to staff. He was
30 not sure whether there should be an ad hoc or liaison role, although he thought it should
31 be, at minimum, a liaison role. Chair Greenfield said there is not any immediate activity
32 on it, unless it started from an activity from coming out of a Rec project which would need
33 consideration of environmental impacts and potential environmental uses. Overall, he did
34 not see a role of a liaison for the coming year, but was open to opinions of others.
35 Commission LaMere wondered if they could add a liaison later if it looked like there was
36 going to be activity. Chair Greenfield said it was something they could easily add.
37 Commissioner Cribbs said it could be merged into the Recreational Opportunities, and if
38 it came to the top, then it could go back to being a liaison specifically for 10.5. She felt it
39 should go someplace. Chair Greenfield said they wanted to try to avoid overlap. If there

1 is a liaison for 10.5 that is not part of the Rec projects then there are potential concerns.
2 Commissioner Cribbs said that is why they would put it in the Rec projects for now and
3 take it away from where it is now. Chair Greenfield agreed.

4 Commissioner Kleinhaus wondered if, when it came back, it would be more focused on
5 the recreational opportunities and not the nature restoration opportunities which at least
6 half of the people commented on in the Parks Master survey, asking for it to be a natural
7 area restoration. Chair Greenfield said that would be the case if it came back as a
8 Recreation project, but if it was coming back as more of a Sustainability project, then that
9 would have a different focus. It is something the Sustainability Liaison could potentially
10 make a recommendation on. If there is a group that is looking to develop it for other, non-
11 recreation purposes, that is something else that the Commission should consider.
12 Commissioner Kleinhaus didn't think people saw it as non-recreational, but just as a
13 "birding issue" rather than development of intense use. She pointed to that day's front page
14 of the *Mercury News*, stating that people from all over the country are flying to Palo Alto
15 to see one bird that happened to be somewhere in midtown. She said it has been going on
16 for over a week. The birding part is a recreation facility. It's just different than a gym, and
17 she thought when the surveys were done in the past, at least half of the respondents asked
18 for a birding park. Chair Greenfield said he understood that she was saying that the natural
19 project would be recreation as well and something else that the Recreation Ad Hoc could
20 take on. Commissioner Kleinhaus said she wasn't trying to create more and more
21 committees and liaisons, but was concerned with this issue. Chair Greenfield said if there
22 is a group that comes in with a potential project to develop, then they can consider where
23 it fits in.

24 Chair Greenfield moved on to other liaisons. The recommendation was to continue with
25 Baylands Tide Gate, Community Gardens, Cubberley Field Users, Golf, and GSI. He said
26 on Hawthorne's Area Planning, there was no activity on it last year but it did get
27 information from Mid-Pen and was something appropriate for the Commission to continue
28 having a liaison for and would probably have some activity in the coming year. He said
29 they are looking to create a Funding Partner Liaison, who would be the partner for both
30 the Palo Alto Rec Foundation and the Friends of Palo Alto Parks. For Brown Act purposes,
31 this should be someone who is a point person for these organizations, but is also part of
32 the Funding Opportunities Ad Hoc. Keeping the PAUSD and Safe Routes liaisons, the
33 Sidewalk Vendor Policy would be a short term role, just to help the policy across the finish
34 line. The Skateboard Park would get folded into Rec Projects.

35 Commissioner Cribbs asked what the current situation was with the Ventura plan. Council
36 Member DuBois advised that they have an Ad Hoc that is talking to Sobrato, and the Fry
37 site is a key part of that. Council had a meeting with some preferences and are waiting for
38 that conversation to finish, and it will then go back to Council to select a preferred
39 alternative. He thought Council was very strong about some of the creek restoration.

1 Commissioner Cribbs thought that was good to know because the Commission was
2 concerned that the area doesn't have as much parkland as maybe it should, so before it
3 goes farther along, it would be nice to keep up with it. Chair Greenfield said the role of
4 this liaison would be to monitor the activities of that Plan, and report back to the
5 Commission, particularly as it applies to parks in the area, looking to ensure that park
6 resources are included in conjunction with new developments.

