



City Manager's Office

MEMORANDUM

DATE: 6/2/23

TO: Mayor and City Council

THROUGH: Doug Thornley, City Manager Approved Electronically

FROM: Nathan Ullyot, Director of Parks and Recreation
Karina Mercier, Management Analyst

SUBJECT: Status update on Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan

In advance of the June 7, 2023, City Council meeting where staff are recommending an amendment to the Stantec Consulting Inc's contract, staff feel it is important to provide Council with the most updated draft of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Master Plan.

Due to a lack of funding after the Great Recession, very little from the City of Reno's 2008 Recreation Facilities Plan was completed. Thirteen years later in 2021, staff began updating the 2008 Recreation Facilities Plan to create a more robust Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Master Plan. After completing the RFQ process, no bids were received and staff began to seek potential vendors who could assist with completing the plan. On August 24, 2022, Council approved an agreement with Stantec Consulting Inc, in partnership with Citygate Associates LLC, to perform an independent assessment and complete work on this plan in the amount of \$152,500. In 2021 and throughout 2022 staff worked to expand the content of the plan to include open space and Truckee River needs, as well as estimated maintenance and operations costs.

Staff has worked with Stantec to move the plan forward, including completing an extensive data request and holding various review meetings for the draft. Public input for this plan has included working with multiple stakeholder groups, a general citizen survey, virtual community workshops, general public input via email and opportunities for input at the Recreation and Parks Commission, all Neighborhood Advisory Boards, the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee and the Financial Advisory Board. Staff has also sought Council review and feedback during this update process. This draft of the PROS Master Plan currently contains the following:

- Level of Service Gap Analysis and Comparison Metrics
- Census Data and Trends
- Needs assessments for Parks, Recreation, Programming, Facilities, Open Space and Trails, Urban Forestry and Maintenance

- Funding options and potential partnerships
- Public Input overview
- Facility/Amenity inventory
- Facility Conditions Analysis

It is important to note that this draft does not include elements scheduled to be completed after Council input. Still to be completed as a part of the original scope is:

- Implementation plan
- Completed funding matrix
- Final plan document

This draft has been recommended by the Recreation and Parks Commission to move forward for City Council feedback. The next decision to be made is how and when Council would like to receive the consultant presentation. On June 7, 2023 staff will bring an amendment forward for Council consideration. Staff is requesting this amendment to the existing agreement to expand the consultant scope of work to include additional plan review meetings with Council and staff, expanded public outreach and additional analysis for an additional amount of \$54,397, bringing the total project budget to \$206,397. The amendment would allow for the following items to be included in the plan as necessary:

- **Presentation of Draft Plan in Special Policy Briefings with Council:** These would occur in place of one special Council meeting/workshop. One-on-one meetings at one (1) hour each. Seven (7) meetings in total.
- **Community Townhall/Outreach to Present Plan Overview:** A virtual meeting will be held to present the draft plan to share with the public and obtain input. Stantec will develop materials to use in the presentation.
- **Community Input Online Survey - Customized Project Website and Engagement Platform:** The Stantec Team will assist City staff by providing and hosting the Social Pinpoint website for the PROS Master Plan. As one of the industry-leading and innovative digital engagement platforms, this website will serve as a dedicated engagement space unique to this project allowing community members to always know where to find information and progress about the Reno Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan. Stantec will work with City staff to provide general information about the planning process, previous community feedback highlights, and opportunity for community feedback on the final draft of the PROS Master Plan. The project website will be developed upon revised contract approval and will remain active through project completion.
- **Citygate Associates Sub-consultant:** Citygate Associates will participate in additional meetings, public outreach and document reviews.

If approved by the Reno City Council, staff anticipates plan adoption would take place in summer of 2023.

