



**MINUTES  
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
February 22, 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  
32  
33  
34

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

**Commissioners Absent:** Vice Chair LaMere

**Others Present:** Council Member Tom DuBois

**Staff Present:** Daren Anderson, Lam Do, Kristen O’Kane, and Adam Howard

**CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Lisa Steinback wished to hear the plan for resurfacing of the Cubberley tennis courts, which she said is long overdue, and she feels Palo Alto may have a potential liability issue due to safety problems on the courts. She said that recently she noted gouges out of the courts, missing surface, with deep divots. She mentioned that the courts are being rented to USTA teams, and it is very dangerous to be on the courts, with the chances for tripping and falling, so it should be at the very top of the court resurfacing schedule. Secondly, Ms. Steinback commented on lighting on all of the courts. She noted that the lights are up on pedestals. There are a number of burned out lights at Rinconada – Courts 2, 3 and 4. As the courts are rented after dark, she said it seems that burned out bulbs should be replaced. She was told that staff waits until a certain number of bulbs are burned before replacing bulbs, but for the people trying to play, it is dim. She expressed that if people are paying money to rent the courts, there should be a higher frequency of replacing burned out bulbs.

**AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS**

**BUSINESS**

- 1. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting During COVID-19 State of Emergency**



1 Motion by Commissioner Heinrich to approve the Resolution. Seconded by Commissioner  
2 Freeman, the motion passed, 5-0, by roll call vote.

3 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

4 **2. Approval of Draft Minutes from the January 25, 2022 Parks and Recreation**  
5 **Commission Meeting**

6 Motion by Commissioner Brown to approve the minutes of the January 25, 2022, Parks  
7 and Recreation Commission meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Cribbs, the motion  
8 passed, 5-0, by roll call vote.

9 **CITY OFFICIAL REPORTS**

10 **3. Department Report**

11 Mr. Anderson announced that, starting in March, all board, commission and committee  
12 meetings will be held both in person and hybrid. The Commission will be in person and  
13 members of the public and select staff making presentations can participate remotely via  
14 Zoom. Commission should be receiving an email from the Clerk's Office with details on  
15 the process for that.

16 Regarding Cubberley Gym A and B, rentals have been cancelled until further notice due  
17 to flooding issues. Facility staff discovered major flooding under the gyms when  
18 investigating the hardwood floors, which were showing signs of discoloration. They found  
19 three inches of standing water, and they are working on repair of a few leaks. They have  
20 brought in a contractor to help work on that. It will be closed for several weeks while  
21 repairs are made and they hire a remediation company to help dehumidify and make  
22 repairs.

23 The Town Council on February 14<sup>th</sup> passed a motion to direct staff to pause preparation of  
24 the Cubberley Concept Plan and request a joint meeting with the PAUSD School Board  
25 and City Council prior to the June break, and to ask staff to return to Council with a work  
26 plan to include exploring a land swap at Fletcher or a financial framework for acquiring  
27 available land; and secondly, to scope and design process for Cubberley Community  
28 Center that is a City-owned once the acreage is determined.

29 On March 7<sup>th</sup>, the City Council will discuss the PRC recommendation on a new community  
30 gymnasium project and also the Foothills Fire Mitigation and Safety Improvement  
31 Strategies. On March 14<sup>th</sup>, the Roth Building lease will be discussed. On April 11<sup>th</sup>, the  
32 First Tee proposal for improvements to the youth practice area and driving range area is  
33 listed as an action item. Mr. Anderson said the Cubberley tennis courts are scheduled to  
34 be resurfaced in mid-April. The Cubberley Field renovation project is nearly complete and



1 the fields will be re-opened on February 25<sup>th</sup>. The Baylands Athletic Center baseball field  
2 was also under renovation, and it will be opening March 4<sup>th</sup>. The Eleanor Pardee Field,  
3 also renovated, will open March 14<sup>th</sup>.

4 Mr. Anderson announced that there is a “Walk With a Naturalist” program at the Baylands.  
5 The class meets in front of the Baylands Nature Interpretive Center, and the program  
6 includes time out on the trails and time in the Interpretive Center. The participant capacity  
7 is 25 people, and everyone must register for the program, which can be done on the Enjoy  
8 Online. The dates for that are Saturday, February 26; Saturday, March 12<sup>th</sup>; and Saturday  
9 March 26<sup>th</sup>, all from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.

10 Mr. Anderson gave an update on summer camp registration, which has gone well.  
11 Registrations are higher compared to the last three summers, with 185 of the 244 camps  
12 already meeting the minimum number of enrolled campers to move forward. Another 108  
13 camps are totally full and have wait lists, and there are about 1,250 open spots remaining  
14 for campers to register, which will remain open through the spring. Also, CSD will host a  
15 table at the Summer Camp Fair on March 6<sup>th</sup> at Palo Alto High School, advertising camps  
16 and recruiting counselors for Summer, 2022.

17 Chair Greenfield invited questions from the Commissioners on the Department Report.

18 Commissioner Cribbs asked about the California Parks and Recreation Society (CPRS)  
19 Conference coming up in March and whether Community Services was planning to send  
20 any staff people to the conference. Mr. Anderson responded that that is yet to be identified.  
21 There may be staff working on it, but they have not discussed it as a team yet.

22 Councilmember DuBois asked about the gym flooding and how it is impacting the  
23 basketball season. He asked if they are trying to find any alternative space. Mr. Howard  
24 said this news just came out recently. Staff was scrambling to get all of the notifications  
25 out and get an understanding of who is being impacted. They still have the Pavilion so if  
26 they can do some rearranging and put more groups there, they will. He thought they would  
27 have a more clear picture of the impacts by the next day.

28 Commissioner Freeman asked if there was a schedule for the resurfacing of the tennis  
29 courts. He assumed it required taking the courts offline and wondered notification would  
30 go out to the public with the information. Mr. Anderson said mid-April is the approximate  
31 start date, and it is a 30- to 45-day window. He said there would be signage posted at the  
32 courts well in advance and information for the Cubberley staff as well. He will announce  
33 it to the Parks and Recreation Commission and try to get it on the website as well.

34 Chair Greenfield inquired on the Cubberley gym issue. He assumed funding for the repair  
35 would come out of the annual Cubberley budget. Mr. Anderson said it was yet to be  
36 determined, but he thought it would be from funds designated for Cubberley maintenance.

1 Chair Greenfield mentioned the direction from City Council for staff to explore the land  
2 swap at Fletcher and wondered if that was referring to Terman Park. Mr. Anderson said  
3 that was correct. Mr. Anderson said the swap being explored was land on Terman Park for  
4 land at Cubberley. Mr. Anderson said Parks and Recreation Commission would certainly  
5 be involved, and he would bring it as a discussion item, but they have not yet begun  
6 working on it. As he has more information they will learn more about the process and what  
7 it looks like.

8 **BUSINESS**

9 **4. Ad Hoc Reports**

10 Vice Chair Greenfield invited any reports on the recently-created Ad Hoc and Liaison  
11 roles. Hearing none, he clarified for the new Commissioners how the Ad Hoc and Liaison  
12 roles work. He said, in general, the Ad Hoc should be checking with their staff liaison and  
13 each other at least monthly, to see if there's something to be pursuing or following up on.  
14 The staff liaison will help in leading them in the process to the extent necessary, or the  
15 Ad Hocs are able to take over the lead on their own. Regarding liaison roles, he suggested  
16 that everyone check in with their staff liaison, particularly for those in a new liaison role.  
17 Mr. Anderson can help with contact information.

18 Vice Chair Greenfield said some of the liaison roles are more like a basket, available to  
19 catch things that happen to fall that way, so there may be many months when there may  
20 not be much activity. If taking over a liaison role that someone else served in last year, it  
21 would be a good idea to check in with the Commissioner, whether a current Commissioner  
22 or a previous Commissioner, to get up to speed and help with continuity. He said at next  
23 month's meeting, the Ad Hocs will give more detailed updates. He also said that next  
24 month's agenda will include their work plans that he hoped to complete to present to City  
25 Council for approval afterwards. Each Ad Hoc should focus this coming month on nailing  
26 down their work plan, working with the staff liaison, or looking at the work plan from last  
27 year if there is one available that is related to ongoing work. Each of the Ad Hocs will  
28 submit their work plan to staff, and it will be included in the agenda item that will be  
29 shared a week before the next meeting. At that point, all of the Commissioners will be able  
30 to see the work plans being proposed by all of the Ad Hocs. In working on that agenda  
31 item, the Commission will complete the Work Plan as a body, led by the Ad Hocs  
32 associated with each item, but also with any input from the other Commission members.

33 Chair Greenfield said they have been looking for sample work plans or guidance from the  
34 City Clerk's Office in terms of how they should move forward with their work plans this  
35 year. Mr. Anderson said to reach out to him if there is anything he can do to help each Ad  
36 Hoc develop its individual work plan element, and he would be glad to help facilitate that.  
37 He said they were informed that there would be a revised template or form coming from  
38 the Clerk's Office, but it has yet to arrive. He has an inquiry in to the Clerk's Office to ask

1 when they might expect that. He thought, given the timeframe, the appropriate course of  
2 action would be to continue with the templet they've got, and if they receive something in  
3 the near term with time to alter and change before their March meeting, they can do so.  
4 Mr. Anderson said he would share any further feedback from the Clerk's Office or other  
5 staff members. He thought they could put this on the website, or email it out to the  
6 Commission, without any Brown Act problems, and he would look into whether it needed  
7 to become part of the record at the next meeting.