7 Chair Greenfield said they would finalize the roles and assignments in the next action, but
8 he directed that they go back to talking more about specific priorities for the year and how
9 the ad hocs fit in with the City Council priorities in terms of climate change, community
10 safety and community health, looking to start articulating their priorities. He said they
11 would take a ten-minute break and he asked the commissioners to think about how these
12 roles would apply directly to their priorities.

13 [The Commission took a ten-minute break]

14 Chair Greenfield said it was time to try to nail down their priorities and noted the
15 discussion they've had on ad hocs and liaisons was to include preliminary discussion
16 focused specifically on how to inform what areas and what projects should fall under their
17 priorities. This could include more discussion of points such as those Commissioner
18 Kleinhaus brought up regarding inclusion of a natural focus. He added for consideration a
19 liaison role of Natural Environment Ambassador that they could consider in addition to
20 the Sustainability liaison. He said they will also want to consider under Park Amenities
21 Liaison, with that person being the first contact that staff would reach out to for Park
22 Improvement Plans and PIO reviews, if that was something mentioned as a Sustainability
23 Liaison, or maybe both of them. He felt it would be helpful to look at the 2021 priorities
24 and determine which ones would apply moving forward and which ones would not. He
25 thought they should aim for three or four priorities and try to keep them as concise as they
26 can – and broad at the same time.

27 Commissioner Cribbs said she thought that the Recreational Projects specifically is talking
28 about capital improvements, or things that have to be built. She was concerned that they
29 don't specifically call out recreation programs, such as new programs that the community
30 might want to see instituted having to do with kids or seniors or adults, or something that
31 is specifically a recreation program. For example, a new dance opportunity in town that
32 everybody wanted to take lessons. Or maybe a senior's exercise class that they are missing
33 and should have. Chair Greenfield suggested Recreation Projects and Programs.
34 Commissioner Cribbs agreed.

35 Chair Greenfield said looking at their priorities from last year, at a quick glance it would
36 make sense that Foothills Nature Preserve Stewardship would not be a specifically
37 called-out priority for them, but is one they have completed work on to the extent of not
38 even planning to have an ad hoc specific to that. Having been a specific focus for the past

1 two years, it would be nice to be able to move on. He said, looking at the ad hocs and
2 considering how they mesh with the Council priorities, it makes sense for them to align to
3 the Community Safety and Health and the Climate Change Protection and Adaptation the
4 Funding Opportunities, which applies to all of them, also, Capital Projects applies to
5 everything they do in a high level sense. The Rec Projects and Programs applies to
6 Community Health. He was not sure it applied to Community Safety. Commissioner
7 Cribbs thought that it did, because offering programs or projects for people to become
8 involved in may result in crime becoming less attractive. Chair Greenfield said Racquet
9 Court Policy is about health. Electronic Conveyances would apply to all and would be
10 primarily on the Safety front. Park Dedication is about Health and Climate Change. Chair
11 Greenfield was interested in ideas from people on what to state as their priorities for the
12 coming year.

13 Commissioner Heinrichs said they have environment and nature as a big part of the Parks
14 Master plan, and should be there, too. It fits well with Community Health and Safety, with
15 Climate Change, and with Economic Recovery. She thought they should have improved
16 nature in the city rather than always mitigating. Chair Greenfield asked how it would be
17 articulated it as a priority for them to consider. Commissioner Heinrich liked the term
18 Nature in the City.

19 Commission LaMere asked if there were any worthy of carrying over, or if they were
20 trying to come up with completely new ideas and directions similar to City Council, who
21 carried over some that they are able to do. Chair Greenfield said that is an obvious place
22 to start. He thought they do want to consider carryover. They could start by copying the
23 other three priorities in and discuss whether they want to keep them, edit them or omit
24 them, or combine them in some manner.