Attachments:

- Draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan
- Recreation and Park Commission Comments

Recreation and Parks Commission

Comments and Responses on the City of Reno Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan from April 18, May 16, 2023 meetings

B.4. Discussion and recommendation regarding the draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space (“PROS”) Master Plan (For Possible Action) – Nathan Ulliyot, Director

Explanation: The PROS plan draft was presented to the Recreation and Parks Commission (RPC) on March 21st by consultant team from Stantec. The RPC Commissioners listened to the presentation summarizing the plan and ultimately motioned to continue to review the plan individually in preparation for further discussion at the April 18th meeting. At that meeting, the commission consolidated their questions/concerns and submitted them for a response from Reno P&R staff and the consultant group.

Below is a list of the questions/concerns followed by staff and consultant responses. The responses were shared with the RPC Commissioners prior to the May 16th meeting. The commissioners highlighted items 1, 5, and 16 as areas that they would like to see addressed further. The commission’s comments are below the consultant’s comments on the three items.

At the bottom of the document are the official motions made in relation to the PROS plan. This includes motions from the April 18th meeting and the May 16th meeting.

PROS Plan comments from the Recreation and Parks Commission on April 18, 2023:

The PROS Master Plan was presented to the Recreation and Parks Commission at their regular meeting on March 21, 2023. The Plan came back to the Commission on April 18, 2023 and May 16, 2023, for further discussion and possible recommendation. After further discussion, the Commission raised the following issues, listed in no priority of order, as issues to be addressed in further detail.

1. The Plan does not adequately describe the current situation related to youth sports and activities; either related to the number of youth currently participating in programs in Reno, nor a comparison of Reno as it relates to youth participation with other agencies and/or national standards.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately within the purpose of the plan.

- **In the Service Summary in Table 2-6 approximately 50 agencies are listed as offering programs for youth.**
- **The future of recreation services on page 92 also addresses how we should assess this regularly.**
- **Table 1 in the appendices also describes program offerings including youth.**

In Staff’s opinion, the plan adequately displays the provided data and providers for youth opportunities. It also establishes the justification and needs for more space and facilities to expand opportunities without becoming overly specific. Trends in participation and programming shift regularly so less specificity in this adopted plan gives Reno the ability to adjust based on real-time data and feedback.

Consultant comment: The city did not include public outreach to any outside groups in the consultant’s contract as the public input process was accomplished by City staff prior

to the contract commencing in August 2022. The Plan recognizes, by name, RYSA on page 139 in the Partnership Opportunities section, provides a gap analysis on Table 7-2 *Recreation Facilities Standards and Level of Service* chart on page 209, provides a Level of Service comparison with other agencies on Table 7-3 and Table 7-5 on page 212 and identifies recommended upgrades needed to ball diamonds and flat fields on Table 2, page 234. Additionally “Youth Programs” are mentioned in Table 1: Recreations Services and Programs on page 224. Table 2-6: Community Recreation Service Providers Services Summary on page 89 & 90 lays out various agencies which provided services to different age groups to include youth programs. Figure 4-2: Parks & Recreation FY22 Adopted Budget Expenses by Program Total on page 122 identifies that 13.6% of the \$12.7M budget is for youth development.

Commission comment from May 16th meeting: The Plan does not address the needs of youth between the ages of 6-17 enough. The challenges youth face today include poor performance in schools, obesity, learning challenges, teamwork among other things. This age group needs to be made a priority in the Plan. It should not be grouped with seniors.

2. The consultants have not reached out to current youth program providers to describe the needs that are met and unmet through these organizations related to programs and facilities.

CoR Staff Response:

RYSA is mentioned on page 139 describing the relationship and services offered. As the representative group of over 30 youth sports and activities organization, they are a primary user of CoR parks and facilities.

Staff agrees that RYSA could be made more aware of the process and has recently met with the Reno Parks and Recreation Director and will be provided a draft of the PROS plan. As a part of the discussions with staff RYSA has indicated that the plan addresses the need for additional flat field and sports facilities and prioritizes that appropriately. Those needs have not changed since the last PROS plan was adopted in 2008. RYSA also mentioned the need for improved maintenance of School facilities so that they are more playable in competition.