8 Commissioner Cribbs mentioned that on the Ad Hoc committees there are three without  
9 any staff liaisons yet. She wondered if those could be filled yet. Mr. Anderson shared the  
10 list and discussed the liaisons that needed to be filled. He said he would help with the Park  
11 Dedication, Electric Conveyance Policy, Dog Parks and Park Amenities. Mr. Do would  
12 be the liaison for the Website Refresh. Chair Greenfield pointed out this one was less  
13 critical because there would not be a work plan item for it.

14 **5. Supplement to Development Impact Fee Justification Study**

15 Sarah Duffy, Community Services, introduced the update and recommendations regarding  
16 the development impact fees for parks, community centers and libraries. She introduced  
17 David Taussig, from DTA, who would be sharing the analysis and research he and his  
18 colleagues have worked on, with some recommendations. DTA had presented the initial  
19 fee impact nexus study to Parks and Recreation Commission and Finance Committee  
20 during the last fiscal year. There were some follow-up questions which DTA has  
21 researched and developed recommendations on. Ms. Duffy said after they get feedback  
22 from the Commission, they will move on to Finance Committee and Council with the goal  
23 of making any modifications, getting to the fees this fiscal year and getting Council  
24 approval this fiscal year.

25 Mr. Taussig said previously Nathan Perez was responsible for this project and has taken a  
26 position elsewhere, so he would be presenting the item. He has been working with Kyle  
27 Martinez, who has done much of the work on this study. He said basically, there was a fee  
28 program adopted by the City Council last year on April 12<sup>th</sup> and implemented on August  
29 23<sup>rd</sup>. The Council had questions regarding certain assumptions made and wanted some  
30 updates based upon what they found, looking deeper into those assumptions. The current  
31 fees were studied in light of issues that City Council wanted them to look at, and some  
32 changes were made to the recommendations for fees based on some of the Council's  
33 suggestions, as well as some outstanding issues having to do with the price of land in Palo  
34 Alto that may require further changes to the fees. He wished to get some feedback from  
35 the Commission as to what direction they would like to be taken.

36 Mr. Taussig described the current programs, explaining that they are divided into Park  
37 Fee, Community Center Fee and Library Fee, with the Park fee being the one under  
38 discussion. At the current levels the Park fee is \$57,420 for a single-family home; \$42,468



1 for a multi-family home; and adding the Community Center and the Library, the total fee  
2 comes to about \$64,500 for a single-family home and \$47,700 for a multi-family.  
3 Normally, when a developer pulls a building permit that is when they are asked to pay that  
4 fee. In addition, there are two non-residential categories – commercial/industrial and  
5 hotel/motel. For the non-residential fee relating to parks, the situation becomes fluid  
6 because there is a certain usage of parks that comes with a resident versus an employee.  
7 An employee who doesn't live in the community comes, works for five days, and then  
8 goes home. Mr. Taussig described the way they allocate fees between residential and non-  
9 residential. Theoretically, there can be a person residing in the community with access to  
10 the park 12 hours a day. With an employee, they might run for an hour, or picnic at lunch  
11 for an hour, and maybe stay after work for an hour to participate in some type of activity.  
12 They would have access to a park for perhaps an average of three hours a day– not that  
13 they would use it, but they would have potential access three hours a day, five days a week,  
14 so 15 hours a week. The comparison is normally that an employee using a park based on  
15 the hours available is about 18 percent as much as a resident. So, one resident has a little  
16 more than five times the usage of a park as a non-residential user who is an employee.  
17 consequently, in allocating the fees, there is residential carrying a large portion of the  
18 weight, since residents have slightly more than five times the likelihood of using park  
19 space as an employee working in a non-residential facility. Mr. Taussig advised that for  
20 commercial/industrial, the number was \$18.91 per square foot; for hotel/motel it was \$3.22  
21 per square foot.

22 Mr. Taussig said the City had concerns and questions, one thing they wanted DTA to look  
23 into was the value of the land. Mr. Taussig said they have access to certain databases  
24 through a subscription so they obtained information for the last ten years, and the last five  
25 years, regarding the cost of land. The number they came up with was \$5.7 million per acre.  
26 There was a lot of discussion regarding that, because if the City had to go out and buy  
27 parkland, particularly in an expensive single-family home area, probably a vacant piece  
28 land – of which there is not a lot in Palo Alto – they would be paying a lot of money for  
29 that land. He said most cities have a lot of vacant land and sales, providing a good cost of  
30 land. In Palo Alto, it is more difficult. The number used is really a matter of what kind of  
31 assumptions are made. He said they had looked at more recent data, and \$5.7 million was  
32 the number they came up with, so they have increased to that number, which affects the  
33 fee.

34 The second item the City brought up was that they want to look closer at non-residential  
35 categories. Commercial/industrial together includes retail and office. They wanted to  
36 differentiate between those, because the number of persons working per square foot in  
37 each type of facility is different. Mr. Taussig said they were using 250 square feet per  
38 office worker, which has been the industry standard forever, but the feeling was that  
39 actually offices here have more employees per square foot than what has been the standard  
40 average used in most cities, so they refigured their numbers based on that and did the

1 same for retail, for hotel and for industrial.

2 Mr. Taussig said the third item was updating the office density. They thought there was  
3 not enough office workers per square foot. They had 250 square feet per office worker and  
4 the feeling was it should be 190 square feet per worker. They worked with City folks and  
5 came up with some real numbers based on census data and on the amount of square footage  
6 in the City right now that's office, and found that they really could have used 190 square  
7 feet per employee, which means you're generating more use of parks, because you've got  
8 more employees per 1,000 square feet, so that adjustment was made.

9 The next Council direction, Item D, was for a recommendation for frequency of fee study  
10 updates. Mr. Taussig said they work with many cities that update their fee studies every  
11 five years, and many have an escalator that allows the fees to go up every year, so once  
12 the City adopts the fees, there is an escalator that allows it to go up every year a certain  
13 amount. In terms of going back and revisiting this to determine if there's been an increase  
14 in the cost of land that is greater than the amount of escalation every year, whether there  
15 is a different number of acres of park necessary, and whether the quality of the park should  
16 be different, all of that could be reconsidered in a new fee study. However, he said doing  
17 a fee study involves public hearings, a lot of calculations, going through a resolution  
18 process which is adopted by a city council. There is a lot to it, so the question is how often  
19 does the City want to redo their fee studies? Mr. Taussig said their recommendation is  
20 once between every five years and eight years, depending upon how long the City is  
21 satisfied with the fee they have. Mr. Taussig thought it would be important to update and  
22 take a look at new circumstances, especially if the annual escalator being applied is not  
23 keeping up with the actual cost of providing whatever capital facilities they're providing  
24 – in this case, parks.

25 Items E involved evaluating the single-family/multi-family fee structure. Mr. Taussig  
26 explained that there is a new law which will take effect July 1<sup>st</sup>, and if the fees are approved  
27 before then they can have one fee for single-family homes no matter what the size of the  
28 home, and another fee for a multi-family home, which would remain in effect until a new  
29 fee is adopted. After July 1st, for any new fees adopted, a per-square-foot fee will be  
30 mandatory. For example, a 3,000-square-foot home will pay twice the fees of a 1,500-  
31 square-foot home. The logic is that the larger the home the more people living there, the  
32 more benefit there is, so they should pay higher fees. Also, larger homes generally tend to  
33 be more expensive than smaller homes, so the assumption is that they can handle the higher  
34 fee. Mr. Taussig said the Building Industry Association was very crucial in the State  
35 Legislature changing this law. He said adopting new fees before July 1st – whether a  
36 single fee regardless of size, or a per-square-foot fee – is something to consider doing or  
37 not doing, but the next fee adopted after July 1<sup>st</sup>, which he said may be five years from  
38 now, or eight years from now, would have to be based on square footage, since the law is  
39 changing as of July 1, 2022.

1 Finally, on Item F, evaluating fee credit options, Mr. Taussig commented that the City is  
2 trying to build some affordable housing homes below market price. A very large fee for  
3 parks or anything else makes it more difficult to build affordable housing, so the question  
4 is, should there be some kind of fee credit or partial waiver? He said one thing about fees  
5 that people don't seem to recognize but is very important is that when they do these studies  
6 they are to justify the maximum fee that can be charged. It does not mean the City Council  
7 has to charge that amount. Charging less is fine, but they can't charge more, because they  
8 would have to go through a new fee justification study, a new set of hearings, a new  
9 resolution to charge more than that. Mr. Tausig said that the fees discussed are the  
10 maximum that can be charged based upon their analysis. They could charge less if they  
11 decided to, and that may be a factor if there is a park fee that is very high and, because of  
12 different goals for the City, they may not want to charge the maximum level. It is a  
13 political choice, whatever is right for that particular community.

14 Mr. Taussig shared their findings after they concentrated on land cost in the last five years  
15 and updating it from to a \$6.5 million per acre valuation from \$5.7 million per acre. This  
16 resulted in an increase in the fee level of 9.37 percent. Looking at the same four categories  
17 from 2021, when the fees were first adopted, the single-family residential fee for parks  
18 goes from \$57,420 to \$62,802, a little bit over \$5,000 increase. Multi-family goes from  
19 \$42,500 to \$46,000. Commercial/industrial per square foot goes from \$16.83 to \$18.41.  
20 Hotel/motel goes from \$2.86 to \$3.13, so going up based upon what they see as the up-to-  
21 dated land cost at \$6.5 million per acre resulted in fees ranging from \$46,500 for multi-  
22 family and \$62,800 for single-family.