25 Commissioner Freeman thought Nature in the City could possibly be considered part of
26 Environmental, Sustainability and Climate Change as it is in some ways related, with the
27 tree canopy and other such priorities. Commissioner Heinrich shared a distinction between
28 the understanding of climate change as opposed to biodiversity and ecology, things she
29 has been working on for many years. She explained that nature and biodiversity is the first
30 layer. Sustainability comes under that layer and focuses on humans and how to use less
31 resources and how to share more of the resources. When they do that without taking care
32 of nature and without taking care of the non-human-focused part, then the result is
33 essentially that they will lose everything. She said sustainability, the human part, is part of
34 the natural world, not above it. So, while having Environmental, Sustainability and
35 Climate Change as priorities is critically important, she felt they should also look at Nature
36 and Biodiversity, which are not the same. She suggested perhaps stating Biodiversity as
37 the priority instead of Nature in the City. She said other City Councils and government
38 agencies are recognizing that sustainability is really anthropocentric, and nature and
39 biodiversity are bigger than that. She said it is not easy, but people think they just have to



1 change how they consume and whether they use electric or gas, or whether they recycle or
2 not, to save the planet. But they have to look at both pieces – the biodiversity part and the
3 human focus.

4 Commission LaMere wondered if it would be appropriate to put Biodiversity,
5 Environmental Sustainability, and Climate together as one priority. Commissioner
6 Heinrich felt if they were all equally weighted that would be fine, although some cities do
7 separate biodiversity and sustainability. Chair Greenfield appreciated raising the
8 distinction regarding biodiversity and advocated combining it with sustainability. The
9 Commission continued to discuss the wording of this priority and came to agreement on
10 Biodiversity, Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change.

11 The Commission discussed Maximizing Recreation Opportunities Using Available
12 Resources. Chair Greenfield asked if the Commissioners preferred to focus on “projects
13 and programs” as opposed to “opportunities,” with areas identified to pursue, highlight
14 and emphasize, or leave the statement as it is. Commissioner Freeman wondered if “using
15 available resources” could be seen as an opt-out opportunity. Commissioner Brown said
16 this was something she felt strongly about last time they were doing this, because it does
17 fall in line with the economic recovery and transition and everything the City has been
18 going through, being strapped for resources and staff. She thought it was important to keep
19 that top of mind, especially because the City Council wanted to focus on economic
20 recovery and transition, and efficient use of staff resources is key to that. The Commission
21 agreed upon the wording, “...considering available resources.” Regarding “Equity, Access
22 and Inclusion,” Commissioner Cribbs felt it was important to keep it as is, since equity is
23 so important in thinking about programs and parks and open space, along with access and
24 inclusion.

25 Commissioner Kleinhaus wondered if the issue of sea level rise should be called out as a
26 separate item. There is a lot of current work being done in Public Works on sea level rise,
27 mitigations, adaptations and many discussions. The Tide Gate is part of that, to protect the
28 community. Since there is so much going on, she wondered if they should consider it this
29 year, separate from climate change. Chair Greenfield thought if they consider their
30 alignment with Council priorities, climate change means protection, adaptation, sea level
31 rise. If they consider that climate change encompasses protection and adaptation, then sea
32 level rise is part of climate change adaptation, and is covered under that priority.

33 Chair Greenfield suggested a check of how the ad hoc priorities aligned with the priorities
34 they proposed. He worked through each of the ad hoc committees, to identify which
35 priority it falls under, and said it looks like all of the ad hocs are consistent with what they
36 are setting up as priorities. He asked if the Commissioners wanted to consider any further
37 update to the proposed priorities.

1 Vice Chair LaMere moved to adopt the 2022 Parks and Recreation Commission priorities
2 as discussed. Seconded by Commissioner Brown, the motion carried 6-0, by roll call vote.
3

4 **3. Establish and Assign Parks and Recreation Commission Ad Hoc Committee**
5 **and Liaison Roles**

6 Chair Greenfield shared the list of proposed ad hoc committees for the Commissioners’
7 consideration and discussion pertaining to the titles. The Racquet Court CY 22 was
8 changed to Racquet Court Policy Update Ad Hoc since it was close to finished and would
9 be disbanded later in the year.

