

PARKS AND RECREATION COALITION (PARC) RECOMMENDATIONS
July 29, 2021

RECOMMENDATIONS	EXPLANATIONS
<p>A. 20 POINTS FOR LAND REVISE conflicting language added to the July Draft PMP (v.4), Appendix D, pages 19 and 20 regarding award of points for park acreage, as follows: 1) DELETE this sentence from Appendix D, Local Recreational Value in Parks, page 19: <i>"The minimum score for any park shall be no less than 3.5</i> 2) REPLACE this sentence in Appendix D, page 20: <i>"Parks under an acre will receive 0.875 points for each 1/8 acre."</i> with the following sentence, <u><i>"Fractional park acreage shall be awarded 0.875 points for each 1/8 acre."</i></u></p>	<p>1) A minimum score of 3.5 points, as recommended by PSLN, would nullify the 20% park land requirement per draft PMP v.3, and drastically reduce park acreage required to be provided by developers and in community plan updates. PARC does not support the 3.5 points amendment per PSLN #4, page 3.</p> <p>2) The use of fractional scoring for parks acreage reinforces the 20% park land requirement and equity goals. Addressed by PSLN #5 on page 3, however the language in Appendix D, page 20, was not revised in the draft PMP v.6, dated August 3, 2021.</p>
<p>B. EXCESSIVE POINT REDUCTIONS ELIMINATE unwarranted, excessive point reductions, as follows: 1) REVISE Appendix D, Recreational Value Scoring Matrix, Note #14, page 24: "If the required recreational value points are provided onsite, and either a dedication in fee or a recreation easement for public access in perpetuity for the park site is shall be granted to the City, the applicant's required recreational value score may be reduced by 10%. The applicant can reduce its required recreational value points by an additional 15% if the applicant provides private maintenance for the onsite park for at least 30 years to the satisfaction of the Parks and Recreation Director. The design upon which the recreational value points provided onsite is based must be in accordance with an approved General Development Plan in accordance with Council Policy 600-33."</p>	<p>Required points should not be reduced for dedication of land or provision of a recreation easement in perpetuity as this is current City practice. Additionally, State law requires DIF funds to be spent solely for capital infrastructure to support new residents. Point reductions ultimately short-change the public of needed and deserved park and recreation facilities. Private maintenance incentives should be addressed by other methods. PARC does not support point reductions for these purposes.</p> <p>Example of excessive point reductions using a 100-points requirement for onsite park development:</p> <p>10% points reduction for payment of 10% Park DIF (100 pts – 10 pts = 90 pts); 10% points reduction for deeding the land to the City, or placing an easement in perpetuity (90 pts – 10 pts = 80 pts); and 15% points reduction for 30-yr private maintenance (80 pts – 15 pts = 65 pts).</p> <p>Result: Potential 35% reduction in total points to be satisfied by developer onsite, of which 13 pts (20% of 65 pts) would be required for land and 52 pts for amenities.</p>
<p>C. CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF CHANGES TO PMP & PMP RESO 1) REVISE this sentence from 4.7 Implementation Framework, last paragraph page 87, as follows: <i>"Along with a commitment to deliver To ensure oversight and the delivery of flexibility in implementation enables the City to adjust, refine, and improve strategies accessible, equitable, innovative, and high quality recreational experiences, all changes in implementation strategies, including the points system in Appendix D, Recreational Value Scoring, shall be approved by the City Council."</i> 2) DELETE this sentence from the PMP Adopting Resolution, page 3, as follows: "BE IT RESOLVED...3. That the Mayor or his designee is authorized to make minor administrative changes to achieve the vision of the Parks Master Plan."</p>	<p>City Council must approve any changes to the descriptions or point values defined in Appendix D, Recreation Value Park Scoring Matrix. No metrics are provided within the PMP to determine what constitutes "minor administrative changes". This should be reflected in both the PMP document and the PMP Adoption Resolution. At PSLN, Councilmember von Wilpert requested an amendment that language be added to the PMP requiring City Council oversight of any changes to Appendix D, Recreational Value Scoring, however the official Committee Actions and staff report do not include language to this effect.</p>

