

**Baumb, Nelly**

---

**From:** Alice Smith <alice.smith@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 27, 2021 7:00 AM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Fwd: Foothills Park's Evolution

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

I received this this morning. I think these comments are worthy of consideration.

Alice Smith  
850 Webster Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94301  
650 283 2822

----- Forwarded message -----

Hi, nature lovers:

**I recommend you take the time to read every one of the readers' comments below this story!...**

[https://www.paloaltoonline.com/square/index.php?utm\\_source=express-2021-01-26&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=express&i=3&d=&t=50076](https://www.paloaltoonline.com/square/index.php?utm_source=express-2021-01-26&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=express&i=3&d=&t=50076)

La Doris Cordell will surely regret having served Palo Alto with this lawsuit, without a section that proposed a fix that actually solved the problem(s) she saw! Now her reputation is tarnished by having done only harm, and no good, for the wild land & its living creatures...while providing no help for the populations she had hoped to represent!

Cannot Palo Alto rename its preserve a Preserve? Sheeesh!

--

xxx one of many former residents

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Bette Kiernan <betteuk@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 26, 2021 5:58 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** APPLAUSE!!

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Dear Mr. Shikedo:

The plan to reduce the park visitors to 400 is ideal.

That assures continuation of Foothills as a wildlife refuge, preserves the environment and shares with all the beauty of quiet and solitude in nature.

There are many other parks but Foothills is unique. I am ecstatic you found the way to sustain it . Brilliant!

Bette Kiernan

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Jeffrey Lu <jeffreylu6@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 26, 2021 5:44 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** feedback on city council priorities for 2021

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Hi,

I'm writing to submit public comment on the city council's priorities for 2021, which will be selected during this Saturday's retreat meeting.

I hope the city council will continue working hard on last year's priorities: Housing, Sustainability, and Mobility for all.

All three priorities are closely intertwined, and making headways in one area complements the other areas too. In particular, I urge greater focus on mobility for all, with an eye toward non-car transport. Transportation is Palo Alto's (and California's!) leading source of both climate-harming carbon emissions, as well as air-polluting NOx and particulate matter. Transport emissions have been trending upward statewide since 2012, even as many of us have switched to zero emission vehicles. Additionally, speeding car traffic is more prevalent than ever; in 2020 our roads were noisier, less safe, and less pleasant. There is much work to be done to improve mobility for all.

While Palo Alto has a commendable existing biking network, many gaps remain. I still can't get to Happy Donuts on El Camino on a bike without riding on the sidewalk or mixing with high speed vehicular traffic. Access to shops on Middlefield in Midtown remains difficult on a bike, and vehicles rarely abide by the 25MPH speed limit in that area. Palo Alto's encouraging bike boulevard plan appears to be on hold, and many of us are still waiting for previously cleared road safety improvements to materialize. Further, demand for recreational pedestrian and bike trails is at unprecedented levels, as evidenced by overflowing lots at the Baylands, Pearson-Arastradero, and Foothills park.

Palo Alto is where I learned to bike and love biking. I hope you will continue making strides to ensure that our streets are safe for all road users.

Thanks,

--

Jeffrey Lu  
Midtown

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Jane Moss <jgm0ss@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 25, 2021 1:00 PM  
**To:** ParkRec Commission; Council, City  
**Subject:** Suggestions for Foothills Nature Preserve Reservation System

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

To the Honorable City Council members and Parks and Recreation Commissioners, I submitted comments to the Palo Alto City Council meeting last Tuesday evening on the topic of Foothills Park. I spoke out about the various standards I thought would improve the situation. I listened to the entire discussion, and one thing disturbed me. I thought I heard reluctance to embrace an online reservation system. In my opinion that is the only method that can solve many problems seamlessly. It provides access to a restricted resource in a way many of us have come to expect where the demand exceeds the supply. To the argument that some people don't have access to or choose not to use the internet for this kind of purchase, there is an easy answer. The park doesn't need to offer a capacity-filling number of reservations each day. If several spaces are "removed", these set-asides can be offered as same-day entries, first come first serve, until gone. This is very similar to how wilderness permits are distributed for popular trail systems. Having an online calendar and reservation system allows management to (partially) black out dates that are not 100% available to the public for a variety of needs: summer camp days, tour days, education and school group field trip dates, free access days, etc. My personal preference is always to have an advance reservation. It is a known thing. Then you are not gambling with your family's time and committing to something that might not happen. Of course there will be reservations that go unredeemed. That is perfectly fine. The on-site manager can decide to let the park "rest" and the current occupants enjoy a less crowded day, or it can be opened up with ad hoc, additional same-day permits. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jane Moss, Palo Alto resident

**Baumb, Nelly**

---

**From:** M. Gallagher <writing2win@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 23, 2021 12:10 AM  
**To:** Mary Gallagher; Council, City  
**Subject:** Foothill Park Admission Fee

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Dear City Council Members:

May someone explain publicly why a reservation system with maximum hourly visitor limits was not considered a better solution than charging visitors a fee to limit visitors at Foothills Park?

