

# **Issues with Parks Inventory and Performance Standard**

## **Do we have 3 acres/1,000 residents/quadrant as required?**

### **Changes in Park Size/inventory**

About 80% of parks have changed size in the last year- between what was reported in WP # 3 and what is now shown in the draft General Plan. Some are larger, some smaller- but certainly the public deserves some explanation for these changes. Park acres are the only performance measure for parks so everyone needs to have confidence in these numbers.

### **School yards are fully counted as park acres**

Since the Kelly school shootings school yards are fenced, gated and locked. The only access is after school- only if the school does not need it- and only for organized sports teams. There is no general public access. The NW quadrant is hurt the most by this as almost ½ of what is credited as parks are actually locked school yards. Fenced, gated and locked school yards should not be given full credit as a park.

### **Some land is double counted as hardline open space and as a park**

Parts of 4 existing parks- with a combined total of 51 acres are double counted as both hardline preserve land and as a park. The same land can't be both. Under the laws that established the Habitat Management Plan (HMP) - there is no right for the public to have any use of hard line preserve land. This land is set aside in fulfillment of federal and state laws to protect native plants and wildlife. **No active recreation is allowed.** In limited cases where passive recreation is allowed (i.e., trails) even these can be closed at any time- as recently happened at Mission Trails Park. Counting hard line preserve land as a park increases the number of park acres- and thereby falsely shows that the minimum required park acres have been provided. No double-counting of land as hard line open space and as a park should be allowed.

### **Some "parks" are really city-wide facilities and should not be allocated to a quadrant**

There is only one Senior Center, only one Skate Park yet both are charged 100% to a single quadrant. There is only one golf course- it is identified as a city-wide facility and is not counted toward meeting the required 3 acres of park land /1,000 residents for any quadrant. There needs to be uniform standards for when a recreational facility is counted as city-wide and when it is charged to a quadrant in fulfillment of the minimum required park acres.

### **There is no justification for counting Veteran's Park in all 4 quadrants**

No other park in the city is counted in all 4 quadrants. This is the site where staff have said they expect the "big idea" active recreation park will be built- something clearly expected to serve the entire city. Why is that different than the golf course or beaches that are not counted toward meeting quadrant park acres?

### **Isn't it time to have a standard for neighborhood parks?**

Early versions of the GMP had 2.5 acres/1,000 residents/quadrant for community parks and 0.5 acres for neighborhood parks. These were combined to 3 acres in total- but both kinds of parks are important. The Vision emphasized the importance of connectivity, and accessibility. The park standards should really be updated to reflect this –with walkable neighborhood parks. Every neighborhood deserves to have a park.