10 Chair Greenfield requested feedback on the list of staff liaison roles. He pointed out
11 regarding the Baylands 10.5 Liaison that it did not portray the nature-related orientation.
12 Also, in response to the discussion about adding a “Bring Nature to the City” type Liaison,
13 he had added a “Natural Environment Ambassador” as an idea. There was a question of
14 separate roles for a Sustainability Liaison and a Natural Environment Ambassador, and if
15 so, if it would better to have that as two different people. Mr. Anderson thought it would
16 be helpful to have one person cover both of those areas. Chair Greenfield said if there was
17 a need to split it into multiple roles, they could easily do that, as the ad hoc and liaison
18 roles are created by an action of the Commission and could be changed if needed without
19 impacting the Work Plan and did not require Council approval.

20 Commissioner Kleinhaus asked that the Sustainability Liaison be changed to
21 Sustainability and Biodiversity Liaison if it was to be just one person. The Commission
22 was fine with this.

23 Chair Greenfield asked what the consensus was on the Baylands 10.5. Commissioner
24 Cribbs thought it was to be put back in the Recreation Ad Hoc and that if it were to become
25 a passive nature preserve, then that would actually be recreation, too, just a different kind
26 of recreation, so it could fit there. If the need arose, they could change it around.
27 Commissioner Kleinhaus was agreeable as long as the idea of so many people in Palo Alto
28 who wanted it to be a more natural park was not forgotten.

29 With the Commission in agreement as to the list of ad hoc committees and liaisons, they
30 then proceeded to making assignments for the committees and liaisons. Chair Greenfield
31 advised that they should keep in mind that there would be another Commissioner added to
32 the group within the next few months and they will want to get the new person involved
33 in some of the roles. He said if someone’s load gets heavy they may want to give up some
34 space moving forward. Typically, there were three people on the ad hocs. Given that they
35 were looking at seven ad hocs for six people, he highlighted that Website Refresh, CIP
36 Review and potentially Park Dedication were ad hocs that probably could get by with two
37 people, although it would probably be better to have three people on the other ad hocs.



DRAFT

1 The Commissioners proceeded to communicate which ad hocs they were interested in.
2 Commissioner Freeman was interested in the Electric Conveyance Policy, the Racquet
3 Court Policy, and Recreation Projects. Commissioner Kleinhaus chose the Electric
4 Conveyance Policy. She asked why the Park Dedication ad hoc would take so long. Chair
5 Greenfield said it was because it was an open item. The committee would stay active until
6 a potential item is taken up by City Council. Commissioner Kleinhaus chose the Electric
7 Conveyance Policy. Commissioner Brown preferred the CIP, the Website Refresh and was
8 happy to stay on the Racquet Court Policy for continuity. Commissioner Cribbs was happy
9 to stay on Funding Opportunities and Recreation Projects. Chair Greenfield pointed out
10 that the committees are new committees continuing in a similar related effort. Vice Chair
11 LaMere chose Recreation Projects, Funding Opportunities and CIP Review. Chair
12 Greenfield said his interest would be CIP, Electric Conveyances and Park Dedication. He
13 volunteered to help with Website as well. Commissioner Cribbs added that she would also
14 be on the Racquet Court Policy.

15 The Commission then made assignments for Liaisons. Commissioner Brown volunteered
16 to continue on the Sidewalk Vendor Policy and Dog Parks , in honor of her pet that passed
17 away last week. She was interested in the School District citywide also, but said she could
18 be flexible. Chair Greenfield asked if she would be able to attend the meetings on a
19 Wednesday morning, somewhere around 8:30 or so. Commissioner Brown would check
20 on that. Commissioner Kleinhaus chose Baylands, BCCP and Sustainability and
21 Biodiversity. She was also interested in Foothills and Urban Forestry. Commissioner
22 Freeman assumed most of these meet on a weekly basis. Chair Greenfield clarified some
23 might be monthly, others more quarterly or less frequent, but some will be more than once
24 a month. The nature of the activity and what is happening with it will determine the
25 frequency, and it may not be consistent. Commissioner Freeman went with Park
26 Amenities, Golf and Cubberley. Chair Greenfield shared that Cubberley is a role that is
27 more of a basket waiting for something to happen. If something is happening at Cubberley,
28 it could quickly become a top priority for the Commission but is in more of a monitoring
29 status at present. Commissioner Freeman said Field Users would be another one for him.
30 Commissioner Cribbs chose the Youth Council and Aquatics – unless someone else
31 wanted to take it on – and Funding partners. Vice Chair LaMere volunteered for
32 Community Gardens and Safe Routes. Chair Greenfield remarked that Foothills is where
33 they could potentially have two liaisons, and Ventura Plan was an open possibility. Vice
34 Chair LaMere indicated he would take the Ventura Plan. Chair Greenfield volunteered for
35 Baylands Tide Gate, Field Users jointly with Commissioner Freeman in a transitional
36 manner, Hawthornes and Urban Forestry. Chair Greenfield summarized that all were
37 covered, with two on a couple. He asked if there was any interest in joining anything else.
38 A second person on Foothills could be used potentially. He volunteered if no one else
39 wanted to. Commissioner Freeman offered to take Foothills. There were no final
40 comments or changes made.