<p>D. FUTURE IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS ADD prioritization and estimated timeline for all Future Implementation Actions, Section 4.8, pages 87-88. These four actions should be undertaken first:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Update Council Policy 600-33 2) Citywide recreational value assessment 3) Park funding prioritization policy and forecast 4) Park Needs Index 	<p>The implementation plan must have a timeline to guide future actions.</p>
<p>E. DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE REVISE this sentence, page 89, as follows, and REVISE Policy PP13, page 93, accordingly: “Park Design Review Board Committee Feasibility - In accordance with Policy PP13, determine the feasibility and actions needed to form re- <u>establish</u> a Park Design Review Board Committee that is comprised of <u>multidisciplinary members including Architects, Civil Engineers, Urban Planners, Community Planners and Landscape Architects, and Park and Recreation professionals, and citizens that who</u> are representative and reflective of the demographics of the City’s population.”</p>	<p>Re-establishment of a Design Review Committee is essential to ensure a safe, secure and equitable park system, and high quality park designs.</p>
<p>F. MONITORING REPORT REVISE Parks + Programming, Policy PP7, page 92 as follows: <i>“Develop a Parks Master Plan monitoring program and provide a report to the appropriate City Council Committee every two years to ensure successful implementation. Make monitoring results available to the public on the City website. This report shall report on park land and amenities separately, and on developer-provided on- and off-site park and recreation facilities, and provide a current list of park deficient communities and Communities of Concern.”</i></p>	<p>The RV-Points system is experimental and requires close oversight to determine the outcomes. Oversight must include reporting on how the points system is being used and what choices are being made with respect to fees or building parks on-site.</p>
<p>G. RECREATIONAL-VALUE POINTS FOR “LINKAGES” OR “TRANSIT” ELIMINATE award of Recreation Value Points for "Linkages" or "Integration with Transit" for Pocket Parks, Mini Parks and Neighborhood Parks in Appendix D, Access/Connectivity, page 23.</p>	<p>These park types serve neighborhood residents and are accessible by walking.</p>
<p>H. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT REVISE fifth Whereas paragraph to include maintenance of effort language for Park and Recreation budget, as follows: 1) <i>“WHEREAS, the Citywide Park DIF will be used solely to fund parks and recreation facilities throughout the City; and shall be used for capital projects only in dedicated or designated neighborhood- and community-based parks, and shall not be used to replace the existing Parks and Recreation budget.</i></p>	<p>Current Resolution language does not ensure that use of the Citywide Park Fee is adequately limited and does not replace existing Park and Recreation funding.</p>
<p>I. COMMUNITY-BUILDING POLICY Add the following policy: <u>“Community Building, Policy CB9: Determine community-wide and neighborhood-specific parks and recreation needs, and engage in fine-grain planning to meet those needs with a focus on good design.”</u></p>	<p>Each neighborhood must be looked at in detail to determine the needs, opportunities, and possibilities. Both the current acreage standards for parks and the proposed point system--together are a starting point for providing the park and open space needs of a community.</p>
<p>J. COMMERCIALIZATION/PRIVATIZATION RETAIN language proposed for deletion from the Recreation Element, as follows: “RE-C.6 <u>Protect parks from commercialization and privatization.</u>”</p>	<p>To reinforce the importance of protecting public parks from commercial and private interests over-reach, retain the existing language.</p>
<p>K. IMPROVE THE RV-POINTS SYSTEM CORRECT the numerous errors in the Recreation Value Scoring sheets included in Appendix E for each of the Sample Communities, as documented in PARC’s previous letters and public testimony.</p>	<p>These errors may have significant impacts on the calculation of two foundational elements of the PMP: the proposed park standard (100 points/1,000 residents) and the Citywide Park Development Impact Fee.</p>

**PUBLIC SAFETY & LIVABLE NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE
MOTION/AMENDMENTS
July 14, 2021**

The PS&LN Committee Motion “to recommend approval of staff’s recommendation along with the following amendments” are identified below with PARC’s position on each proposed amendment.	
1. That the implementation of the Parks Master Plan be monitored annually by the Office of Race and Equity through a report to City Council; <i>(per Montgomery-Steppe)</i>	PARC supports this amendment.
2. That the Citywide Park Development Impact fee resolution be amended to include a section with the following language, after Section 16, “the Citywide Park DIF prioritized investments in park deficient communities and Communities of Concern, as determined by the Mayor or their designee shall be approved annually by City Council.” <i>(per von Wilpert)</i>	PARC supports this amendment, however this language does not reflect the specific language submitted by the Councilmember according to screen shots taken at PSLN hearing.
3. Add language to Section 16 in the draft resolution approving the Citywide Park Development Impact Fee to read: “Park deficient communities shall be determined as shown in the Existing Conditions Report for the Parks Master Plan, dated June 2019, Figures 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3 on an interim basis until a Park Needs Index is completed, as identified in Section 4.8 of the Parks Master Plan.” <i>(per von Wilpert)</i>	PARC supports this amendment.
4. Amend sentence from Appendix D, page 19, Local Recreational Value in Parks to read: “The minimum score for any park shall be no less than 7.” to “The minimum score for any park shall be no less than 3.5.” <i>(per Whitburn)</i>	PARC does not support the 3.5 points proposal. See Explanation for Key Recommendation A.1 on page 1.
5. Replace sentence from Appendix D, page 20, Local Recreational Value in Parks to read: “Parks under an acre will receive 0.875 points for each 1/8 acre.” with the following sentence, “Fractional park acreage shall be awarded 0.875 points for each 1/8 acre.” <i>(per Whitburn)</i>	PARC supports this amendment, however the amended language was not added to Appendix D, page 20 of the draft PMP v.6, dated August 3, 2021.
6. Add to Appendix D, Cumulative Recreational Value for a Community Planning Area, page 19: “No less than 20% of a community’s local recreational value points must be scored in the Park Size category.” <i>(per Whitburn)</i>	PARC supports this amendment.
7. Add a policy section with the following language: “Development projects that were not accounted for in a community plan should provide parks onsite to address the project’s park needs, as appropriate.” <i>(per von Wilpert)</i>	PARC supports this amendment, as stated in official transcript. The Errata Sheet and Policy CB8 added to the draft PMP v.6, dated August 3, 2021, include different language which PARC does not support.