

**Approved Meeting Minutes**  
**PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
9-26-11

ATTENDING: Simmons, Bank, Vann, Madison, Volin, Palacios, Johnson, Madsen, Walking, Kirby, Coomber, Shalaby, Southworth, Soderstrom  
NOT ATTENDING: Godfrey, Beyaert, Weiss, Mercurio, Pellegrini, Walters  
STAFF ATTENDING: Johnson, Barial, Wiese, McCarthy, Kassebaum, Fox, Wilson, Fujita  
GUESTS: Beverly Lane, Sabbath Coomber, Marilyn Saarni, Norm Kidder  
PUBLIC: NONE.

The meeting began at 7:00 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes:** The July 25, 2011 meeting minutes were approved with one edit.

PAC member Volin moved and PAC member Walking seconded approval of the minutes. PAC members Coomber and Southworth abstained as they were absent from the July meeting.

1. **Introductions:** PAC Chair Kirby asked PAC members and staff to introduce themselves.
2. **Board Member Comments:** Director Beverly Lane thanked the PAC for their service and mentioned her role as President of the Board this year. She announced two new staff members: Jim O'Connor, AGM of Operations and Emily Hopkins, Public Information Officer, Public Affairs. She mentioned the challenges inherent in forming partnerships with other public agencies and groups, particularly when it comes to coordinating and obtaining information. There are 33 cities, two counties and three or four water districts within the boundaries of the District's jurisdiction. Lane has been attending various city dedications and District events. She stated Contra Costa County clear cut all of the trees between the Point Pinole staging area and the detention center. She distributed the Healthy Parks, Healthy People pin.
3. **Public Comments:** None.
4. **Presentations:**
  - a. **Master Plan Mission and Vision Revisions – Beverly Lane, Board of Directors and Carol Johnson, AGM, Public Affairs**

AGM Carol Johnson presentation will be a joint discussion to obtain input and ideas from the PAC. The Board has established an Adhoc Committee to look at the Master Plan mission and vision statements. The Committee includes President Lane and Directors Severin and Dotson, as well as AGM Mike Anderson. Director Lane explained the group brainstormed and received input from District staff to update the mission and vision statements. A mission statement explains why the organization exists; whereas, the vision is what should be done to accomplish the mission. PAC Chair Kirby asked whether the parenthetical comments would be included. Lane responded the parenthetical comments are not final comments and added there are a wide range of adjectives that can be used. PAC member Madsen noted one of the things he did not see was the interrelationship between the human vitality of the East Bay population and the natural environment the District continues to preserve. AGM Johnson asked how Madsen thought that could be best expressed. Madsen responded on the fly it could be stated the District contributes to the vitality of East Bay cities and towns by protecting the natural settings which exist in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. Southworth stated education seems to be missing. Some mention of environmental education is particularly important at a time when environmental challenges continue to perpetuate. AGM Johnson clarified the original mission and vision statements were reversed. There were a lot of objectives that were actually listed as vision elements. The goal is to tighten up the mission and vision statements so they are relevant and describe what the District means to the East Bay community. Education and interpretation will clearly be a specific bullet point as part of the District's Master Plan. Lane added she thinks

the word “understanding” implies education. PAC member Simmons asked if the guiding concepts would drop off in the future. Lane answered yes and the goals would be the next item to consider. Simmons noted the text of the guiding concepts varied from noun to verb. He further explained the mission and vision statements begin with either the “District” or “We” and suggested the subject should be consistent and clear. Simmons also noted he did not see any references to safety or to employees. PAC member Palacios thought a mission was the reason you exist and not how you are going to provide the service. She added this mission statement is long. It should capture the reason the District exists. The objectives should be how and why services are provided. The vision is how the District foresees the future. Mission should be shorter, vision can be longer. PAC member Walkling concurred and added the third sentence regarding environmental ethic does not belong in the mission statement. PAC member Southworth agreed. Chair Kirby’s suggested re-ordering the sentences in the vision. Perhaps the environmental ethic sentence could be the second one in the vision and could come before “work with our partners.” The last sentence should say *the District will acquire and protect open space and open regional parks and trails.* AGM Johnson read the existing master plan and acknowledged the District needs a crisp and short mission statement. She expressed appreciation for the PAC’s excellent feedback. PAC member Shalaby added keeping the reason why the District exists should be a short, direct, first sentence. PAC member Vann agreed with Simmons on the use of the collective nouns and they should be replaced with “the District.” He stated the current mission statement is a little bit cumbersome. He suggested several additions/edits - adding *the communities symbiotic relationship with nature*, second paragraph should say *we protect and preserve and provide, work with our partners* not really sure what that means would it be inclusive to say *work with our cities and counties.* Lane noted that the partners wanted to be broader than cities and counties. AGM Johnson asked if Vann felt the term “partners” was too vague. Vann said yes, it begs the question, who are the partners? PAC member Soderstrom thought it was a great idea to have a brief, crisp statement. He cautioned, however, not to edit too much out because future generations may forget what the District has historically been about – both land preservation and acquisition. A subtext may be needed to communicate those objectives. PAC member Volin agreed that three sentences are not excessive, and it is important to mention the core issues. PAC member Johnson mentioned that although we know the District parks are destination places for domestic and local visitors looking into the future we should look at it as destination place for international visitors as well. PAC member Madison mentioned the statement should be brief and active. He gave an example: *The EBRPD preserves a rich heritage of natural and cultural resource opportunities, open space parks and trails, through the provision of healthful recreation and promoting the communities understanding of nature.* The term “environmental ethic” guiding the District’s work is more of a tool and not active. Walkling mentioned a belief statement can provide a valuable gut check.