Consultant comment: The City did not include public outreach to any outside groups in the consultant’s contract as the public input process was accomplished by City staff prior to the contract commencing in August 2022. The Plan did inventory and identified community organizations and businesses that provide youth services on Table 2-6, page 89 & 90. The Plan elevates the coordination with sports leagues as a priority by identifying it as Objective 3.5 within the Overarching Goal #3 *Quality of Life* as shown on page 26. It also recommends specific Strategies regarding recreation services delivery, including youth services, on page 93. The consultant encourages the city to circle back with the citizens and interested stakeholders regarding the completion of the draft final PROS Plan through its website or other outreach methods as the next step in the process.

3. The Plan does not adequately describe the current state of aquatics as it exists in Reno, with or without the construction of the new Moana Springs Community Pool and Fitness Center. The

Plan also does not describe the future needs of aquatics related to number of facilities and the locations in the community.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately within the purpose of the plan.

- **Table 7-5 highlights the extended need for aquatics in New Recreation Priorities.**
- **A listing of Aquatics programming is in the Table 1 for Recreation Programs and Services on page 226.**
- **Table 2-6 on page 90 lists organizations that provide services including aquatics. The current project at Moana is a step in the direction towards addressing this, and aquatics is listed as a continued priority over the next 15-20 years.**

Consultant comment: The Plan summarizes the need to provide park and facility system improvements and upgrades in Goal #2 and Goal #4 on pages 26-27 and water recreation is specifically identified in the General Recommendations on pages 32-33. The Plan identifies partnership opportunities regarding aquatics on page 145 and includes the public's feedback regarding aquatics in Chapter 7 pages 193-205, provides a gap analysis on Table 7.2 on page 209, and on Table 7-5 page 212. The Plan also includes the city's Facility Condition Analysis document regarding the need to upgrade existing aquatic facilities, costing \$24,739,000(2021 dollars) as shown on Table 2 on page 229 and on Table 3 page 236. Goal #3 & #5 on pages 26 and 27 also speak to expanding recreational services as well as providing the goal to provide more facilities and amenities to all user types. Public feedback on the need for aquatic facilities and pools is also shown on page 204 in the table named "Input Relate to Park Space". Aquatic related programming is listed in Table 1 on page 227 under the heading of "Aquatics".

4. The Plan does not adequately measure the current number of sports fields (flat fields) in Reno compared to current need or how the City measures up against national standards currently or for the expected future.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately, but could clarify/mention shared-use facilities.

- **The word Field shows up 18 times and Fields 24 times.**
- **The inventory for Fields is listed on table 7-2, but could/should include joint use spaces as a part of the inventory. Philosophically these were left out and staff believes explaining or mentioning this near table 7-2 in the document would be helpful.**
- **On page 210 the document shows the gap and what is needed to catch up. The section includes similar information on Courts, Pools and Community Centers. Table 7-5 covers where fields are in the list of new recreation priorities. The tables on page 212 also compare our current inventory with regional standards.**

Consultant comment: The gap analysis can be found on Table 7-2 *Recreation Facilities Standards and Level of Service* chart on page 209. Additional narrative identifying the flat field need is provided on page 212, Table 7-3, and Table 7-5 on page 212, and includes the city's Facility Condition Analysis document regarding the need to upgrade existing

ball diamonds and flat field facilities, costing \$53,481,000(2021 dollars) as shown on Table 2 on page 234. Table 6-2: Reno Park Inventory on page 168-169 provides a listing of all parks and what amenities/facilities each contain. Among the amenities/facilities listings are Soccer/Football Fields, and Baseball/Softball Fields. This listing also includes locations of sport courts. Public input was also obtained and priority locations for new fields were identified with the input. This information can be found on page 205 in the table titled “Priority Locations for New Fields”. Page 210 (Ball fields and flat fields) speaks to the comparison between the City and the national standards.

5. The Plan does not adequately describe the current situation as it relates to services and programs for seniors related to existing need and location of services, or as they should be expanded for the future.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately within the purpose of the plan.