23 In looking at the various categories and looking at the different numbers of employees per  
24 square foot, they differentiated between retail and office, so that there is now a retail,  
25 office, industrial, hotel and an Other commercial category. Anything that does not qualify  
26 under any of the other four categories and yet is non-residential would fall into the  
27 commercial category, and average, catch-all category for outlier types of use. They update  
28 the numbers based upon carrying those four categories instead of one category. The retail  
29 fee decreased by 41 percent because the number of employees per square foot for retail  
30 was lower than what the average was with a combined commercial category. Office  
31 increased by 30 percent, since it went from 250 square feet per employee going to 190  
32 square feet per employee, so 30 percent more employees-per-1,000-square-foot of the  
33 building. Industrial decreased 12 percent and the Other Commercial is the average of all  
34 the other non-residential categories. Mr. Taussig said there was not an Other Commercial  
35 last time, but they added this just to have a category to catch people in if a builder says  
36 they're not retail or office or industrial.

37 Regarding frequency of updates, Mr. Taussig said the fee is going up by construction cost  
38 index or consumer price index. During good years, when there is a lot of development  
39 going on it goes up more, generally somewhere between two and four percent per year, as



1 an increase every year, without having to go back and do a new fee study. However, that  
2 doesn't keep up with all of the needs of the City, particularly if land costs go up more than  
3 that. He said many clients do a new study every five years, but five to eight years is the  
4 norm around the state. Regarding evaluation of single versus multi-family, he reminded  
5 them that July 1<sup>st</sup> is the cutoff date, after which it will be on a per-square-foot basis. The  
6 fee could stay at one number for all single-family and one number for all multi-family,  
7 which is simpler for the City to implement; however, he noted that smaller homes are  
8 perhaps paying a little more than they can afford and the larger homes maybe less than  
9 they could afford. Breaking the fee down by square footage would make it possible to  
10 charge more appropriate amounts based on the size and the price, as well as the demand  
11 for more park facilities created by a home.

12 On options for below market rate units, Mr. Taussig said they didn't answer because they  
13 weren't sure how much to go into to that. He said they can show what it takes to build an  
14 affordable home and how much easier it is to build an affordable home if there is no park  
15 fee, or a lower park fee, but remarked that it is an issue that is not black and white, but a  
16 gray area, and they will look for more direction from the Council on this, as it can be a  
17 complicated issue.

18 Mr. Taussig shared the Summary of the proposed Development Impact Fees, based on the  
19 updated land acquisition valuation of \$6.5 million per acre. The totals go up for single-  
20 family, detached, from \$62,800 per unit to \$69,886. Multi-family increases from \$46,500  
21 to \$51,687. In the five new categories for Non-Residential, the totals for Parks,  
22 Community Center and Library comes to \$11.20 per square foot for retail; \$24.53 for  
23 Office; \$16.61 for industrial per square foot; \$3.49 per square foot for hotel, which remains  
24 the same; and \$13.96 per square foot for Other Commercial. These are the numbers they  
25 are recommending to the Council based on the higher sales price of a home, the new  
26 categories of non-residential, and each one reflecting the updated number of employees  
27 per 1,000 square foot in a non-residential building.

28 Mr. Taussig concluded by summarizing their recommendations:

- 29 • Update the land valuation from \$5.7 million to \$6.5 million
- 30 • Separate the commercial/industrial into retail, office, industrial, and other  
31 commercial
- 32 • (Already done) Update office density to lower it to 190 square feet per employee
- 33 • Fee study updates every five to eight years;
- 34 • Update the fee schedule with above recommendations this fiscal year, but convert  
35 to square foot recommendation in the next fee study update
- 36 • Seek further direction from the City on how to deal with affordable housing, and  
37 how much of a priority it is, versus parks.

1 Mr. Taussig noted that if parks are that important, then you do one thing. If affordable  
2 housing is more important, then you do another, or you come up with a compromise in the  
3 middle somewhere. There are many options, and much of it ends up being local policy and  
4 what the City Council feels is appropriate at this time for the city.

5 Chair Greenfield invited comments and questions from the Commissioners.

6 Commissioner Cribbs asked if the presentation could be shared with the Commissioners,  
7 because it was easier to understand than wading through all of the paper in the packet. Mr.  
8 Taussig was very agreeable to this. Chair Greenfield commented that the Commissioners  
9 who were there when it was first presented would have an advantage over the new  
10 commissioners, who were trying to absorb it for the first time.

11 Commissioner Kleinhaus asked about SB 9 and ADUs, how single-family residential is  
12 defined and what to do in light of SB 9 if someone has four units, plus an ADU. Mr.  
13 Taussig responded that each city is different. Cities trying to encourage affordable housing  
14 tell them to waive the fee on an ADU, reasoning that the single-family home that was  
15 there to begin with paid the fee and that the ADU doesn't have to. Other communities say  
16 it's a detached, separate home and therefore treated as a single-family detached home,  
17 obviously with very small square footage, which wouldn't be paying as much. In this case,  
18 since the fees are pretty high for single-family home, the Council may decide to waive it,  
19 or to charge a much lower amount based on the fact that the typical ADU is maybe one-  
20 sixth the size of a typical single-family home. He said there's no law one way or the other.  
21 It's a matter of what the Council decides to do. Mr. Taussig said they did not deal with it  
22 in this study, but could call it out if they wanted, and make it something separate. Since  
23 SB 9 is new, it's the first time they've had to deal with ADUs in quantity.

24 Chair Greenfield invited comments from members of the public.

25 Keith Reckdahl, former Parks and Recreation Commissioner, said parks and recreation are  
26 important parts of Palo Alto's quality of life, and RHNA is going to require the City to  
27 add over 6,000 new housing units over the next eight years. This study is crucial to ensure  
28 that the new neighbors have the same access to parks and recreation that the rest of the  
29 city enjoys. He agreed that it was a good presentation and very informative. He said his  
30 biggest complaint is that the study only looks at vacant parcels, and that is not  
31 representative of the land that they would need to purchase for park acquisition. It is clear  
32 that the study examines the wrong property. Although a valuation of \$6.5 million per acre  
33 sounds like a lot of money, in Palo Alto real estate it is not. It is much more expensive than  
34 that, so the \$6.5 million per acre is insufficient to buy parkland. He pointed out that five  
35 years ago, in his neighborhood in South Palo Alto, a tear-down near the railroad tracks  
36 sold for \$13 million per acre – double what the nexus study is assuming. He said North  
37 Palo Alto is even more expensive, so \$6.5 million per acres is definitely insufficient. He  
38 said considering the housing shortage in the area, is it more likely that parkland acquisition

1 would be commercial property, which is even more expensive than residential property.  
2 He gave an example, that three years ago the old Pizza Chicago site in El Camino, which  
3 was sold as a tear-down, was \$21 million per acre. The County now assesses this empty  
4 lot at over \$22 million per acre, which is three-and-a-half times what the nexus study is  
5 assuming.

6 Mr. Reckdahl continued and stated that in addition to city parklands, they also have open  
7 space. The nexus study values their open space, like Foothills Nature Preserve, at about  
8 \$65,000 per acre. He pointed out that the last open space acquisition was 20 years ago,  
9 with the Bressler addition to Arastradero Preserve, which cost \$274,000 per acre. Even  
10 ignoring inflation, that is 4.2 times the value assumed by the nexus study. He said it is  
11 important to correctly value the assets, adding that North Ventura went to Council last  
12 month, and City staff concluded that the park impact fees were insufficient to fund the  
13 needed parks in the area. So, the new residents in North Ventura will not be receiving their  
14 fair share of parks unless the impact fees are accurately updated. With the City being  
15 stretched due to pandemic issues and the huge unfunded mandate for affordable housing,  
16 the City's General Fund does not have the cash flow to subsidize new parks, so the impact  
17 fees must be updated to realistically reflect the true cost of park acquisition.

18 Chair Greenfield clarified the role of the Commission in considering this action. He  
19 appreciated the background information provided. He said when the item came to the Parks  
20 and Recreation Commission last February it was recommended to be approved by a vote  
21 of 5-2. Commissioner Reckdahl and he vote against it. The City followed up on some of  
22 their reasons for voting against it and ended up asking for more information on some of  
23 the items currently being discussed. He said it is a different type of item than the  
24 Commission normally is involved in, but is very important, because it impacts funding  
25 for everything they do, particularly down the road as the community increases in  
26 population.

27 Chair Greenfield highlighted the fact that public fees are collected and are available for  
28 targeted uses, so the Park Fees that are contributed are targeted for the Parks and don't go  
29 into the General Fund. Also, the studies justify the maximum fee that they are allowed to  
30 collect. He said that one way of looking at it is they want to make sure they are not  
31 improperly limiting their fee structure. They are not specifying what the fee will be, but  
32 setting what the ceiling will be.

33 Chair Greenfield wondered if the PRC were to forego making a recommendation to accept  
34 the study in its current form and instead make a different suggestion, if there was potential  
35 for the study to be revised and come back to them before going to the Finance Committee.  
36 He wondered if Council Member DuBois had any insight on that, being the Chair of the  
37 Finance Committee.

38 Council Member DuBois was not sure what the process would be if the Commission did



1 not accept the recommendation. He thought Mr. Reckdahl’s comments were interesting  
2 and thinks there is a lot of concern about the land value. He appreciated the update and  
3 said there is a seeming disconnect, so he was interested in the discussion. He noted that if  
4 he could buy an acre of land for \$6.5 million, he would do it. He thought if the Commission  
5 could save Council time, that would be the most useful, because the Council has the same  
6 question and will be kind of stuck on the issue as well.