1 Mr. Anderson thought the list looked good, but offered for consideration that on Foothills,
2 some continuity from a previous ad hoc might be beneficial, but not essential. Chair
3 Greenfield said it might be good for him to continue on that. He asked Commissioner
4 Freeman if he minded moving off of Foothills, and Commissioner Freeman was fine with
5 that. Commissioner Kleinhaus said if someone else was interested in Urban Forest, she
6 was happy to give it to them. Chair Greenfield designated the list as a starting point which
7 could be adapted.

8 Commissioner Freeman moved to adopt the 2022 Parks and Recreation Commission Ad
9 Hoc Committees and with assignments, and the Liaison assignments. Seconded by
10 Commissioner Cribbs, the motion passed unanimously, by roll call vote.

11 **4. Develop a Calendar Year 2022 Parks and Recreation Commission Workplan**

12 Chair Greenfield requested that Mr. Do share the Work Plan template screen, which
13 consisted of two component. First, a report on the Work Plan from 2021 and second, the
14 items included in the 2022 Work Plan. He did not expect to move forward with an action
15 that day to complete the item, but the plan at this point would be for the Work Plan to be
16 completed at the March Parks and Recreation Commission meeting, on the 22nd, and would
17 be going to City Council in April for approval.

18 Chair Greenfield asked the Commission to focus on getting their reviews in place as best
19 they could for the 2021 Work Plan, listing the items to be included in the columns on the
20 Work Plan on Baylands Tide Gate from last year, the primary focus of the project of the
21 ad hoc, the community benefits and measures of success being the main things. He said
22 rather than getting bogged down on wordsmithing, he wanted to focus on concepts. He
23 said a task will be given to each of the associated ad hocs to return with a proposed work
24 plan with all fields completed. This would be submitted to staff and included in the packet
25 for the March meeting. The process will be that each ad hoc will develop what they believe
26 to be an appropriate work plan for the work they will be undertaking and leading, The full
27 Commission would then review it and approve it at the March meeting. The first time the
28 full Commission will see all of the details will be a week before the March 22nd meeting
29 when the packet is posted.

30 Chair Greenfield asked the group to work on input to guide the ad hocs as they create the
31 Work Plan for next year. He invited questions, suggestions, clarifications. Commissioner
32 Cribbs wondered if there was a new, revised, updated work plan, or if this was the form
33 from last year. Mr. Anderson said he was told by the Clerk's Office that they were
34 developing one and would try to get it to them soon. He recommended that they move
35 forward with this one, given the time schedule, and if he gets a new one he will help move
36 things around, or work with the ad hocs to do so. Commissioner Cribbs said when she read
37 the Boards and Commissioners Handbook again it looked like it was new, but this didn't
38 look new. Chair Greenfield said he has posed a question to Council Members regarding

1 the Work Plan. The process is new, and they're all figuring out their way, with
2 considerable differences from commission to commission. Right now they are in a one-
3 size-fits-all template, based on the work plans submitted last year from the various
4 commissions and boards. He asked what the Council liked, and if they could get examples
5 of work plans that Council considered well-developed and that they could use as models
6 moving forward. He said they may get more information before the March meeting, which
7 Mr. Anderson would circulate.

