



**PARKS AND RECREATION
COMMISSION MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting
November 14, 2007
6:00 p.m.
Burgess Recreation Center
700 Alma Street**

Chair Maurano called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Paula Maurano, Jim Tooley, Patricia M. Watkins, Andy Kirkpatrick, Nick Naclerio, Kristi Breisch and Kelly Blythe

OTHERS PRESENT: Barbara Santos George, Community Services Director, Marc Nuckolls, Jessica Lewis, Councilman Heyward Robinson, Councilman Richard Cline and 22 attendees in the audience.

A. PRESENTATIONS AND PROCLAMATIONS:

NONE

B. COMMISSION VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS AND REPORTS:

NONE

C. PUBLIC COMMENT #1:

NONE

D. CONSENT CALENDAR:

Maurano asked for minutes to be approved for the October 17, 2007 meeting. Kirkpatrick motioned for them to be approved, Tooley seconds the motion. Minutes approved. Maurano asked for minutes to be approved for the October 20, 2007 special meeting, Watkins motioned for them to be approved, Blythe seconds the motion. Minutes approved

E. PUBLIC HEARING

None

F. REGULAR BUSINESS:

1. Field Allocation Report

Marc Nuckolls presented final version of field permit report. One of the goals of the new permit process is to increase use and accommodate more residents of Menlo Park. The report distinguished between Single use (picnic areas) and Multi-use (sports) and examined the best

and most appropriate way to use the field space in Menlo Park. The permit procedures will be in effect in January and permits will be mailed by December 1st to all people that are affected by the changes. Commission members Kelly and Andy worked closely with Marc to develop these new procedures and policies. Marc said that the largest change will be in the area of youth/adult sports. The permit process will address seasonal use. It also allows new groups to more easily utilize the fields. The permit process addresses priorities. It tracks resident's use of facilities and allows the City to ask for documentation. It will act as a check and balance for the City and help them to determine the best way to divvy up the fields. A permit process will also address growing need of field space and simulate growth of teams and use in particular for residents of Menlo Park. Marc stated that there will be some tweaking of the new system once it is in effect and appreciates the backing of the commission with regard to the new permit process.

2. Nealon Park Staff Report

Barbara Santos George gave an update on Nealon Park. She reported that the City and Commission have spent a lot of time working on the idea of moving the dog park to another location. She reaffirmed the City's position that it is not appropriate for Nealon Park to have dual use (as a ball park and dog park). Commissioners Maurano, Blythe, a representative from DOGMA and Barbara went out to Nealon to look at the dog park again. She spoke with Dave Mooney about alternate sites. He suggested the new site is an 8/10th grass area which is a net loss of 3/10th from the current location. A study still needs to be done of the new site and the potential move.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Tooley asked how much passive use area will be left if the dog park is relocated. Barbara stated that approximately 2/10th of an acre will remain. Commissioner Naclerio inquired about the cost of putting in fencing at the proposed site. Barbara was told by the director of public works that it would cost \$40,000 dollars to fence the area. Commissioner Kirkpatrick wanted to know if the change of location would increase the hours for the dog park, Barbara predicted that the hours would be increased including afternoon hours, weekend hours and from 4pm-Dusk. When the dog park is not in use the area will remain passive and allow for the land to rest. Barbara said that over 700 people currently use the ball park and there is also discussion of growth. She thought the root of the problem is the lack of property for everyone to use and reiterated that the dog owners are not at fault. Further, she knows of no other cities in the area that have this type of dual park use. The commission expressed other concerns such as the impact on passive space and valuable picnic/play space. They stated that the new plan also presents new and different problems. Commissioner Maurano suggested conditional use of the current dog park while sports are in off season she then opened the floor for public comment

PUBLIC COMMENT #2:

Dave Richardson of Menlo Park

Mr. Richardson is opposed to the proposed new location of the dog park. He stated that this area is invaluable to parents and argues that \$40,000 for fencing seems excessive.