7 Chair Greenfield asked Director Kristen O’Kane, Community Services, to comment. Ms.  
8 O’Kane thought they could hear the Commissioners’ comments and they could take  
9 whatever action seemed appropriate and present it to the Finance Committee, which may  
10 mean some additional work before the Finance Committee met in order to present them  
11 with some additional information on which to make their recommendation. She didn’t  
12 think they would need to come back to the PRC necessarily, but whatever the PRC’s input  
13 and recommendation were, they could apply that to their Finance Committee presentation.  
14 Chair Greenfield noted that Council’s motion last April was requesting them to return to  
15 Council in the following fiscal year, which ends on June 30<sup>th</sup>.

16 Chair Greenfield invited further clarifications or questions. Hearing none, he invited  
17 comments from the Commissioners.

18 Commissioner Freeman appreciated the presentation, being a new member and hearing  
19 this for the first time. He noted how COVID has changed things across all industries and  
20 the fact that a lot of companies are going with a hybrid model which probably will last for  
21 some time, so the way things will be different going forward, so they should take that  
22 into consideration when thinking about how often to revisit fees. Companies might not be  
23 increasing their real estate footprint as a result of downsizing their in-house employees  
24 and giving people an option to work remotely. He asked if that was taken into  
25 consideration. Mr. Taussig said other people ask about this, and they do not have a solid  
26 answer. They are using data that was basically pre-pandemic. He talked about some of the  
27 latest numbers they’ve seen on industrial as Amazon and other firms are putting in more  
28 high-tech material. He said the new number used by Amazon now is 1,200 square feet per  
29 employee because they have so much mechanization going on. He knew this because they  
30 just did a study for the City of San Bernadino. So obviously, the 300 square feet per  
31 employee isn’t going to apply anymore, but they used 300 for Palo Alto’s study. Those  
32 adjustments will have to be made at some point in the future. They did not consider that  
33 in their study to date because they don’t know what the new model is going to be .

34 Commissioner Freeman agreed it is hard to predict the future and many companies don’t  
35 necessarily know what the future will be. He said there is already starting to be a reduction  
36 by organizations acquiring new space and probably looking at giving up space at some  
37 point.

1 Commissioner Cribbs said as she listened to the presentation she wondered how it reflects  
2 the effect that COVID has had over the last two years and the projections for the future.  
3 She understood that the data they were using to make these decisions is data from pre-  
4 COVID. Mr. Taussig confirmed this is the case. They used 2018 census data, which is the  
5 commercial census that shows how many employees there are in each industry as of 2018,  
6 number of employed persons in each of the industries, industrial versus retail, versus  
7 office. They have the square footage existing in the City, which is up-to-date. They did the  
8 division and came up with the number of square feet per employee, which is why they  
9 lowered the number for office from 250 feet to 190. Thinking about what it might be from  
10 now on, he said if his company ever goes back to the office, they would be in a hybrid  
11 situation where people would come in on some days but not other days. He suspected there  
12 would be a lot of empty space a lot of the time. They could say they have 55 employees  
13 and so many square feet, but how many of them come in every day and therefore would  
14 be using the local parks, or the roads, or the water or sewer? He reiterated that it will all  
15 be changing, and it is very difficult to predict exactly where they will be going. He said if  
16 the building industry sues they will have the numbers to show.

17 Commissioner Cribbs agreed that it will be hard to predict the future and was interested to  
18 know whether their company would be looking at this more closely, because coming out  
19 of COVID is such a new thing. Mr. Taussig said they will definitely have to, and he was  
20 sure someone would sue over that issue at some point. They've been very fortunate not to  
21 have been sued, but the world is changing and is more litigious in this area.

22 Commissioner Cribbs added that she continues to think that the land valuation is too low,  
23 given the cost of land in Palo Alto and because the Commission's responsibility is to look  
24 for ways to get more parks, especially in the underserved part of Palo Alto, which is the  
25 Ventura area. From a personal perspective, she was concerned that they are low. Mr.  
26 Taussig acknowledged Mr. Reckdahl's points were well-taken. He said what they could  
27 do is go out and get every single sale of every parcel over the last 12 months and come out  
28 with a per-acre cost, irrespective of whether it has a building on it or not. Most have  
29 buildings on them, and whether old industrial or a brand new single-family home, they  
30 could have a number which would be supportable in court. As Mr. Reckdahl had said, the  
31 City may have to build a park by knocking down a couple single-family homes because  
32 there is no vacant land and they have no choice. They would have to pay for the land as  
33 well as the building on top of the land. They can do that, and then it becomes a political  
34 football for the City Council, because they have to consider that they needs parks. Yet,  
35 what other priorities does the City have? Affordable housing. Their fee was \$64,504 per  
36 unit as of 2022, for a single-family. If they doubled the valuation from \$6.5 million to \$13  
37 million they would have a \$130,000-per-unit park fee in addition to all of the other fees.  
38 Mr. Taussig asked, how does that affect other city policies? The City Council has to make  
39 up their mind. They could decide that right now they want more housing so they won't  
40 charge the maximum \$130,000, but will move to that in two years. They have a lot of

1 flexibility, but the bottom line is it's expensive to buy land in Palo Alto, and if they are  
2 going to buy land they will have to pay a high price and be cognizant of that when coming  
3 up with the fee program.

4 Mr. Taussig went on to say that he has been with a lot of other cities doing these studies.  
5 They finished one with Costa Mesa a couple years ago, and that City decided to take the  
6 money they are collecting for land and for improvements and look at certain of their parks  
7 that are very undeveloped, with no ballfields, et cetera. The intent would be to take the  
8 money and put it into existing land to make it more useable, because they thought that was  
9 the most effective use of the fee money, to make parks available to people today, based on  
10 the fact that they have park space that's not used very efficiently. On the other hand, Mr.  
11 Taussig pointed out that if you do that instead of buying land, the land is not going to get  
12 cheaper. It will get more expensive, so you're limiting yourself as to how many parks you  
13 have. He said it is not a crazy idea, because they are using the land and the money more  
14 efficiently, building facilities that people could use right away. He said Irvine did a soccer  
15 field with 12 fields in one place on what was bare land, because they decided it would be  
16 more useful for the soccer leagues. This could be an option for Council, although not one  
17 they may want to use, but something that should be out there among the smorgasbord of  
18 things they can do with this money. The City Council has to come up with a number that  
19 works for their entire program, entire development, entire land use controls program,  
20 including building enough parks.

21 Commissioner Cribbs commented that she feels their recommendation is easy because the  
22 Council has to make the decision, which could get them voted in or out. Mr. Taussig agreed  
23 and said he could come up with a very high number by using every sale for the last 12  
24 months, because to build a park, the City would likely have to buy a piece of developed  
25 property. He thought Mr. Reckdahl was correct in that.

26 Commissioner Brown noted the administrative costs of five percent to account for staff  
27 time and asked if that is an industry standard or if they took a look at the staff time required  
28 in the City of Palo Alto. Mr. Taussig said it is an industry standard used to administer the  
29 fee program, and they use five percent for every city they work with. Commissioner Brown  
30 asked if they knew of any cities that have gone through the developed land route and if  
31 they have been challenged by the building industry. Mr. Taussig said they have not. He  
32 explained that the AB 602 law, referred to earlier, also has a rule saying that the quality of  
33 whatever structure you're building with the fee program cannot be higher than the existing  
34 level. He said no courts have looked at this yet. The fear would be that developers would  
35 come back, looking for something to sue over, and will say that The City has increased the  
36 quality of parks, the location of parks, the amount put into parks, compared to what the  
37 existing folks paid. The fee is so much higher because parks cost more than they did before.  
38 Some cities will go to an area where there is low income housing or industrial buildings  
39 that are going to be torn down, but nobody has gone to beautiful single-family residence



1 neighborhoods and taken down two houses to build new parks. Mr. Taussig said he does  
2 not think this happens often; however, they will see what happens this time around.

3 Commissioner Kleinhaus thanked him for the explanation on AB 602 which helped her  
4 understand the urgency. She felt it makes sense to charge per square foot, because they are  
5 seeing larger and larger building on small lots. She would generally want to see smaller  
6 homes, which are more sustainable and leave some land free for trees and vegetation and  
7 for kids to play. She thought there was ambiguity about not being able to provide better  
8 parks than what there already are, and she would love to know more about that and  
9 understand it more. Also, she agreed with Former Chair Reckdahl and other  
10 Commissioners who say the valuation of land is not realistic. In terms of land availability  
11 in Palo Alto, she noted that there was a church that sold some of its land to put three or  
12 four gigantic homes on, and it was available for sale from the church for a while, so there  
13 are still occasional opportunities in built environments. She thought when such  
14 opportunities occasionally arise they should have the funds to take advantage of it. She  
15 felt the current valuation provided would not afford them that.

16 Mr. Taussig said he agreed with her on the per-square-foot and that small homes should  
17 pay less and larger homes pay more. They have done that with school fees since 1990, but  
18 this is the first time it's been enforced on other types of fees. However, it's not the law  
19 until July 1<sup>st</sup>. Commissioner Kleinhaus asked for an explanation of why they don't just  
20 wait. Mr. Taussig said it could be done by square foot now, and the PRC could express  
21 their opinion that it should be per square foot. He said it comes out to about \$35 per square  
22 foot of building, so a 2,000-square-foot – if mixing single-family and multi-family  
23 together – would be \$70,000. If they went up to \$13 million per acre valuation, then it  
24 would be in the range of double that, or \$70 per square foot, so a 2,000-square-foot home  
25 then would require a \$140,000 park fee.