8 Chair Greenfield suggested they go through and review the status and see to what extent
9 they can decide on the success of each ad hoc. On the Tide Gate, the ad hoc has been
10 disbanded because the goal was completed, with a Park Improvement Ordinance
11 recommended to City Council. Unfortunately, the work on the project was delayed a year,
12 so it will be starting at the end of this year instead of at the end of last year. This was
13 outside of the Commission's control and something they knew was a potential risk. They
14 will continue with the liaison, but the work is completed.

15 Commissioner Freeman asked if they are working on the Work Plan document in concert
16 with someone else, or providing their own best input. Chair Greenfield said it is a
17 document that each of the Boards and Commissions prepare their own and submit to City
18 Council for approval. It is a check and balance that the commissions and boards are
19 working in areas and projects that Council is authorizing and recognizing as consistent
20 with their priorities and with staff priorities.

21 Mr. Anderson added that the ad hocs are welcome to communicate with staff, both him
22 and Mr. Do, to assist and brainstorm together to get things in the position they want to be,
23 but they cannot consult with other Commissioners until the March meeting because of
24 Brown Act regulations. Chair Greenfield said if there are ad hocs that only have two
25 people, a third commissioner could be involved.

26 On the Dog Parks and Restrooms, Chair Greenfield said there are multiple line items
27 applying to particular that work plan. The Ramos Park restroom construction is not
28 complete. The Park Improvement Ordinance is complete and awaiting construction. On
29 Dog Park Improvements, the Boulware Park Improvement Ordinance is in place and
30 awaiting construction. The Off-leash Dog Park Pilot item is completed, although not
31 successful in moving forward, but it was decided that Ramos Park was not a suitable site
32 for an off-leash park. Public Education on dog park practices was not completed. It could
33 be continued with the 2022 Dog Park Liaison.

34 Regarding Fund Development, support for CSD events, Commissioner Cribbs said all the
35 community events that Mr. Howard wanted to do last year were supported. Some of the
36 events did not happen because of COVID. The relationship with support organizations
37 was very successful, with each coming in to speak with the Commission twice. The
38 guidelines published for public donation and sponsorship is a task that the Ad Hoc will

1 continue and wrap up, and will be a starting point for developing the 2022 Work Plan.

2 Commissioner Kleinhaus asked regarding Friends of the Parks if Friends of Foothills Park
3 was part of that. Chair Greenfield indicated that it was not. It has been a focus of funding
4 partners, which is not the role that Friends of Foothills Park have played. Mr. Anderson
5 said there has been a recent development where they are connected and working under
6 their 501(3)c. They are a distinct entity with a distinct focus, but for their fundraising and
7 non-profit status, they have to tie into Friends of Palo Alto Parks. Chair Greenfield asked
8 if they were working with Environmental Volunteers on some of the work at Foothills.
9 Mr. Anderson said their work is independent of that. Commissioner Cribbs said there are
10 some conversations going on with Grassroots and the EVs. They have good
11 communications, some coming from the stakeholder's group at the City Manager's Office.

12 Commissioner Kleinhaus asked if there was a separate liaison to the stakeholder group.
13 Chair Greenfield explained that in the past year the Chair and Vice Chair served as liaisons
14 to that stakeholder group. They could potentially add a third person to be involved with
15 the stakeholder group. If Commissioner Kleinhaus was one of the Foothills Liaisons, it
16 would be appropriate for her to be in that role. Mr. Anderson described the stakeholder
17 group, saying it was originally put together to help address the influx of new visitors to
18 Foothills when it opened to the general public. It was intended to be a diverse group of
19 people from Stanford and adjacent cities, all looking at and weighing in and discussing
20 things during that process. It has tapered off some as visitation has become more
21 manageable. But it is still helpful in reviewing the latest and being aware of what is going
22 on. He felt it would be helpful to have another Commission join. The frequency of
23 meetings has diminished and will probably be around every other month. Commissioner
24 Cribbs added that one of the things she thought they should focus on is future plans, such
25 as a docent program and the relationship with the community college, and things they can
26 do for the Preserve or can suggest in the future. She said it has been very effective in
27 thinking and talking with different groups. Commissioner Heinrich thought it would be
28 hard to be the liaison for Foothills without being part of that group, or at least know about
29 it and what is going on with it. It was decided that Commissioner Heinrich would be added
30 to the stakeholder's group.