- **Similar to youth programming it is included in the suggested periodic assessment report on page 93 as a part of the Future of Recreation Services.**
- **Senior services are mentioned as a part of strategy #6 where it is recommended we rebrand rec centers as hubs for service and connection.**

Similar to youth and aquatics, Senior Service providers in the area are listed in the program inventory in Table 1 on page 224. As compared with Youth programs and Aquatics, Senior specific information is more sparse, however, it is included as a part of programming and ongoing assessment of needs. The idea that we would not dedicate specific/special facilities to Senior programming is a common trend in parks and recreation. Ideally, Seniors would have the ability to participate in all of the possibilities provided in programming and services as well as have senior-focused opportunities.

Consultant comment: The Plan recommends the city perform a full Recreation Assessment analysis as identified in Strategy #2 on page 93. Strategy #6 on page 94 recommends further analysis of the City’s recreation centers related to senior service delivery. An inventory of Senior Services is included on Table 1 *Recreation Services and Programs* on pages 224-227. The consultant’s scope of work did not include a detailed Recreation Needs Survey and Assessment and agrees a citizen and user survey should be done in the future, as recommended in page 93 working with Washoe County Senior Services and other stakeholders.

Commission Comment from May 16th meeting: The Plan should subdivide seniors from youth along with the services and programs that pertain to each group. They have different needs, concerns and interests. Youth should be set apart from seniors.

6. The Plan does not adequately describe how the City is currently served related to programs and specialty parks such as dog parks, either in number or how they are located around the community.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately within the purpose of the plan, but clarity could be beneficial.

- **It could be beneficial to break out Dog Parks under Special Use as that would be the most common.**
- **Table 7-1 does provide general amounts and the park inventory identifies which parks are considered special use. I'm not sure it's worth pulling forward more than that.**

In staff's opinions prioritizing discussion or construction ahead of spaces and facilities that allow for flexible use. CoR could add these elements in larger parks without building stand alone parks.

Consultant comment: The City did not include inventorying or analyzing specialty parks, such as dog parks, in the consultant's contract. The Plan does include a level of service comparison to the national average and illustrates this amenity on the Amenities chart on page 209, as reported in the *Trust for Public Lands 2021 Park Score* document. This additional scope can be added to the contract addendum, should the City wish the consultant to research, analyze and map this amenity throughout the Truckee Meadows. The "Special Use Park" classification on page 167 identifies that there are 49.24 acres (5.43% of overall 907.17 parkland acres) dedicated to special use parks. Table 6-2: Reno Park Inventory (page 168-169), also lists which parks are specifically categorized within the Special Use Park classification.

7. The Plan does not tie into the City's existing storm water program, specifically as it relates how storm water facilities may be developed as joint use facilities that could be used for recreational programs.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately within the purpose of the plan.

- **Storm water appears 10 times including heavily in the potential funding sources. Staff's opinion is that it's not a large part of the narrative, Staff believes the document connects the opportunities for storm water mitigation and flat fields appropriately and the City is already exploring this avenue in its projects. By the prioritization of flat fields and their connection to storm water mitigation as a best use of space, staff feels this gives the direction needed.**

Consultant comment: The Plan acknowledges the important interrelationship between parks, open spaces and the urban forest and stormwater facility management and facilities and as explained on pages 18. It is also highlighted on Table 4-4 page 129 *Potential Funding Sources*, identifying potential grant sources to fund improvements where stormwater goals are combined with park improvements. The Plan identifies within the Big Five #5 specific Strategy #12 on page 113 related to use of treated effluent at Rosewood Nature Study Area. An additional strategy can be added to the Big Five #5 to work with the city's Public Works Department staff to integrate the goals of the PROS Plan with the Truckee Meadows Regional Stormwater Quality Management program. On page 17, first paragraph of "Importance and Benefits of Parks" identifies the understanding that parkland plays an important role in mitigating stormwater runoff.

8. The Plan does not discuss how joint-use facilities/partnership/collaborations could enhance the ability to meet program and facility needs, especially in areas of the City where services and facilities are below service standards. The Plan should also highlight an example of a possible joint-use facility in one of the areas where the service level currently does not meet service standards.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately within the purpose of the plan.