Kelly of Menlo Park

Kelly is worried about the urine and dog excrement that is present at Nealon. She took pictures of the poor condition of Nealon and gave them to the City. Her daughter's equipment is ruined because of dog urine. She is concerned that the field will be ruined by the dogs present at Nealon.

Hope Hudson of Menlo Park

Ms. Hudson expressed her concern for the new proposed dog park. She said that this space is regularly utilized for kids to play, ride bikes and picnics. She believes this is an asset to the community and it should not be replaced by a dog park. She would also like to see a report that substantiates the claim that the ball park will be negatively affected by the dual use.

Mary Kenney of Menlo Park

Ms. Kenney is against using grass area for Dog Park. She is concerned with how this will affect property values and would also like to see a study about dog impact on current area. She believes dual use can work at Nealon.

Phillip Jensen of Palo Alto

Mr. Jensen has made good friends at Nealon and thinks the space of the current dog park should remain the way it is. He wants the city to show proof that the dogs have a negative impact on the ball field and surrounding areas. He thinks that especially since DOGMA is willing to contribute financially to the improvement of the dog park, the City should make this its permanent location.

Eric Kintzer of Menlo Park

Mr. Kintzer wants the City to agree to change the entrance of the dog park and have DOGMA fund this alternate entrance. He does not feel that City money should go toward building a dog park in another area.

Mary Kuechler of Menlo Park

Ms. Kuechler is a defender of the lawn space that is the proposed site of a new dog park. She applauded the creative dialog of the commission and members of the community and urges that the grass area be left alone.

Frans Honis of Menlo Park

Mr. Honis is a coach and softball player in Menlo Park. He expressed concern for the health issues that might arise if dogs continue to be on the fields at Nealon Park. He guaranteed that if dual use of the park continues the field will deteriorate.

Fariborz Rostami of Menlo Park

Mr. Rostami has two children that make good use of the grass area in Nealon Park. He is against fencing the area in and making a dog park. He likes how the dog park is now and says that it is well used by dog owners.

Jennifer Bester

Ms. Bester is in favor of putting a gate in the outfield at Nealon Park. She expressed the desire to make things work. She proposed, an outfield gate, sanitation service paid for by dog owners to clean Dog Park, curtaining the infield, and increased signage. She made reference and handed out the UC Davis report on Dog parks that states that a dog park needs to be at least one acre. She also suggested a fee to use the dog park similar to the City's procedure with Tennis courts.

Motion by Commission, that on a trail basis the dog park will remain at current location and that an alternate entrance be installed. The following are requirements for this proposal.

- 1) **Direct City staff to work with DOGMA**
- 2) **Work with City officials to get bids for gates and to have gates installed for new entrance.**
- 3) **Increase signage and have poop bags available and the garbage moved.**
- 4) **Have DOGMA come up with a formal proposal that presents ideas for signage.**

The commission will look at the issue of the Dog Park again during their March meeting. This plan is a preliminary decision and must be reevaluated after time.

Kirkpatrick moves, Blythe seconds and the motion approved.

3. Request for a comprehensive Master Plan review of Burgess Campus

Motion from commissioner Blythe for commissioner Naclerio and Tooley on behalf of the Park and Recreation commission to distill the Master Plan into a comprehensive summary and present it to the commission at a later date

Commissioner Tooley seconds, motion unanimously passes.

4. Update on Playing Field Study

When a consultant is hired, they will communicate with the commission and involve them in the process of the playing field study and outcomes. They will study the potential of building more fields in the city.

5. Update on Burgess Gymnasium contractual agreement

6. Tour for gymnasium subcommittee to a Field/Paoli facility in San Jose

Agenda item postponed. Barbara will send information about gym tour to commissioners.

7. December Park and Recreation Commission: Discussion of Project Priorities

8. January Meeting: Study session with Silvia Vonderlinden, City Clerk and Bill McClure, City Attorney.

Barbara thought that in January the commission could meet with City clerk and City attorney to have a question and answer session. A retreat is also being planned for the Park and Recreation commission.

G. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

None

I. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.