26 Chair Greenfield thanked Mr. Taussig for leading the discussion. Regarding land  
27 acquisition costs, he felt it doesn't pass the sniff test. If an acre of land came up for \$6.5  
28 million, it would not even make it to market before getting snapped up. He asked roughly  
29 how many data points they used to reach the \$6.5 million number, in terms of open lots  
30 sold in Palo Alto, which doesn't seem like a large number. Mr. Taussig said over ten years  
31 there were quite a number of them, but when they used five years there weren't as many.  
32 Going back two years, there were three, although the last two years have been different  
33 than the three before. But since there aren't many vacant, there may be outliers – a  
34 particularly bad piece of land on the list, et cetera – and it's a matter of what you take a  
35 look at. The building industry could argue that numbers are too high and it's not fair to use  
36 land that was sold for a \$40 million house as part of the analysis. Chair Greenfield thought  
37 it was safe to say that their data set is not necessarily representative. He suggested that  
38 perhaps a halfway point between using all sales, whether including structures or not, would  
39 be to try to get data on teardowns. There are a number of sales in the city where a developer

1 will purchase the land, tear down the house or existing improvement and build a new one  
2 from scratch, which seems like a realistic equivalent of a vacant lot sample as well. In  
3 some cases, the property may be worth even more than the sale price, because they have  
4 to pay for tear-down cost. Mr. Taussig said they would have to work with the City to figure  
5 out which lots those are. They have information on the sales prices and location, but he  
6 wasn't sure whether they knew whether it was a tear-down or not, but they could possibly  
7 find out from the City where people pulled building permits to demolish units and use  
8 those. Chair Greenfield thought this was a good direction to look. He thought as a  
9 Commission they should focus on determining the maximum fee limit and let City Council  
10 decide what fee is appropriate in balancing the needs of the community.

11 Regarding the below market rate discussion, Chair Greenfield said certainly the  
12 community wants to encourage more true below market housing and if the ceiling for  
13 impact fees is set high enough, then Council can balance the priorities between housing  
14 and parks, which are both important priorities for the community. However, he felt their  
15 role as a commission was not to artificially lower the ceiling that they can work with.

16 Chair Greenfield said he liked the differentiated fees, separating nonresidential out into  
17 different areas, which made sense. He asked if the projected net total remains the same  
18 across the various types. Mr. Taussig said overall it would be the same amount, because  
19 an employee was still worth the same number of residents. Some went up and some went  
20 down and he assumed that they probably ended up with approximately the same amounts.  
21 The total went up 9.7 percent because of increasing the valuation of the land from \$5.7  
22 million to \$6.5 million, so in general there would be a 9.5 percent increase. Otherwise, the  
23 nonresidential, if averaged out, should be the same as it was before. He said they would  
24 have to do some calculations on this. Chair Greenfield suspected the Finance Committee  
25 and City Council would be interested in understanding what the net change would be in  
26 collected fees based on the differentiated structure.

27 Chair Greenfield wondered if there were some examples of "Other Commercial." Mr.  
28 Martinez gave a daycare center as an example. Mr. Taussig thought also senior living  
29 would fall into that category.

30 Chair Greenfield invited comment from Council Member DuBois.

31 Council Member DuBois responded that it was an interesting conversation. The questions  
32 regarding methodology used to calculate the land value are important and hearing that  
33 there were very few data points, he thought that looking at a larger data set, such as  
34 possibly including tear-downs, would make sense. He thought the Council would get a lot  
35 of the same questions, and it would save time if they had more information on a different  
36 approach. Mr. Taussig said they understand and was happy to have some direction on  
37 doing something different.



1 Chair Greenfield invited further follow-up questions.

2 Commissioner Freeman asked, regarding tear-downs, if they were talking about just  
3 residential or possibly commercial as well, because he has seen a number of commercial  
4 tear-downs. Mr. Taussig said he would like to do both, although he has heard the argument  
5 that a park would not be built in an industrial area. He felt that it depends on whether  
6 you're talking tennis courts, soccer fields, somewhere that everyone goes. There are  
7 industrial areas and then there are industrial areas next to residential. He would like to  
8 include both, because he can't be sure that going to the expense of single-family areas to  
9 build a park was the only option. There are reasons to build in other areas as well. He said  
10 they would differentiate industrial from residential so they would have two separate  
11 numbers and then also a blended number. He thought the Commission gave a good cover  
12 for not going to the \$20 million per acre number, which would create a fee so high it would  
13 be unreasonable. Using the criteria with tear-downs would be helpful if they can find  
14 enough over the last five years. Over the last 60 days would be even better, but not realistic.

15 Commissioner Freeman commented on the use of the parks, whether residential has more  
16 usage than commercial. He thought with the hybrid model that organizations are going to,  
17 people may have more free time, being able to do the work balance between home and  
18 office, getting out and taking kids to the park on what used to be a workday, where now  
19 there's more time to do that. It could be that that equation will change over time. Mr.  
20 Taussig agreed that it is another thing that will change. He said their office used to be right  
21 next to the Bay and there were many runners. He said they actually stayed with the  
22 company longer because they would go running every lunch along the beautiful Bay with  
23 wildlife and birds, et cetera. It was a plus, so to say nonresidential doesn't benefit from  
24 parks is really not true. But whether it benefits as much as a subdivision, single-family  
25 residential area may not be quite accurate. Chair Greenfield thought that was heading in  
26 the right direction, given the distance between commercial/industrial and residential land  
27 in Palo Alto is not very far and blends pretty quickly.

28 Chair Greenfield invited any further follow-up questions.

29 Commissioner Heinrich moved to accept the recommended fees for non-residential  
30 categories in items B and C, but to recommend further review of land valuation costs based  
31 on realistic considerations for acquiring land in Palo Alto for residential fees, including  
32 industrial, residential, blended and tear-down properties, if available. Secondly, to have  
33 the fee calculation based on two different things for residential properties – one, per square  
34 foot, and two, per unit as currently.

35 Chair Greenfield asked for clarification and said he understood that Commissioner  
36 Heinrich was recommending everything except the updated land acquisition costs. He  
37 wondered if she was accepting commercial but not residential. He suggested  
38 recommendation of points B, C, E and F in the presentation but they did not need to

1 comment on D. With respect to updated land acquisition, he thought the Commission  
2 would recommend further review of the land valuation costs based on realistic  
3 considerations for acquiring land in Palo Alto.

4 Mr. Taussig said their plan would be to use industrial with tear-downs, residential with  
5 tear-downs and then blend the two together to give an average cost of an acre. He thought  
6 it would probably be less than the \$12 million, but more than the \$6.5 million, because  
7 they wouldn't be looking at bare land. They would need help from the City to determine  
8 which lots had tear-downs. He hoped they could get at least 20 data points to come back  
9 with from the Building Department, who would have a record of that for the last few years.  
10 He stated again that it is a matter of balance. Balancing the goal of more parks with  
11 everything else the City Council wants to achieve, and how to do that all at once, is the  
12 gray area.

13 Chair Greenfield suggested working on the wording to have something to look at before  
14 asking for a second on Commissioner Heinrich's motion. The Commission worked  
15 together on to developing a motion based on their general areas of agreement, resulting in  
16 the following:

17 The Parks and Recreation Commission recommends:

- 18 1. The Finance Committee approve the methodology for points 2, 3 and 5 (no comment  
19 on 4) of the nexus study as found in the Supplement to Park, Community Center and  
20 Library Development Impact Fee Justification Study (the "Study").
- 21 2. Further study on land valuation costs based on pragmatic consideration for acquiring  
22 land, including residential and commercial tear-down acquisition data.
- 23 3. Provide alternative fee calculation data based on a) existing per-unit methodology, and  
24 b) residential square footage.

25 Chair Greenfield invited discussion before voting on the motion.

26 Ms. O'Kane wanted to make sure that the staff who would be implementing the motion  
27 were clear on the direction. She asked Ms. Duffy if she had any questions. Ms. Duffy  
28 thought they needed to make sure they were able to access the tear-down acquisition data  
29 and would need to work with the Planning and Building Department to find that. She also  
30 noted that there may be an additional cost with it, so they need to make sure that they have  
31 the fees to cover the additional work for the consultant.

32 Commissioner Cribbs wondered how they could make a recommendation without  
33 knowing they have the money to actually do the work involved. Chair Greenfield thought  
34 they were simply highlighting that further study is needed regarding land valuation cost  
35 and making a recommendation, not a mandate.

1 Commissioner Heinrich moved to approve the recommendation as stated above, seconded  
2 by Chair Greenfield.

3 Chair Greenfield asked Commissioner Heinrich if she wished to speak any further to the  
4 motion. Commissioner Kleinhaus wanted to explain why she felt it was important to have  
5 the fee calculation based on square footage for residential. She said as newer homes get  
6 larger and larger and multi-family units have smaller units, and since they will eventually  
7 be required to do it anyway, if they adopt the per-square-foot method now, then they  
8 wouldn't have to abide by the second part of the AB 602 that prohibits providing new  
9 parks that are better than the old parks. She thought that would be something to be ahead  
10 of the curve on. Also, she thought they should encourage smaller units, because they are  
11 much more sustainable and provide what people need without the extravagance. She said  
12 if people want extravagance, they should pay for it, and the per-square-foot fee is one way  
13 to do that.