- **Included in the Reimagine Reno Goals on page 238 GP6.**
- **Mentioned along with listed examples of partners on page 47 in strategy 4 and suggests re-evaluating and searching for new opportunities.**
- **On page 138 there is a review of local history for joint use between agencies.**
- **Further examples on page 139.**

The RPC conversation centered on CoR doing this better with current partners and looking for opportunities to expand in the future. I think the document adequately addresses this topic and doing it to our utmost ability would be implied.

Consultant comment: The Plan highlights the importance of partnerships and recommends expansion of collaborations in Strategy #4, page 47 to leverage the city's resources, it's also outlined in the Big Five #4 related to Recreation Services, the listing of *Community Recreation Service Providers* on Table 2-6 page 89. Based on that section narrative, Strategy #3 page 93 was included recommending review of existing partnership agreements to enhance service delivery through collaboration, Strategy #7 on page 94 also recommends reviewing/expanding partnership agreements to leverage City resources to enhance recreation services. (The city has an interlocal agreement with the Washoe County School District for joint-use dated December 17, 2008) Specific examples of collaboration both past and present are highlighted in brief in the *Partnership Opportunities* section, pages 138-139. Also noted in the *Standards-Based Assessment* section on page 210 related to ballfields and flat fields joint use, Table 1 Recreation Services and Programs inventory on page 224 related to use of School District sites for programming needs. The Plan does recognize on page 238, that Joint-Use Facilities are an important goal to the City as they are part of the City's Comprehensive Plan (ReImagine Reno 2017, GP 6, Item 6.7C).

9. The Plan should emphasize a recommendation to re-establish a positive working relationship with the Washoe County School District, including updating a joint use agreement that creates a win-win scenario for both the City and School District.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes that the execution of any partnership agreement to the best possible outcome can go without saying and wouldn't fit within this agreement. The point is well taken and can be part of the strategy going forward and should be a part of daily consideration.

It will certainly be a department priority and the spirit of this point is embodied in GP6 of the ReImagine Reno Master Plan on page 238.

Consultant comment: The Plan highlights the importance of partnerships, specifically referencing the school district agreement, in Strategy #4, page 47 to leverage the city's resources. The city already has an interlocal agreement with the Washoe County School District for joint-use dated December 17, 2008, that is still in effect and the Plan recommends through this strategy that it and all related agreements need to be updated and renegotiated working with its stakeholders.

10. The Plan needs to add a chapter where all recommendations, policies, action items, and strategies are listed so that everything needed to implement the Plan can be found in one place.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff does not agree that this level of detail and operation belongs in the PROS plan. The mention of strategies and suggestions for policies exists in the document.

Consultant comment: An Implementation Plan is part of the consultant's scope of work and will be completed once the draft plan and its recommended focus and strategies are approved by City Council. The Implementation Plan will include all the identified Goals, Strategies and Action items, recommended priority for implementation, for example, within the 1st fiscal year, 2-4 fiscal years, 5-7 fiscal years or 8-10 fiscal years.

11. The Plan needs to add a chapter for Implementation that describes how the Plan needs to be implemented, including a prioritization of steps, a proposed timeline and assignment of duties, and a yearly reporting through the Recreation and Park Commission to City Council as to what has been completed, what is to be worked on, and any recommended changes to the Plan.

CoR Staff Response:

This is a valuable tool as a part of short to mid-term strategy and is included in the scope of work for the consultant to complete after council feedback is received.

Related to this, Staff believes it's important to acknowledge that we do not have an asset replacement plan and that it is important we get one for our facilities and parks.

Consultant comment: An Implementation Plan is part of the consultant's scope of work and will be completed once the draft plan and its recommended focus and strategies are approved by City Council. The Implementation Plan will include all the identified Goals, Strategies and Action items, recommendation for implementation priority, for example, within the 1st fiscal year, 2-4 fiscal years, 5-7 fiscal years or 8-10 fiscal years. The Consultant will work with staff to assure the table format supports staff's quarterly and annual reporting needs.