I wholly disapprove of this fee. The fee sends a divisive message: those with bucks can visit the park. Those who don't have bucks won't. I think the park, the people, and the planet would be best served if folks wishing to visit the park also considered themselves to be stewards of the park. As stewards individuals, families, and groups could be assigned an area or a suitable task to maintain the park in exchange for the privilege of visiting the park.

Thank you for listening to my view of the access fee.

Respectfully,

Mary Gallagher

Mary Gallagher, B.Sc.  
Content Strategist  
650-683-7102

Copyright 2020

Security Alert Notice

The information contained in this e-mail is confidential information, presumed to be virus free, and intended only for use by the individual or entity named above. Virus protection is the responsibility of the recipient. If the reader of this email is not the intended recipient, dissemination or distribution is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete the material from your computer. Thank you.

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** rogersac@aol.com  
**Sent:** Friday, January 22, 2021 1:19 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Comments on latest developments on the subject of Foothills Park.

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

I am writing to you further with comments on how things are developing.

1. All the yellow caution tape is dangerous for all the animals in the park. The deer could easily get caught up and have the tape wrapped around their legs. They will want to continue access to their deer trails and the red tape will either cause them to jump over it or run through it. Likewise other larger animals. Even the turkeys may not be able to go under it and once the tape is broken it could get wound up around animal causing it to be trapped. If it starts breaking down it will probably be digested by them or enter the creeks. This yellow tape is a hazard to the environment for the habitat and should be moved. For similar reasons, no permanent structure should replace the tape. The deer trails, rabbit holes, are where the animals live. Putting up any type of barricade to keep out humans is not going to keep them safe.

2. Since it seems likely that you will endorse an entrance fee, thought must be put into how that fee is collected. At present we are in the middle of a pandemic and nobody is handling cash. Even without the pandemic the least number of bank notes of one denomination without change is ideal. \$6 means at least two bank notes and possibly means change. The amount of handling of cash is not a good idea and the \$6 fee is very inconvenient in a society which so rarely uses cash anymore. I myself would probably have to stop at an atm to pay and then I would need change. None of this is ideal. A much better system must be worked out that does not involve cash at the gate. Online payment system with an online pass makes most sense to me. Likewise, there should be annual pass particularly for Palo Alto residents with a mirror hanger, not a sticker. Cars should not be putting lots of stickers on windows as that is against DMV rules. Online reservations and an app that shows whether there is space before we leave home is also necessary.

3. When it comes to bikes and pedestrians, it will cause more problems unless they are counted. Los Altos Hills residents can walk in quite easily and cars can park on their roads and walk (or bike) in. Having LAH residents allowed to enter when PA residents cannot is not going to be anything equitable. Those residents should not have a privilege that they are not paying towards. Pedestrian and bikes should be counted and have to pay like any vehicle.

I am sorry we are in the mess we are. The pilot was a good solution. This is not. The cat is among the pigeons and have the chickens have come home to roost. You must sort this situation out equitably for Palo Alto residents as well as anyone else. We are the ones who have been treated abysmally through all this and you must rectify the situation that this has caused.

Thank you for your time.

Carol Rogers, Stockton Place.

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Richard Placone <rcplacone@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 21, 2021 1:33 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Foothill Park Fee

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Council Members:

Thanks to your newly imposed Foothill Park entrance fee of \$10, my wife and I will never again visit this park. There were other more reasonable ways to limit park attendance. The City certainly doesn't need the extra income, given the way it already spends our tax dollars on often exorbitant administrative and police salaries, and the continued over staffing of employees compared to most other cities in our area. You took the easy way out, thinking that all residents in Palo Alto have unlimited funds and so this high fee will be readily accepted.