14 Chair Greenfield invited any further comments.

15 Ms. Duffy asked for clarification of what “pragmatic consideration” meant. She felt she  
16 had a good sense of the analysis in getting the additional data, but was not quite sure what  
17 “pragmatic consideration” meant. Chair Greenfield said he what he meant by it was what  
18 land actually sells for, although he was open to using a different word. Ms. Duffy said that  
19 helped clarify. She wanted to make sure it was in reference to the cost of land versus the  
20 actual analysis being pragmatic. Commissioner Heinrich suggested “realistic  
21 consideration” might be better. “Realistic consideration” was suggested as well, and there  
22 were no objections to this.

23 Chair Greenfield called for the vote. The motion passed, 5-0, by roll call vote.

## 24 **6. Discussion Regarding Court Usage and Joint Use Courts**

25 Chair Greenfield advised members of the public who would like to speak to raise their  
26 hand before the staff report.

27 Adam Howard, Senior Community Services Manager, Community Services, discussed  
28 court usage, specifically nighttime use and the multi-use courts at Mitchell. He gave a brief  
29 history, explaining that around 2017 to 2019 staff started receiving requests to have a space  
30 for people to play pickleball. At that time there was nothing in the policy that would allow  
31 it, as it was very specific to tennis courts. However, pickleball users started using Mitchell  
32 courts 5, 6 and 7 as available on a first come, first served basis. There were no complaints,  
33 but it was unofficial. On August 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018, staff made recommended changes to the court  
34 use policy allowing pickleball. At that time temporary lines were added and temporary  
35 priority hours were established for tennis on Tuesdays and Thursday, 4 p.m. to 10 p.m.  
36 and 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday. Pickleball was 4 p.m. to 10 p.m. on

1 Mondays and Wednesdays and 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. In 2019, with  
2 continued growth in pickleball, staff and the PRC wanted to find a way to have designated  
3 space for pickleball. An idea was put in place to designate one court in Mitchell Park to  
4 be pickleball space, and to make two more courts that would be multi-use. Priority times  
5 were reserved again, for each, with pickleball 8am - 2:30pm, seven days a week and tennis  
6 3pm – 10pm, seven days a week. This went into effect in early 2020, and is the current  
7 schedule. There are eight designated pickleball courts in Mitchell Park, with six that are  
8 lit, and a plan in place to light the other two. There is a total of 51 public tennis courts in  
9 Palo Alto, 17 of which are lit, spread over three locations. The two multi-use courts in  
10 Mitchell Park can either be two tennis courts or seven pickleball courts, all of which are  
11 lit.

12 Mr. Howard described the Mitchell Park complex. The first area has two pickleball courts  
13 off by themselves. These were converted racquetball courts that weren't heavily used. The  
14 re-striping and changing of nets made them more accessible for pickleball. Those courts  
15 are not currently lit, but there is a plan in place to light them. The light poles at the tennis  
16 courts can hold more lights since being converted to LED lights, so the Utility Department  
17 said they could get those lights. The Palo Alto Pickleball Club has agreed to buy those  
18 lights so that those two courts can be lit

19 In the area of the pickleball courts and the two multi-use courts, Mr. Howard pointed out  
20 the new space that was created during the last project, adding two designated pickleball  
21 courts. The area that was previously Court 5 was turned into four designated pickleball  
22 courts, all lit. The priority times were to address the peak times for both sports at that time.  
23 It also created stability, streamlined across seven days a week, making it more accessible  
24 to the community. Mr. Howard showed a rough distribution of courts throughout Palo  
25 Alto, highlighting the 17 lit courts that are at Rinconada, Paly and Mitchell Park. The rest  
26 of the courts are in smaller groupings through Palo Alto.

27 Mr. Howard said this policy has been in place for two years. There have been no formal  
28 meetings of stakeholders. He shared feedback received by staff over the last two years.  
29 The feedback indicates that evenings have become compacted for pickleball. They would  
30 like to see additional either designated space or evening priority times on the courts.  
31 Grouping of courts also continues to be an important aspect for their community.

32 Regarding feedback on tennis, Mr. Howard said they hear about the high demand for the  
33 lit tennis courts. Also, they hear about longer wait times. If courts are filled, there is a wait  
34 time of about an hour and 10 minutes. Because the wait time is increasing, there are less  
35 people willing to wait for the court to turn over. Grouping of tennis courts is also important.  
36 Mr. Howard said they also continue to hear about private lessons, especially on weekend  
37 days that are causing some issues. He said they have seen many more people being outside,  
38 playing tennis and pickleball, both seeming to have grown during COVID, which they see

1 as good, although it creates some issues on the courts. As staff started to hear from all  
2 groups that lit courts were an issue for them, they decided to take a look at what that might  
3 look like. They also wanted to see how things were going since the policy implementation.

4 Mr. Howard did court counts for seven nights between January 11th and February 8<sup>th</sup>. He  
5 went to Mitchell Park courts; the lit courts at Rinconada; and Palo Alto High School. He  
6 shared a chart of the data he collected. On three of the days, every court was full during  
7 each time slot. On February 8<sup>th</sup>, he noted that it was 70 degrees when he did the counts,  
8 and that was also the busiest day. He said it was noticeably different at the courts that day.  
9 He said he felt the counts need to continue as the weather gets warmer, because it seems  
10 that it will have an impact moving forward, although there is a lot of court usage even  
11 during colder weather.

12 Mr. Howard invited any clarifying questions regarding the data.

13 Commissioner Freeman noted that the times are all in the evening. He wondered if the  
14 mornings and afternoons were not impacted as much. Mr. Howard said he started with the  
15 evenings, mostly because much of the feedback he heard was around lit courts. He said it  
16 doesn't mean they don't need to look at other times. Though evenings have the most  
17 compaction, he thought weekday mornings could be similar moving forward.

18 Chair Greenfield asked what time the multi-use courts shift from pickleball to tennis. Mr.  
19 Howard replied at 3:00. Chair Greenfield thought that was part of the reason as well, since  
20 there are more pickleball courts available for most of the day until 3:00.

21 Mr. Howard said he wanted to explore some of the questions that staff will face with the  
22 Ad Hoc and the Commission. He hoped to discuss the pros and cons of the current court  
23 use policy and how it's working; whether demand for lit courts justify a change in priority  
24 hours; whether it makes sense to continue having multi-use courts or if they should be  
25 changed to single use courts to help with demand. He said an important question for the  
26 discussion was whether they want to see additional data to help see the whole picture and  
27 determine what changes might be needed, keeping in mind he is the only one collecting  
28 data, so his time is somewhat limited. He said he would like to continue collecting data,  
29 but be specific as to what he is collecting, to help drive the conversations.

30 Mr. Howard summarized that they need to continue collecting data, especially as it starts  
31 to get warmer. He would like to meet with the new Ad Hoc members and start getting their  
32 input, possibly including specific stakeholders. He thought they had a good idea of what  
33 each stakeholder group is looking for, but if they want get particular feedback a meeting  
34 with stakeholders might be beneficial. In spring or early summer, possible  
35 recommendations for policy changes could be made, or not made if the current policy  
36 seems to be working.

1 Chair Greenfield thanked Mr. Howard for the overview and invited clarifying questions  
2 from the Commission.

3 Regarding the multi-use courts, Commissioner Freeman asked why there is not a  
4 consideration to have more multi-use courts or if there was a certain amount of labor  
5 involved in doing so. Mr. Howard said currently those multi-use courts are set up by a  
6 non-profit, the Palo Alto Pickleball Club. The courts are set up as two tennis courts. The  
7 Pickleball Club members take their own nets and set them up to play pickleball. He said it  
8 is difficult to have those spaces and takes people willing to do that. They are not truly  
9 multi-purpose unless somebody sets them up. Commissioner Freeman asked if there is  
10 additional painting of lines that has to be done. Mr. Howard said that is correct, but the  
11 lines by themselves aren't very effective without the additional support. Commissioner  
12 Kleinhaus asked if staff time is involved in changing the courts from pickleball to tennis.  
13 Mr. Howard confirmed this is the case.

14 Chair Greenfield invited comments from the public, allowing two minutes per speaker.

15 Monica Williams, President, Palo Alto Pickleball Club, said a few of them would speak  
16 on behalf of all of the members. They are very excited with all the publicity about the  
17 incredible growth of pickleball featured on NPR and in the *New York Times*. They are  
18 extremely proud that Mitchell Park has the reputation of being the best pickleball facility  
19 in the Bay Area and thankful to the Parks and Recreation Commission for making that the  
20 case. She said many families have discovered the sport, and parents are bringing their  
21 children to play together after school and on weekends. They have had many requests to  
22 offer classes to kids after school. The classes bring in revenue to the City, but unfortunately  
23 the City policy does not allow pickleball play on the temporary courts from 3 - 10 p.m.  
24 each day. She asked the Commission to please consider changing the policy to allow  
25 pickleball play at Mitchell Park all day, every day, and every evening. She said the lines  
26 on the temporary courts are hard to see, so they request that the lines on those courts be  
27 repainted bright yellow or orange. She said the U.S. Tennis Association approves painted  
28 lines for pickleball and junior tennis on all tennis courts, so they request that they also  
29 consider painting pickleball lines on the Cubberley courts to make them multi-use once  
30 they are resurfaced. This will enable people with portable nets to play pickleball there  
31 when the tennis courts are empty.