31 Commissioner Cribbs asked to go back to the PRC Review of CIP Priorities. She wondered
32 if there was a way to get a more timely review from the CIP Committee about the gaps,
33 because one of the ideas was to be able to do some fundraising for things that fell out of
34 the CIP program, but sometimes they don't know about it far enough in advance to do
35 anything about it. Chair Greenfield said that is part of his goal for the CIP Ad Hoc this
36 year. Commissioner Cribbs wondered how to do this in view of Brown Act considerations.
37 Mr. Anderson agreed it was a challenge, with the Brown Act, to have those two related
38 Ad Hocs communicate. He thought a route to try would be to have things in his Department
39 Report that could be shared for the community and the full Commission. Commissioner

1 Cribbs thought they should try that, because too many times in the past they have been at
2 a community meeting and there's a hole that could be filled by neighbors willing to help
3 pay for something, and by the time they get it organized it's already past. She said it's
4 nobody's fault but she wanted to figure out to get that to be more visible.

5 Chair Greenfield continued with review of the status on the PRC Review of CIP Priorities.
6 Mr. Anderson thought that the review was successful.

7 On New Recreation Opportunities, further discussion on a City Gym definitely happened.
8 On Baylands 10.5 Acres Assessments, Chair Greenfield was not sure they had further
9 discussions on that. The Skate Park goal of further community discussions did occur; about
10 the recommendation to be forwarded to City Council has not happened yet. First Tee,
11 Vice Chair LaMere said they took action on a public-private partnership, shared facilities,
12 with the City and PAUSD and sports organizations. Vice Chair LaMere said nothing
13 happened with shared facilities. The survey regarding ethnic and gender opportunities did
14 not occur and is something to consider for next year.

15 Foothills Nature Preserve – the item was completed and the Ad Hoc disbanded. A
16 recommendation was forwarded to City Council for consideration on a future agenda.

17 For the CIP Review, List of Gaps, Identifying Supplemental Funding Opportunities – they
18 were not successful in that, but it was something to strive for in the coming year. Chair
19 Greenfield said they did review and discuss the plan. It is a matter of timing on when they
20 can get information to have an opportunity to influence what happens. This one is a burden
21 for staff to be able to carve out time to review this with the Commission within the limited
22 window in which they have access to the information.

23 The Racquet Court Policy is in process but not completed. Mr. Anderson added that
24 Pickleball Rules were completed. Chair Greenfield said he has heard some requests that
25 pickleball rules be posted more prominently. For example, the amount of time someone
26 can play on a court versus the pickleball convention of 75 minutes to 90 minutes. The
27 convention is 20 minutes on, and then the next group rotates. He wondered if this was
28 something that the Court Policy Ad Hoc that will be coming back to the Commission with.
29 Mr. Howard advised that it has already been passed forward. It is a part of the rules that
30 were approved, but they have not gone to the Consent for the City Council. He is trying to
31 get it through on March 7th. There has been delay, but as soon as it gets approved, the signs
32 are ready to go, and those rules will be posted and visible at the sites.

33 Chair Greenfield moved the discussion to the 2022 Work Plan. He suggested prioritizing
34 talking about the new Work Plan items as opposed to the carried-over items from the
35 previous work plan, because those Ad Hocs have a good basis on the direction to move in.

