

**PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**

MEETING DATE: October 6, 2015

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 3E

APPLICANT: Donna Curtis, Commissioner

REQUEST: Discussion only regarding a “Master Plan Update” report given to the Board of Supervisors on behalf of the Parks and Recreation Commission by Commissioner Donna Curtis on June 18, 2015.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: During the May 5, 2015 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting the Commission selected member Donna Curtis to represent the Commission by presenting the Commission’s report and findings of their year-long review of the “Parks and Recreation Master Plan.” The review and report of the Master Plan was approved by the Commission during its April 7, 2015 meeting. Donna presented the review and its findings to the Board of Supervisors during the Board of Supervisors meeting of June 18, 2015. The report given to the Board by Donna is attached as Exhibit A.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: This is a “discussion only” item therefore no action can be taken.

Exhibit A

Commissioners: Please note that comments in italic are from the meeting/Supervisors. Their purpose is to build a number of future agenda items as we review my presentation. Underlines were made for me to be sure to mention. Report has been edited somewhat as it was just an outline when first presented!

OUTLINE REPORT ON PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION'S REVIEW OF PARKS MASTER PLAN 6/18/15

To the Board of Supervisors: I promised if I was reappointed, I would ask the Commission to review the 10 year-old Parks and Recreation Master Plan. But, this report has not sat on the shelf. Staff refers to it often when considering justification for development projects. For example, when the Brewery Arts center proposed closure of Minnesota Street and developing an outdoor stage and passive park area on its properties, it was noted the Master plan called for a park in this neighborhood. As there is very little land to build a typical park, and as there is already a neighborhood park out Kings Canyon Road, the park proposed by the BAC is in perfect conformance with the 2006 adopted plan.

But the frequency of review, and if this review should include what could be a costly survey to see how public citizens view P&R programs and facilities today, consumed most of the Commission's discussion about Chapters 1 and 3 of the Master Plan. The Frequency of review was not explicit but all agreed doing so every year was not necessarily needed. (In fact it was later agreed every five years was sufficient). In any event, it is time now to consider an update, starting with a community-wide survey.

The P & R Master Plan has more than 80 Implementation Measures. During FY 2009, the Commission broke into three subgroups to look at these measures. Were they still relevant? Was there new information or methodologies that should be introduced as an update to the plan? At the end of the plan, there is data concerning 30 neighborhood responses to questions about needing facilities. The yes or no answers mostly made sense but some did not. Some wanted another neighborhood park when there was one in their neighborhood. Did they mean they were unsatisfied with the park that was there? I think that is the case but we have never revisited this data to find out. Personally, I think this could be done NOW Maybe, with a little volunteer help to set up meetings etc.

But and I will say this often, as we did as a Commission while reviewing the plan, staff has not been able to get back with their take on the three subgroup's work in FY 2009, due to heavy workload and other priorities. I believe that hampered our review of the plan this past year. But, as I refer you to the chart in Vern's report, called "A Snapshot in Time," that is the chart of new programs, facilities, duties added since FY 2006 in spite of the economy and loss of staffing; something had to give. So not only did the Master Plan need to be updated, the Commission also discussed the need for a new city-wide survey and the need to get a sense of priorities.

It's timely to consider doing another public survey. The last survey was done in FY 2010 on the need for indoor recreation. As the Board is considering a City Strategic Plan implementation measures, a questionnaire can be built to "test" those measures. A survey done today may not

need to be as expensive as the survey done for the FY 2006 Master Plan. For example, the Department is considering re-issuing the quarterly city-wide “Discover Us” magazine for Parks and Recreation programs, and stories about park facilities. A survey could be done each quarter on Senior Programs, dog parks, cultural inclusion, theater needs, etc. (Update: this was not funded in the 2015-2016 budget.)

Comment: Work with other Departments and CCVB staff to do a city-wide survey. Staff: we are working on marketing ideas. We will bring whole matter to Commission.

Another issue that has been discussed by the Commission many times is the need to have a sense of prioritization of projects. For example, when the disc golf enthusiasts came to us some years ago, they thought having a golf course at JD Winters Centennial Park was a good idea. But the Master Plan for that park needed updating as there are thoughts of changing the locations of the baseball areas, adding soccer areas etc. While re-mastering Centennial Park is a priority, other matters come up and it gets pushed back. I believe the Commission is interested in some attempt to look at priorities for major projects like Centennial.

Question: How do you prioritize? Answer. “Make a Snap Shot in Time” for projects in the pipeline. Pull out the major one; ones that have the biggest consequence and prioritize them.

Today’s report mentions the need for more facilities. One wonders with some 30 parks on 115 acres why we would need any more. Actually, in the Master Plan Chapter 6 is a Table of Park types. Using national standards, we could build another 45 acres of parks by the time the City is built out. Equally important is the location of neighborhood parks. People should be able to walk to a park from where they live. And, we are encouraged to be a walk-able city.