32 Ms. Williams said their Club is honored that they have been accepted by Roger Smith and  
33 Ed Selden to be partners with the Friends of Palo Alto Parks. She said Friends of Palo Alto  
34 Pickleball will have an avenue to donate funds and receive 100 percent tax donation to  
35 help improve the courts at Mitchell Park. Their club membership is growing and they  
36 finished last year with 772 members, with 50 percent being Palo Alto residents. They are  
37 aiming to raise that percentage to at least 60 percent. They plan to have a youth tournament  
38 in Mitchell Park in August for ages 10 to 18, which will be sanctioned by the U.S.

1 Pickleball Association and the kids will need courts to practice after school. She reiterated  
2 the request to update the policy to allow pickleball play all day, every day, and every  
3 evening and said it is a sport that brings joy. She said they have extra paddles for visitors,  
4 so if anyone hasn't been there to check out the courts, please go over and they will be  
5 happy to give them a lesson.

6 Jimmy Young[phonetic] thanked the Parks and Recreation Commission for helping create  
7 a vibrant pickleball environment in Palo Alto. He said pickleball at Mitchell is as much a  
8 game as it is a community. People show up for any number of reasons. For many, it's a  
9 social game with family and friends playing regularly. There are pickleball birthday parties  
10 and if you are moving away, someone will throw you a going away party. He said for some  
11 its about getting exercise, and there is also open play for fun, competitive games. He said  
12 the pickleball community is growing, and with it, growth opportunities for volunteers for  
13 give back to pickleball have emerged. Players can volunteer as little or as much as they  
14 want. Unrecognized volunteers do things like sweeping the courts in the morning, moving  
15 on-court trash to the trash receptacles, moving items to lost-and-found. Volunteers set up  
16 the nets every day on the shared courts. Some volunteers are more visible, such as  
17 introducing new pickleballers to the sport. During off times the volunteers wear florescent  
18 vests and forego playing to give back to the community by hosting new player sessions.  
19 Some players run ad hoc skills and drill sessions. Others organize practice times with the  
20 club-provided ball machine. He said if you have a pickleball passion, the club will try to  
21 find a way for you to contribute to the community. Mr. Young said the City can help the  
22 pickleball community by prioritizing more evening play, giving players a chance to have  
23 a great pickleball experience by more than doubling the available evening lit courts.

24 Chair Greenfield requested that the speakers indicate if they are Palo Alto residents.

25 Ed Anderson, Palo Alto resident, said he has been playing pickleball at Mitchell Park for  
26 the last four years and has seen how quickly the game has grown. He thought because of  
27 work schedules and school, most families would like to play after 5:00, which is why the  
28 courts are always full in the evening. Yet this is when the mixed use court policy in  
29 Mitchell Park gives tennis players priority. He said two years ago he enjoyed playing in  
30 the evenings, but as the courts got busier, the wait times became unreasonable, so he  
31 stopped playing in the evenings. He had no doubt that if there were more pickleball courts  
32 available in the evening, more working parents and families would be able to join the  
33 game. He thought a switch from tennis priority to pickleball priority in the evenings would  
34 benefit many families, while only inconveniencing a few tennis players. He felt this was  
35 borne out by the two surveys presented earlier. He said they are very grateful to the  
36 Commission for the courts they have and he hoped they will continue to support the  
37 growing community.



1 Susan McConnell, 49-year Palo Alto resident, said pickleball is not just for seniors, but  
2 besides the explosive interest in pickleball for adults it is also happening with younger  
3 players. Palo Alto High School now has an official pickleball club. It is taught in freshman  
4 P.E. in Palo Alto High Schools. She said she has taught her three grandsons to play  
5 pickleball and when they visit, they love going to Mitchell Park and playing pickleball  
6 with her. She said Palo Alto has always supported sports for youth, and the Commission  
7 now has an opportunity to further youth pickleball. This can be done at the Mitchell Park  
8 Pickleball Courts. Palo Alto Pickleball Club parents are begging them to run clinics for  
9 their children, and they would be happy to do youth clinics, but the Mitchell Park priority  
10 hours make it impossible. She advised that the clinics need to be held after school, but  
11 pickleball loses priority at 3 p.m. Ms. McConnell thought it would be unfair to their  
12 members to use the few dedicated courts that they have for youth clinics. She said they  
13 need to have the multi-use courts available and that it is time for the back courts at Mitchell  
14 Park to be for pickleball only, because tennis players have many other options, but  
15 pickleball players in Palo Alto have only these courts. She requested they support this  
16 change.

17 Lisa Steinback, Palo Alto resident, said she is mostly a tennis player, but appreciates that  
18 pickleball is very popular now. She said she would like to have Palo Alto look at setting  
19 up more pickleball courts across the whole city, not just at Mitchell Park or South Palo  
20 Alto. She suggested that someone check out Rengstorff Park in Mountain View, where  
21 they had an existing cement slab for some aging handball courts that were not used much.  
22 They converted the slab into pickleball courts. She advocated for finding more cement  
23 slabs that exist already that could be converted into pickleball courts. She suggested that  
24 one such slab that is not being used is at Hoover Park. There are some ancient handball  
25 courts there that could be easily repurposed into pickleball courts. This would help  
26 particularly in the summer up until 8 p.m. having courts spread out across the city, so that  
27 families in all those neighborhoods could walk down to their local parks to play, instead  
28 of having the contention at Mitchell Park. It would be easy since there are already cement  
29 slabs there.

30 Amy Louderback, 40-year Palo Alto resident, said she is the Membership Coordinator for  
31 the Palo Alto Pickleball Club. She commented that their club is very proud to partner with  
32 the City to create and nurture a gathering place for all members of the community. They  
33 welcome all ages, abilities, languages, cultures and levels of income. Their club members  
34 enthusiastically welcome neighbors who are new to pickleball and they often wave people  
35 in who are walking past the park on the way to the Library. The encourage the  
36 Commissioners to visit the courts to see what a joyful and enthusiastic community of  
37 players crowd the courts every single day. She thanked the Commission for ongoing  
38 support of their efforts to create their welcoming and inclusive space where they meet and  
39 play with their neighbors.





1 Rich Pearson, Palo Alto Resident since 2007, said he used to play casual tennis at  
2 Rinconada but was introduced to pickleball after his wife, Jamie, took a class through the  
3 City of Palo Alto. Like many others, he has not played a set of tennis since starting to play  
4 pickleball. In 2019, he said the Commission invested in six permanent courts, and the city  
5 immediately became a leader in the Bay Area pickleball community. Since then, Palo Alto  
6 has hosted the Bay Area Senior Games and will soon run one of the first youth pickleball  
7 tournaments ever held in Northern California. The pickleball community is thriving in  
8 Palo Alto because of the wise decision the Commission made in 2019. He said they are  
9 now asking for help to keep them thriving. They are not requesting money or upgrades to  
10 the courts, but are instead asking them to propose a court policy change that shifts merely  
11 ten percent of Palo Alto’s night tennis court capacity to pickleball in order to serve more  
12 residents. During the court usage shared earlier and the fact that prioritizing pickleball at  
13 night on courts 6 and 7, trading four tennis player spots for 28 pickleball player spots  
14 seems like a wise decision. He thanked the Commission for service to the City and for  
15 supporting a community that benefits Palo Alto residents of all ages, abilities, languages,  
16 cultures and levels of income.

17 Joseph Afong, 36-year Palo Alto resident, said in June of last year, for two weeks, a team  
18 of eight people surveyed two time slots for usage on the lighted tennis and pickleball  
19 courts in Palo Alto. He submitted a copy of the survey report. He shared three charts with  
20 the Commission. First, he said pickleball courts in Palo Alto in the evenings are very well-  
21 used. The charts showed that the courts are used 88 and 95 percent of the two surveyed  
22 times, with the key takeaway being that pickleball court usage is much higher than tennis  
23 courts. The survey also showed that there are many more pickleball players than tennis  
24 players per court, both in terms of those playing and those waiting to play. The number of  
25 players playing pickleball is much higher than the number of people playing tennis; and  
26 also, the number of people waiting to play pickleball is very high, compared to a low  
27 number of people waiting to play tennis. Mr. Afong said the pickleball courts were fully  
28 utilized much more than tennis courts. His data showed that pickleball courts were full  
29 about three quarters of the time. Rinconada tennis courts, the most popular courts, were  
30 full about half the time. At Mitchell Park, the tennis courts were full about one-fifth of the  
31 time, and the Paly courts were never full. He said the conclusion of the data is that there is  
32 always an open court in the evening for tennis players, but for the pickleball players, there  
33 is no option to play elsewhere. He asked the Commission to use the data and findings of  
34 his survey to inform their decisions on the court policy.

35 Jenny Chan, Palo Alto resident, said she has been playing tennis at Mitchell Park since she  
36 was in high school. Last year she said she could not get a court at night at Mitchell Park  
37 many times. She got so frustrated that she joined a private club so that she could play  
38 tennis at night. She said this indicates that there is a demand from tennis players to play at  
39 night at Mitchell Park, and not everyone can join a private club to have access to tennis  
40 courts. She acknowledged that pickleball is getting very popular, very social and fun, but



1 there are a lot of new tennis players as well, so there is definitely demand from both sides.  
2 She said tennis players at night in South Palo Alto don't have many choices, only Mitchell  
3 Park. She said she does not play at Paly because the lighting is horrible. The middle courts  
4 at Paly have almost no light on them. The only choices as a South Palo Alto resident for  
5 her was Mitchell Park. Since she couldn't get any courts at night, she had to join a private  
6 club. She said actually she does not play tennis anymore at Mitchell Park, because she  
7 could not get courts at night. She thought the earlier suggestion was good – to find other  
8 places to build more pickleball courts to accommodate this demand. However, she felt  
9 taking tennis courts away from Mitchell Park at night is not the solution because there are  
10 more young kids playing tennis now after school and at night, also. She said they need to  
11 find a solution to meet both demands. She asked if lights could be installed at Cubberley  
12 or at Gunn.