36 Chair Greenfield started with the Electric Conveyances Policy and said they need

1 understand what is realistic to try to accomplish this year. He thought they could be
2 researching policies of neighboring jurisdictions and reviewing how they apply to Palo
3 Alto. Commissioner Kleinhaus suggested researching some of the science, a lot of which
4 has been done by other jurisdictions. Commissioner Brown asked how detailed, because
5 it seems like it's getting into the "how" of the policy creation and she wondered how
6 detailed they should be. She felt this seemed like one of the more narrow-focused ones.
7 They can carve out individual actions, but she didn't want to pigeonhole any Ad Hoc to
8 doing things a certain way. Commissioner Freeman thought, on the research, to make it
9 more expansive, reaching out not only with neighboring communities, but also across the
10 country, because they are related. Commissioner Kleinhaus said she does think they need
11 to look at the science. Chair Greenfield thought looking at signage would be helpful as
12 well. The benefits would be safety, preservation of natural environment, increased access.
13 Commissioner Kleinhaus said that needs to be evaluated. Chair Greenfield said part of the
14 research would be balancing access and recreation with safety and environmental
15 protection. He thought it would need to be conservative in goals. He asked Mr. Anderson
16 if it was realistic to have a policy recommendation as a measure of success. He thought
17 they should send some kind of recommendation to Council, but was unsure whether it
18 should be scoping it out, or a policy. Mr. Anderson said he is normally conservative on
19 these because he hates to let anyone down, but he would aim for completing this and
20 sending a policy recommendation to Council.

21 The Commission discussed Park Dedication next. The following goals were suggested:
22 Reviewing and making a recommendation regarding potential rededication of Byxbee
23 Park 10 acres; consideration of other park dedication opportunities with research and
24 review. Commissioner Cribbs thought there had been discussion about pros and cons of
25 park dedication. Chair Greenfield said when they are reviewing the rededication of
26 Byxbee, for example, it should be a balanced discussion, which includes the benefits of
27 doing so and reasons to consider not doing it as well. Chair Greenfield suggested increased
28 dedicated park space to meet Master Plan goals. He wondered if there were mandates for
29 the park space, or just a goal. Commissioner Kleinhaus said there can't be mandates in the
30 plan, but it did have goals. Chair Greenfield wondered if there were any mandates
31 anywhere else. Mr. Anderson said only with Comprehensive Plan and Master Plan goals.
32 Commissioner Kleinhaus said there was the Quimby Act but she didn't know if it applied.
33 Mr. Anderson did not think it was a mandate to achieve those acres per resident goals.
34 Chair Greenfield suggested the measure of success on the first item be recommendation
35 to Council on the Measure E site. He thought they should make a recommendation,
36 whether it be to rededicate it or not. The measure of success on the second item would be
37 reviewing other potential sites, discussing them in the Commission, and forwarding a
38 recommendation to Council if appropriate.

39 Chair Greenfield invited questions on the work plans for the other Ad Hocs – CIP Review,
40 Funding Opportunities, Racquet Court Policy, Rec Projects. He said there will be six work

1 plans coming out of the Parks and Recreation Commission and said this was an opportunity
2 for the full Commission to speak openly on any of these subjects. Commissioner Heinrich
3 asked that on the Recreation Projects there be some kind of integration of biodiversity
4 where possible.

5 **V. COMMISSIONER/BOARD MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS,**
6 **ANNOUNCEMENTS OR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

7 Chair Greenfield advised that it was 2:30, their targeted end time. He thanked the
8 participants for their attendance for the four hours. Commissioner Cribbs said it will be
9 great when they can all get together in person and have lunch and conversation. Chair
10 Greenfield thanked everyone for their different levels of work in preparing for this, a lot
11 of work done very recently, including Mr. Anderson, Mr. Do and Mr. Howard, for making
12 it an informative event. He looked forward to working with everyone in the coming year
13 and getting a new member added to the Commission as well. He thanked staff for their
14 assistance and support through the year.

15 Mr. Anderson echoed Chair Greenfield’s sentiments and appreciated staff being there and
16 spending time helping them out. He looked forward to working with the Commission. He
17 said staff is excited about working with them and making the City as good as they can
18 make it, offering great programs and projects, parks and open space. He complimented the
19 Chair for his leadership and the prep work put into this process, and the Vice Chair as well.

20 Vice Chair LaMere thanked everyone for their participation and input. He was excited to
21 see what the Commission could do in the next 15 months.

22 Chair Greenfield thought they had articulated a reasonable set of goals that they get move
23 forward on. He looked forward to their next meeting on February 22nd.

24 **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

25
26 Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.