12. The Plan needs to clarify that the recommendations to update the signage plan, the renditions of park improvements, and improvements at City Plaza are only conceptual ideas and are not specific recommendations.

CoR Staff Response:

Clarifying that they are conceptual on each would probably avoid confusion for those who would review this document. Staff believes this could go without saying, but if it's helpful to

clarify that each project will have a specific scoping and rendering as a part of any design process.

Consultant comment: A caption and/or comment can be made at the beginning of the sections Big Five #2, page 50 and Big Five #3, page 70 that the visual drawings and perspectives are conceptual and not intended for final design purposes. The intent of these graphic representations is to illustrate potential attractive and functional amenities for the city's park and recreation system.

13. The Plan needs to enhance the section related to the privatization of recreation services, using examples that both show the positive aspects of outsourcing, and issues that need to be considered that could cause outsourcing to be more problematic.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the section on page 91 adequately illustrates this. Table 2-7 highlights different levels of service and how it impacts control, cost, and risk. Each potential outsourcing should be evaluated and socialized with the RPC and related public input before moving forward.

Consultant comment: The Plan outlines on Table 2-6 page 89-90, the provider name and type of recreation services that private, non-profit, and governmental entities are providing in the community. This is important to have an inventory to help the city determine its role and responsibility in providing recreation services, considering the other recreation service providers. Table 2-7 on page 91 provides a model that can assist the staff and its partners to determine the different roles that each partner may want to assume in providing recreation services. A brief narrative can be added to this section to highlight the benefits and detriments to outsourcing services verses assuming a direct provider role.

14. The Plan needs to enhance the discussion of acquiring, disposing, and swapping of land, with examples where it should be considered, and a discussion of concerns that need to be addressed when this is considered.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately within the purpose of the plan, but some clarity may be helpful. Perhaps referencing the City's policy on the sale of land or indicating that we do not traditionally sell land meant for parks or that are currently parks. The document's partnership sections handle information about the joint use and leasing of property. This is really more of a policy issue and anything in the PROS Plan wouldn't trump City Policy.

Consultant comment: The consultant can add the city's policy regarding land acquisition and disposition of property, provided by staff, to the Plan, specifically in section Big Five #5 beginning on page 95. The Plan identifies the need to update the existing outdated 2010 Open Space, Greenway and Trails Plan in Strategy #2 on page 112. A thorough review of this policy should be included in this update process, when the 2010 Plan update is undertaken. The Plan does cite the City of Reno Reimagine Reno 2017 Guiding Principle GP6: 6.3F *Parkland Retention* on page 238. There is discussion on page 100 regarding the City mostly obtaining parkland through the

development and zoning process. It has been noted in Strategy #1 (page 112) that the City should hire professional staff with open space acquisition experience.

15. The Plan needs to enhance the discussion of the importance of the Recreation and Park Commission, and how the Commission can assist in implementation of the Plan. The Plan should also remove the discussion related to categories of Commissioner expertise, as that discussion should be directed by City Council as a part of the Commission enabling legislation and not through a Master Plan.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes listing all of the commissioners and their role in the vetting of this PROS plan is a good thing.

Staff agrees that taking the expertise portion out would be appropriate as well. While beneficial, access to experts is available through City staff and consultants, suggesting it as a requirement for commissioners is a council decision and subject to those interested in participating on the commission.

Consultant comment: The consultants can refine Strategy #7 page 113 to include the important role the Commission plays in plan implementation and refine the statement regarding membership.

16. The Plan needs to enhance the discussion of park classifications so that it is easier to understand how parks are classified, and a discussion of the specific parks needed by area of the City to bring park acreage up to standard.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately within the purpose of the plan, but some clarity may be helpful. Perhaps listing and defining micro or pocket versus both? Staff believes there is clear distinguishing factors in the other descriptions.