13 Hearing no further public comments, Chair Greenfield turned to the Commissioners for  
14 comments and discussion in terms of questions posed by Mr. Howard and the potential  
15 timeline for the Ad Hoc to consider a policy change or not and to return sometime in the  
16 next few months.

17 Commissioner Freeman appreciated Mr. Howard's presentation as well as the public  
18 stakeholders who presented their case. He said pickleball is a sport that is growing by leaps  
19 and bounds and has been for a long time. He thought the problem as seen today will  
20 probably be a lot worse in the next six months, and it is not a sport that is going to go away.  
21 He thought the City has done a good job being on the forefront in the early stages, and  
22 there is an opportunity to take it a step further. The comments noting that the sport crosses  
23 all boundaries, across age groups, gives people an opportunity to get out and for families  
24 to be together. In some ways it also gives people an opportunity to exercise and stay  
25 healthy. He said he would like to work with Mr. Howard to find a way to meet the  
26 challenge on both sides – the tennis community as well as the growing pickleball  
27 community.

28 Commissioner Cribbs noted that Commissioner Freeman and she are new members of the  
29 Ad Hoc Committee, and with Commissioner Brown as a returning member to provide  
30 continuity, and they are all excited to hear this report and the report forwarded by Mr.  
31 Anderson earlier. She thought it would be an exciting challenge to solve. She is delighted  
32 that both the tennis and pickleball communities are talking, and she hoped they can all talk  
33 to each other and explore the options for lighting courts and readjusting some of the times,  
34 looking at the best way to make sure that in this time of emerging from COVID that people  
35 have a place to play tennis and pickleball. She thought it was great that the community  
36 wants to be outside, so she was excited about the next six months and Mr. Howard's  
37 timeline. She thanked the members of the public who took the time to come and speak.  
38 She asked Mr. Howard if he could get some specific costs for lighting per court, and  
39 information on which courts are candidates for lighting for future discussion.

1 Commissioner Brown suggested there would be a lot of give and take and compromise for  
2 this issue. She appreciated the thoughtful options that were suggested and have been  
3 suggested in the past. She loved the charts and the effort that both staff and community  
4 members went to to provide information. She felt it would be interesting to come up with  
5 some priorities and innovative solutions. Fortunately, Palo Alto is not the only place  
6 pickleball is popular, so she looked forward to seeing how other communities have found  
7 innovative solutions. She thought the sense of community and the in-person interaction in  
8 both in tennis and pickleball is more important than ever given the virtual world they live  
9 in.

10 Commissioner Kleinhaus said others had expressed her thoughts well. There is a lot of  
11 demand. She liked the idea of innovative and thought there were a lot of areas now, such  
12 as Cubberley parking lots, as there almost never cars there. She wondered about looking  
13 at some of the parking lots even if on a temporary basis if feasible. She thought they could  
14 add some areas that are not used at all. With Cubberley she said it was going to take a long  
15 time before there is a solution there, with negotiations and decisions of what to do with it,  
16 so it might be a place where they could add some courts.

17 Chair Greenfield thanked staff for their work in the presentation and working with both  
18 the pickleball and tennis community, as well as members of public who commented,  
19 providing bits of color. He thought the pressure point was the limitation of lighted courts  
20 and finding new courts, as well as finding funding for additional lighting. He said  
21 Cubberley might be an option. It has been in a difficult position in terms of hesitance to  
22 pour investment dollars into. Even if things don't change, at some point they need to  
23 consider what makes sense in a nearer term time horizon. He said location is key as well.  
24 He heard both the pickleball and tennis communities want clusters of courts available.  
25 Also related to location is noise. He said pickleball is considerably noisier than tennis,  
26 given the number of players, the number of balls, the action itself. He said he had heard  
27 from staff previously that a location like Hoover Park would not be appropriate for  
28 pickleball given its proximity to residences. He said Mitchell Park is in a sweet spot, but  
29 if there was a way to get lights added to Cubberley – and they are already getting the tennis  
30 courts resurfaced – it becomes a reasonable tennis destination for evening play, then it  
31 would make it easier for them to fully dedicate all of the courts near the Magical Bridge  
32 area permanently to pickleball.

33 Chair Greenfield said as far as data they are looking for, he said Mr. Howard gave some  
34 good data from December. He agreed it was a more seasonal cross section and as it applies  
35 to warmer months is important. The data presented by the member of the public looks very  
36 useful on the surface, and he thought it would be helpful to get staff's assessment of the  
37 data and make a recommendation if it's something the Commission should be considering  
38 as well as data points to help make decisions. He was curious about tennis play at Paly and  
39 whether there was an awareness with the tennis community that those courts are available,

1 although the quality of the courts at Paly at night is an issue, so it could help explain why  
2 some of the usage numbers are lower at Paly and it would be good to get staff feedback  
3 and comment on that as well, moving forward.

4 Chair Greenfield invited further comment from staff. Mr. Howard appreciated the  
5 comments and said he was open to trying to be creative and finding solutions. He said he  
6 would ultimately like to find a way to help both communities. He struggled with any  
7 proposal that would decrease the ability of one to play one sport. At first glance he said it  
8 feels like that is the only option, but he is committed to doing his best to find a solution  
9 that works for everyone, or perhaps multiple solutions that increase the ability to use their  
10 courts better and making it easier, maybe knowing what courts are open, and other options.

11 Chair Greenfield appreciated the words like creative or innovative. He echoed sentiments  
12 about solutions. In addition to lighting there is the funding that is a challenge.

13 Commissioner Freeman thought it seemed like there was public that was anxious to get  
14 started and were more than willing to participate in the process, which would take off some  
15 of the pressure from staff. Also, there are things that they can do on their own, such as  
16 prepping the courts to be able at some point to be used as multi-purpose courts including  
17 painting so that there could potentially be four pickleball courts on one tennis court, among  
18 other things they could do to support the public and the growth of the sport.

19 Mr. Howard added regarding the point about what other neighboring cities are doing, Palo  
20 Alto was and still is on the forefront, so ultimately he has a lot of conversations with other  
21 cities about what Palo Alto is doing and how they can help them. He loves doing that, but  
22 unfortunately in some regards when he asks for help he finds that they were going to call  
23 him, which is a good problem and fortunately in Recreation, they all help each other in  
24 their cities and are all in contact and address problems together. He will continue to use  
25 that model of how to do this to generally help the Peninsula or beyond, depending on how  
26 big of a picture they want to have. They will continue to look for resources in other cities  
27 to find out what is the best model.

28 Chair Greenfield closed the comments, looking forward to creative and innovative  
29 solutions from the Ad Hoc.

30 **COMMISSIONER/BOARD MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS,**  
31 **ANNOUNCEMENTS OR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

32 Chair Greenfield said they have already talked about the work ahead of them and Ad Hoc  
33 work for Work Plans. He said the Tree Ordinance review will be coming to the  
34 Commission. Mr. Anderson added the Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plans. He  
35 said it would have to be moved along before the contracts expire for the two consultants  
36 who are helping with the process. Commissioner Cribbs wanted to make sure the Youth



1 Council scheduled to come and make a presentation. They had invited them, so perhaps in  
2 March or April. Mr. Anderson said he had talked to Mr. Howard about that, and he  
3 explained that there might be some challenges for the Youth Council themselves. They  
4 will be presenting to Council as well and were a little challenged for time. Mr. Howard  
5 said it is a difficult date for the Youth Council but they are committed to wanting to  
6 participate. March would be the last meeting they are available, as they disband for the  
7 summer after that. He said they understand and are not heartbroken if they can't come, and  
8 it is difficult. He said they don't want it to be too impactful for either side, so unless there's  
9 a perfect fit, they can pass.

10 Commissioner Cribbs thought maybe they could pass this year and make sure they know  
11 that at the towards the end of the year they have a standing invitation to come. She said  
12 it's great for the Commission to hear from them and hear their perspective, and then when  
13 they go to Council, Mr. Howard could let them know, and they could listen to their report  
14 at Council. She said they are busy and they do a lot of great stuff but she wanted to make  
15 sure the Commission didn't forget about it.

16 Mr. Howard appreciated that and they do as well. He thought maybe it was just on his side,  
17 schedule a little earlier, get it worked out a little more clearly for the next school year.  
18 Commissioner Cribbs said that was perfect, and she would let them know that the next  
19 time she attended one of their meetings.

20 Chair Greenfield wondered if September/October would be a reasonable time to come  
21 present something. Mr. Howard liked the idea of at the beginning of the school year, to help  
22 them shape what the school year could look like, what their interests are, what the  
23 Commission's interests are, some middle ground where they could work together or focus  
24 on a certain subject together. Chair Greenfield said also if they're presenting to City  
25 Council in the spring, it might reduce the load if there was some presentation to the  
26 Commission in the fall. Mr. Howard said they are open to both models.

27 Chair Greenfield invited further comments from the Commissioners or Council Member  
28 DuBois. Hearing none, he adjourned the meeting.

29 **ADJOURNMENT**

30 Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.  
31