**b. Volunteer Program Update – Anne Kassebaum, Recreation Services Manager (I)**

Anne Kassebaum, Recreation Services began by stating last year the District had 13,000 volunteers contributing 125,000 hours. The District’s volunteer program is in a period of transition. Kathleen Fusek retired and now Kevin Fox is the acting resource analyst. She used a PowerPoint to discuss the recreation services unit’s organizational chart and outline the position duties. She mentioned the unit’s active role in monitoring and data collection for special events, resource and training, and volunteer hours. To date volunteers have contributed 61,689 hours, including 29,000 one time projects. About 4,000 volunteers contributed in Coastal Cleanup efforts. She continued with assessment and evaluation of District services, outreach and service learning. Recreation Services staff had a brainstorming session with park supervisors to get feedback on benefits, challenges and potential opportunities. The goal is for volunteers to have a positive experience, but properly “managing” volunteers takes District staff time. The District recently received a \$10,000 grant from REI to be utilized in the Dublin area. PAC member Shalaby asked how much tonnage of trash or natural debris volunteers removed from District coastlines and parks. Kevin Fox responded actual numbers are not available because it depends on the type of materials – invasive plants, wood and recyclables. Shalaby asked if the District provides education for the public to reduce dumping in the parks. Kassebaum said when

District cleanup projects occur a naturalist is there to provide educational materials and info. Fox said education is a key component of District partnerships with the Coastal Commission and Save the Bay. He added approximately one in four volunteers receive a data card about the materials they are collecting. Save the Bay lobbies in an effort to redirect companies on how they produce their products. Soderstrom wondered if the District's data can determine whether more volunteers are needed and if that data could be channeled to the HR Department to determine if another staff position is needed in a park. Southworth noted the full time equivalent (FTE) chart and wondered if the District still had a hiring freeze. Kassebaum explained some internal staff changed positions which left some additional resources for the FTE. AGM Johnson discussed the budget and how it impacts what staff can do. She added it is a Board priority to use volunteers. Shalaby added more volunteers will require more staff to monitor them. Kassebaum continued the District is looking to strengthen the Regional Parks Foundation which could also work with corporations to develop volunteer activities as team building exercises. AGM Johnson remarked about the successful program Trails Manager Jim Townsend conducts with volunteers to work on District trails. PAC member Coomber asked if the District reaches out to schools because many have volunteer requirements for their students. Kassebaum said the District does have a lot of student volunteers, particularly on special event days.

c. **Land Use Plan Amendment for Brushy Peak Regional Recreation Area – Celia McCarthy, Park Planner, Planning/Stewardship/GIS (R)**