Consultant comment: The Plan defines park classification, standards, and design considerations for classification types in Chapter 6 (page 162-167). Furthermore, a park inventory of existing parks with their classification types can be found on 168-184 of the plan. Level-of-Service acreage is outlined in Table 2-1 on page 32 and again on page 64. The consultant can add a brief narrative in #5 of "The Big Five) summarizing the acreage needed by park type in order to bring the park acreage up to standard. A gap analysis (Table 7-1: Reno Parks Level of Service) is provided on page 207 which provides a comparison of park categories, existing park acres and compares this to the national standards.

Commission Comment from May 16th meeting: It is recommended that the language for item 16 of the Plan reads as follows:

The Plan needs to enhance the discussion of park classifications and City rights of way so that it is easier to understand how parks are classified and the ongoing and anticipated park-like maintenance and planning if further understood. Also, a discussion needs to be added for the

specific parks and related amenities needs by areas of the City to bring park acreage up to standard.

17. The Plan should address how the City/Department website could be used to better articulate the policies and action steps of the Master Plan so the community can follow the process once the Plan is adopted.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes this can be done at the recommendation from RPC and direction from Council outside of the PROS plan. This could be an additional strategy, without specifically outlaying the plan, rather it could be included in the assessments section when it comes to communicating services, programming, and vision. Staff doesn't believe this is within the scope or purpose of this document.

Consultant comment: The Plan recommend updating and utilizing the City/Department website to communicate with the public regarding the City's facilities in Goal #6 Objective 6.2 on page 27 and in Strategy #10 on page 94. The method in which the staff updates and informs the public, the key stakeholders, the Commission, and the City Council regarding the PROS Plan implementation will be determined by Department and City staff and is outside the purview of the Plan.

18. The Plan needs to better address public outreach and input moving forward as many of the existing user groups in the community have informed the Commission that there has been no outreach to their groups.

CoR Staff Response:

Staff believes the plan addresses this appropriately within the purpose of the plan. Mentioning this need as a part of the needed 3-5 year assessments addresses that concern in some detail. The PROS plan and this recommendation should be referenced and verified by RPC when considering the reprioritization or execution of Parks and Recreation services and capital improvement. The steps mentioned as a part of these assessments should occur where appropriate to ensure staff are farming input consistently and diligently.

Consultant comment: As stated in #2 above, the City did not include public outreach to any outside groups in the consultant's contract as the public input process was accomplished by City staff prior to the contract commencing in August 2022. The consultants agree that the Draft Final PROS Plan should be provided on the city's website, stakeholders should be advised of its availability to review and given the opportunity to comment prior to it being finalized. The Plan has provided a summary of the prior public outreach feedback in Chapter 7 *Needs Assessment* from pages 190-206.

Motions from RPC:

April 18th, 2023

It was moved by Member Bronzan; seconded by Member Ginsburg to accept the following comments and recommendations from the Recreation and Parks Commission regarding issues and concerns of the PROS Master Plan as presented to the Commission on March 21, 2023 and further discussed at the April 18, 2023 Recreation and Parks Commission meeting. The motion carried: Commissioners Pritchett, Bronzan, Ginsburg, Rossi and Wager assenting; Commissioners Burkhamer, Lande, Werninghaus and Youngblood absent.

Motions made by the Commission at the 5/16/2023 Recreation and Parks Commission meeting are as follows:

Motion: Chair Pritchett made a motion to move to accept the changes to item 16 of the draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space ("PROS") Master Plan of April 18, 2023, as read by Chair Pritchett as follows:

"The Plan needs to enhance the discussion of park classifications and City rights of way so that it is easier to understand how parks are classified and the ongoing and anticipated park-like maintenance and planning [is further understood]. Also, a discussion needs to be added for the specific parks and related amenities needed by areas of the City to bring park acreage up to standard."

The motion was seconded by Member Lande. The motion carried unanimously.

Motion: Member Wager made a motion to request that City Council consider having a very robust input process from the community when viewing the PROS Master Plan. The motion was seconded by Member Bronzan. The motion carried unanimously.

Motion: Member Lande moved to advance the PROS Master Plan draft along with the addendum provided by this Commission as edited to City Council for consideration. The motion was seconded by Member Ginsburg. The motion carried unanimously.