Richard C. Placone  
Chimalus Drive  
Palo Alto/Barron Park

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Rojas, Gonzo (NBCUniversal) <gonzo.rojas@nbcuni.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2021 4:27 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Cc:** Meghan Taylor (meghan.taylor@cityofpaloalto.org)  
**Subject:** NBC Bay Area Request

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Good Afternoon,  
I'm looking for clarification that Palo Alto's City Council has voted to start charging a vehicle fee and cap attendance at Foothills Park.  
Is there a press release on the decision?

**Gonzalo Rojas**  
**Assignment Manager**  
**D: 408-432-4780**  
**C: 619-277-3364**  
**gonzo.rojas@nbcuni.com**



## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** L Lapier <llapier@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2021 4:00 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Foothills restrictions

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

City Council,

I know you will be hearing from the usual vocal minority demanding restrictions on access to Foothills Park. I would like to point out that ALL parks in the Bay Area were busy last weekend - the weather was great, it was a 3 day weekend, and many folks were eager to get outside and away from their work and computers. I was at the Baylands and it was very busy, with lots of hikers and bikers. On the local news, there were stories about how busy parks were in Marin County and San Francisco, for the same reasons.

Restricting access to Foothills Park because it's "too popular" is very short sighted and does not recognize that ALL parks are busy on weekends. I encourage you to do some due diligence and visit other parks on weekends to get some context, before giving in to demands on restrictions on Foothill Park. Otherwise, do we restrict access to the Baylands? Rinconada Park? Mitchell Park? And so on, if we follow the logic of "restrict access to Foothills!"

Please also realize that there is a population of over 60,000 people in Palo Alto, and seek out other voices Do some due diligence and think about the broader community.

Thank you,  
L Lapier

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Mashhood Rassam <mrassam@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2021 2:58 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Thank you!

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Dear City Council,

Thank you for responding to residents and moving quickly to curb capacity at Foothills Park. The Park has not been safe for my family the last few weeks, with many cars circling at high speeds to find parking while I struggle to make sure my young children are kept out of harm's way. I hope your quick action makes the Park safe for all.

Thank you!  
Mashhood Rassam

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Mary Ann Peters <maryann@maryannpeters.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 25, 2021 9:49 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Foothill Park Concerns  
**Attachments:** Foothill Park Jan 24, 2021 #2.doc; Foothill Park 1102021.doc

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

To: Members of City Council

From: Mary Ann Peters

Date: Jan 24, 2021

---

**MARY ANN PETERS, PH.D.**

(650) 321-8788

2834 KIPLING STREET

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94306

[maryann@maryannpeters.com](mailto:maryann@maryannpeters.com)

---

January 24, 2021

Subject: Foothill Park

TO: Palo Alto City Council

cc: A. Anderson, C. Bourquin

By way of introduction, I am a very, long time resident of Palo Alto who, with friends, have hiked, walked, accompanied children on nature talks, and have enjoyed taking photos of nature's wonderful creatures over some 45 years

I am shocked and dismayed by what I have seen and experienced since the City of Palo Alto opened Foothill Park; apparently without thought, planning, and a strategy; a terrible decision.

This Sanctuary, located in a geography populated by millions should be cherished and protected not destroyed by careless decision.

My thoughts:

- 1.0 **Parks in Palo Alto** – I believe there are 36 open to all  
Why rush to open Foothill Park without a strategy?
- 2.0 **Politics or Environment Stewardship** (Conservation)-  
Foothill Park, a jewel, has been an oasis for animals to live in peace and native flora to grow and flourish.  
Why rush to open Foothill Park to masses of humanity without a strategy and put the animal at risk? Was the rush based on some political correctness versus environmental stewardship?
- 3.0 **Animal population** – animals do not have the resources to defend themselves and hire lawyers. We few caring humans need to speak for them (for they cannot speak for themselves) as others endeavor to destroy their habitats.
- 4.0 **Bikes and Mountain Bikes**- why allow bikes and, certainly not mountain bikes, on the trails. We know mountain bikes erode fragile habitats. As a friend reported, 'I was yelled at as I walked on a trail for, I was interfering with a biker's progress.'
- 5.0 **Budget** -where is money to hire two or more rangers to manage the onslaught? Where is the money to build more restrooms?

Where is money to create signage like NO MOUNTAIN BIKES allowed on hiking trails? How will you deal with conflict between slower walkers and determined bikers on the hiking trails? Where is the money to enforce the rules and regulations?