In response to my comment that maintenance of our Parks has gone from a LOS of 1-2, staff clarified that we keep parks used for tournaments at LOS 1.

Speaking of which, I am wondering why the Downtown and particularly the inter-active fountain project has not come to the Commission. I believe the Commission might have some comments about the nature of the fountain. There are many “pocket parks” and activity centers in the adopted Comprehensive City Master Plan. I believe the Commission should be reviewing the plans for the Corridors as well, as the drawings are now at 30%.

Chapter 2 in today’s report mentions the need for natural as well as built up neighborhood parks. The City is keeping to this policy such as the Ronald B Wilson Park. Chapter 6 has a chart of the LOS. We were at 1. Now, staff tells me we are at 2. (See Staff clarification above). If we have to go down further, sports teams from other areas may decide to stop using our facilities. There goes the “heads in beds!”

I’m not here to ask for any funding. But I can report that many measures have been taken or are still under way to help with the cost of maintenance as well as building new facilities. The adoption of the Landscape District is one measure. We have had pro bono work from engineers to build the much needed bridge to connect trails along the Carson River. There is an adopt-a-park program still operating in some of the parks. Recently the Kiwanis worked 3 hours on a Saturday

to clean up cubic feet of brush, trash at the new Imus Park. I am helping re-establish the Foundation for the Betterment of Parks. This will serve as an umbrella 501c3 for groups like the Women's Gun Club, the Parks 4 Paws, and Disc Golf so they can have tax deductible fund raising. We hope to attract grant writers too. The idea is to do what can be done to help raise funds. (Update, the Foundation has been re-established. There will be a presentation in November).

Chapter 3 concerns public input, such as having a survey, neighborhood meetings as discussed earlier. Today's report mentions the Commission's actions that are to note a need for a follow up survey when a review of the Master Plan is approved by the Supervisors. However, today is not an action item. But any direction could be brought back to the Commission in my report to them when we meet next month.

Comment: Implement Chapter 3 (E), which is to conduct a follow-up public opinion survey when a review of the Master Plan is approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Chapter 4 mentioned the major trends of concern are the economic slowdown that has put us so behind in getting to projects that are needed and have been requested even by your Board. There has been a reduction in staff. But again, note Vern's Chart in the report on additional duties taken on and projects completed since FY 2006. The Department is addressing cultural needs with adding Friday night soccer and Futsal.

Chapter 5 discusses the reduction in staff and that the Commission wants to see more "Snap Shots in Time" as given in Vern's list in the report. I would like to add that I believe the Commission should report to your Board annually. At least, a kind of progress report if you will. I will be asking we put the idea of changing our bylaws or even NRS to establish this practice. The Commission has asked for a wording change from scholarship to financial aid. Note: As not an action item, did not ask for this change or review every 5 years as noted in Chapter 1. We can take up these matters when Master Plan is actually re-done.

5. E. Comment: Requested the idea of having a table identifying existing recreation programming opportunities to "provide a snapshot in time" to compare changes over time come back to the Supervisors.

Chapter 6 has been mentioned as far as its nifty charts. But I do want to stress the urgent need for the \$500,000 awarded for the Community Center. Due to the change of LOS regarding maintenance, the Theater is showing its age. I have documents going back to FYs 2003-2004 with capital projects for the Theater which still have not been done. This is a very popular facility, in fact, surprisingly so in the FYs 2005-6 survey. I'm sure it still is. So very glad for the \$500,000!

6. G Staff responded to a question that most aquatic center hours had been restored.

Chapter 7 as I am known as the "restroom Lady" on the Commission, I am pleased to see the mention of the Commission's interest in seeing porta-potties in most parks, as required in the Master Plan. Getting these built should be a priority. The one requested for Sonoma Park has been on the CIP list as long as I have been on the Commission.

7. C. Comment: Staff should work with CCCVB on considering the reinvestment of sport tourism/economic development dollars into the sport complexes that generate those dollars.

Note to Commission: I was assured by the Board that the \$500,000 for the Community Center from the 1/8 cent sales tax would be kept whole. We need to see what these improvements are and compare these to what has been approved by earlier Commissions.

Other Comments

When is it intended we build a leisure pool? Staff: It's purely a budget matter.

Comment: Can we outsource the ice rink? Where can it go if it is removed from Arlington Square? Staff Answer. It is cost-recovering now. Secondly, it might be placed near the proposed hotel. Suggestion from Jim Shirk: Talk to the people at Sportsman Warehouse. They have interest in this. Staff: It is assumed when the downtown project is approved; the Commission will have opportunity to review this and/or any possibilities of locating it elsewhere.

The Board is pleased to see this report and would like to see a report from the Commission every year. It could be a progress report or action-oriented. I propose we amend the by-laws to have an annual report to the Board of Supervisors by the Chair or his/her designee.