Celia McCarthy, Park Planner, is asking the PAC for a positive recommendation to the Board to approve the Brushy Peak Plan Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA). The purpose of this LUPA is to modify the existing LUP approved by the Board in 2002. It is not intended to replace the plan. It is intended to add to the protections. She recalled the land's history beginning in 1772 to present date. In June 2010, the District began a consultation with local Native Americans. In December 2010, the District conducted a site inspection of the proposed Brushy Peak Special Protection Feature (SPF) with the District's consulting archaeologist, staff and Native Americans. The District proposed expanding the SPF to encompass the entire archaeological site. The District discussed future interpretative opportunities to examine the Native American cultural significance at Brushy Peak. In June 2011, the LUP for Brushy Peak was reviewed to determine better ways to manage the SPF. McCarthy showed a map, the Archaeological District Record and where the Native American human remains were found. The Native American community recommends the site be considered a cultural district which would represent a living tradition, as opposed to a burial site which suggests a dead tradition. One recommendation is to change the name from an Archaeological to a Cultural district. The District wants to involve qualified archaeologists and interested Native Americans in both the planning and construction phases of any future projects at the site if there is any ground disturbance. Additional recommendations are to update the District's Cultural Site Atlas to include boundaries of the Archaeological District Record, perform systematic monitoring of the cultural resources and produce a written report, and repair and record undiscovered sites within six months. The District would prohibit off-trail motorized vehicle access within the SPF. The District would advise against equestrian use on the trail, place salt licks outside of archaeological site, modify fencing to discourage entry by cattle and humans, and protect cultural materials – no mowing, add lean fencing, record a "no bulldozing/no fire retardant" policy in the SPF with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

PAC member Coomber had a question about increasing the fencing farther up the trails. McCarthy stated the District is considering wing fencing. Coomber also asked if the District is considering a designated trail through the summit. McCarthy responded the summit was a culturally sensitive, sacred site. Coomber wondered if the Livermore Area Recreation and Park District (LARPD) had weighed in about the summit. McCarthy said LARPD does not allow the public in and only escorted people can go up to the summit. Chair Kirby stated the most sensitive area is on the LARPD land. The District should include the whole area of archaeological sensitivity. It should have been a joint venture between the two park districts

and was a lost opportunity. Lane added LARPD and the representatives of the Native American community were comfortable with the way it is currently designated. The original plan suggested one trail, but the descendants didn't want any public access. The District and LARPD agreed. PAC member Simmons wondered if the District considered moving the trail on locus two. McCarthy said yes, however, the area is very steep, and a SPF and sensitive species are also in the area. PAC member Walkling had a question regarding Kirby's comments. PAC member Shalaby asked if there will be changes to public access to this area and are there plans to modify Ordinance 38. McCarthy stated the plan is to move forward, monitor and then reassess. Shalaby asked if the District was liable for any damages to the area. McCarthy did not know the answer, but that it is a crime for anyone to disturb those areas. Norm Kidder asked how the group of Native Americans was selected. McCarthy stated the District contacted the Native American Commission and they provided the names. The District sent a mailing to everyone on the list and invited all members on the list to participate in the District's LUPA meetings. McCarthy added the District needs to expand its cultural resources program. Lane added there was a fairly consistent group coming to the meetings who are very concerned about what happens there. The District tries to make it comfortable for them to talk and convey their thoughts. McCarthy stated the District makes a good faith attempt to be as inclusive as possible. PAC member Palacios asked if there will be an educational component. McCarthy said yes and it's part of the original LUP. PAC member Vann moved the PAC recommend the Board support the Brushy Peak LUPA. PAC member Coomber seconded and the motion passed.

5. **PAC Member Comments** – PAC member Walkling announced the North Richmond Shoreline Festival is October 8 in Richmond. PAC member Vann was an Ambassador volunteer at the Breuner Marsh cleanup which had an enthusiastic crowd of about 40 people. PAC member Simmons mentioned Walnut Creek is having its first volunteer community service day project with 800 people signed up.
6. **Report from the Chair** – Chair Kirby stated he had been out enjoying the parks.
7. **Board Committee Reports** – PAC member Bank handed out a written report of the minutes for two Board Operations Committee meetings and an Ecology meeting. She discussed the park supervisors' submission of short trails that were close to reasonable parking. There was an intern this summer that had the pleasure of checking 50 different trails and came up with a draft brochure detailing short loop trails. Lane provided additional input and Wilson discussed further.
8. **Status of Recommendations** – Current.
9. **Old Business** – None.
10. **New Business** – AGM Johnson provided the PAC members with copies of a book with interesting history and pictures of the Tilden Merry-Go-Round. It celebrates its 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary this year. PAC Soderstrom mentioned everyone should visit Garin Dry Creek because it is a unique park with a lot of things that need to be addressed.
11. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

#### Summary of Actions:

1. The July 25, 2011 meeting minutes were unanimously approved with one edit.
2. The PAC recommended the Brushy Peak LUP Amendment.
3. The PAC's next meeting is October 24, 2011.
4. The PAC's Holiday Dinner is at the Lake Merritt Hotel, December 5, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,  
Yolande Barial, PAC Secretary