- 6.0 **Fees** – Yosemite and other parks charge more than \$6. Disneyland charges more than \$6. What decision matrix was used to arrive at \$6; an inadequate amount?
- 7.0 **Funding** - discriminatory; yes discriminatory! – As a Palo Alto resident my taxes help to fund Foothill Park. Currently you are asking us to a) fund the park through our property taxes b) pay an entrance fee AND c) run into the possibility of being turned away at the entrance due to excessive visitor ship. Double taxation without representation.
  - . This is DISCRIMINATORY
- 8.0 **Department** – who will enforce proper manners in the Park? Who will admonish children for throwing sticks and rocks at the deer? Who will admonish visitors for throwing objects at the ducks on the lake?
- 9.0 **Fishing** – who will require and enforce fishing licenses? Who will limit the numbers at the lake so the animal population can access to their ‘watering hole?’

In conclusion, I and my 9 +/- walking friends ages 70-94 feel we can no longer visit Foothill Park for we are afraid for our safety and health due to lack of masks, presence of garbage, rude bicyclists, too many cars driving too fast, too many people, and the disrespect for the Park and its inhabitants

Foothill Park is not Mitchell or Hoover Park; rather it is environmental preserve. Each of us is saddened by the degradation of this Special Place; why destroy the essence of this Sanctuary?

Sincerely

MA Peters

1 Attachment; letter sent to the City Manager describing our experience

---

**MARY ANN PETERS, PH.D.**

(650)650 799-3353  
2834 KIPLING STREET  
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94306

---

January 10, 2021

TO: City Manager Ed Shikada

cc: Sara Cody, MD

SUBJECT: Foothill Park

1.0 Introduction

Foothill Park and nature preserve was given to our City in the 1969; a jewel for we residents to enjoy.

We have been hiking, walking, attending nature presentations, and observing the animal population accompanying generations of children for over 45 years.

2.0 My Experience since opening our Park

I am afraid for my health and safety to return to the Park; why?

- 2.1 too many cars driving too fast
- 2.2 as many as 31 unmasked people gathering at picnic area (note they were not eating)
- 2.3 observed men spitting more than once
- 2.4 noticed a blue latex glove near mountains of garbage
- 2.5 observed condoms in tree area near picnic tables
- 2.6 TOO many fishing; assault on the water shed and preventing our animal population access to water

3.0 Questions – please answer

- 3.1 who made the decision to open without a strategy?
- 3.2 who pays for the wonderful rangers and upkeep?
- 3.3 are we residents of Palo Alto responsible for the additional garbage and maintenance due to the assault on the Park?
- 3.4 who is responsible for protecting the fragile and unique ecosystem with this onslaught of humanity?
- 3.5 why aren't people responsible for holding a fishing license?
- 3.6 why isn't the City limiting the number who enter as well as fish?

We are treating the animal population in a cruel uncaring manner by opening the Park without a strategy and protective processes

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Richard P Gooch <richandtoni@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 30, 2021 12:54 PM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Foothill Park Access Fees

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

As long-time Palo Alto residents and frequent visitors to Foothill Park, we ask that you please add an annual pass option to your fee structure. We bought an annual FHP pass for every year that it was offered back in the early 80's and would continue to do so, when it is offered in the future.

Some advantages of annual pass include:

1. Less work for rangers at the gate and associated reduction in staff costs
2. Reduced waiting times and traffic at the entrance gate
3. Provides a good source of predictable annual revenue for park maintenance and improvements
4. Makes it easier to implement a tiered fee structure such as reduced rates for residence, seniors, etc.
5. Happier city residents

Rich and Toni Gooch  
Barron Park

## Baumb, Nelly

---

**From:** Mashhood Rassam <mrassam@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 9:56 AM  
**To:** Council, City  
**Subject:** Foothills Park

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Dear City Council,

I am writing to urge you to implement the new capacity restrictions you have already passed at Foothills Park as soon as possible. I took my family to the Park on Sunday, January 31, and what I saw was troubling.

First, the amount of litter has increased significantly since last November.

Second, there are many, many cars in the park, some of which are traveling at high speeds. Not only is this bad for the eco-system, but the combination of cars speeding and many more pedestrians creates an obvious safety hazard.

Third, visitors now bring dogs into the park. I saw two dogs in the park on Sunday, and they were not designated service dogs.

Fourth, visitors are still going off trail, causing erosion and trampling sensitive habitats.

Please move forward as quickly as possible with implementing capacity restrictions so that we can start to see some improvement regarding the issues listed above.

Thank you!

Mashhood Rassam