

PRC / COUNCIL WORK SESSION – DRAFT DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Level of Service Standards

Background:

- The 2001 Parks and Recreation Master Plan included a policy of 5 acres per 1,000 residents.
- Quimby Act standards (i.e., 3-5 acres per 1,000 residents). The City can't exact fees for over 5 acres/1,000.
- The City must have an adopted Master Plan that shows how it will achieve the parkland LOS standard
- Nationwide, the typical park and recreation agency has 9.5 acres/1,000 resident- 2016 NRPA report
- Oakland 14.7 acres per 1,000, S.F. 6.7 acres/1,000, Fresno: 3.7 acres/1,000, Reno: 14.3 acres/1,000
- Current LOS is about 4.0-4.3

Question: **Do we want to change the way we calculate level of service?**

- Options:
- A. Retain 5-acre standard and don't count special use facilities
 - B. Increase standard to 10-acres/1,000 and retain calculation method
 - C. Retain 5-acre standard and calculation method

Question: **What strategies should we employ to increase the City's parks and open space lands to meet the standard?**

- Strategies include:
- Pursue joint use agreements with the County
 - Pursue joint use agreements with the School District
 - Require new HOA parks to be publically accessible
 - Purchase land for new parks and open spaces
 - Review all City-owned and public land for additional opportunities

Implications:

Options	A	B	C
Capital Costs	L	L	H
O&M Costs	M (Shared)	L (none)	H (City cost)
Cost Recovery	L (Need permission from schools or County, and any revenue generation would likely be shared)	L (none)	M (City control allows the possibility of revenue)

2. New Parks

- Background: Previous MP called for 3-4 new neighborhood parks (none were added since 2001, the growth has been in privately-owned (HOA) parks).
- Input from this planning process identified interest in an additional community park in neighborhoods north of Main. There is also a lot of interest in creating a new community park as the City continues to grow, likely in the NE quadrant of the City.
- The General Plan Update identifies the most growth on the east side of the city with the most increase in density along Monterey Road through the center of the city. The General Plan identifies a number of areas where parks and public facilities are needed (included in the PPT).
- Questions: **What realistic goal do we want to set for creating new parks in the planning horizon?**
- What areas of town should we target for new neighborhood parks?**
- A new community park? Does it make sense to plan for a community park on the eastside of the city with new residential development**
- Should that community park include indoor as well as outdoor facilities?**
- Which should we prioritize?**
- Options: TBD

3. Park Restrooms

- Background: Stakeholder and community input has shown strong support for adding restrooms to more parks. Since these are a relatively high-cost item to build and maintain, the project team recommends adding restrooms to Nordstrom and Paradise Parks with Diana as a slightly lower priority.
- Questions: **Does the PRC support adding restrooms to more parks?**
- If so, do Nordstrom, Paradise and Diana sound like the right priorities?**
- Options: A) Restrooms in 3 or more neighborhood parks
- B) Restrooms in 2 neighborhood parks
- C) No new restrooms
- Implications:

Options	A	B	C
Capital Costs	M	M	L
O&M Costs	H	M	L
Cost Recovery	L	L	L

4. Regional Sports and Recreational Facilities

- Overarching sports & rec facility topics
- Many of the recreation facilities outlined below will require market studies/market models.
 - The soccer fields at the sports complex operate with no on-going costs to the City because it's a shared regional facility.
 - **What is the right balance between revenue generation / cost recovery and community amenities for facilities that attract regional visitors and tourists?**
 - **What about improvements to existing facilities?**
- Volleyball
- There's been a vocal group of sand volleyball advocates. Sand volleyball ranked high as a priority in the community survey.
 - Two approaches: 1) Regional sand volleyball facility 2) A few sand volleyball courts in a neighborhood or community park
 - **What are your thoughts about pursuing a regional sand volleyball facility vs. a few courts for local use?**
- Gymnasiums
- There is a high level of need for additional gymnasium space
 - This could be a new City facility or a joint use facility with the school district.
 - **Where should a new gymnasium be located?**
 - **Should the gymnasium be a joint-use or City facility?**
- Aquatic Facility
- Adding more aquatic facilities ranked as a top priority in the community survey. The City already provides a high level of aquatic facilities for its population and these facilities are very expensive to build, operate and maintain.
 - **Should the City pursue a new aquatic facility?**
 - **Are there improvements that can be made to existing facilities?**
- Baseball Fields
- The City plans to develop a regional baseball complex in the SE Quadrant
 - **How should this facility be operated? Funded?**

Options: TBD

Implications:

Options	A (Regional facility with limited local access)	B (Facility with relatively equal access for regional and local users)	C (Local facility with limited regional access)
Capital Costs	H	H	H
O&M Costs	H	H	H
Cost Recovery	H	M	L

5. Historic Society and Villa Mira Monte

Background:

- The Historic Society owns, operates and maintains 2 ½ acres including the Morgan Hill Museum and Hiram Morgan Hill House on Monterey Road. The Historical Society would like to expand the services they provide, make improvements to the site and shift away from maintenance and operations.
- They have proposed a partnership with the City.
- The Historical Society's proposed capital improvements will cost \$1.2 in Phase 1 and \$4 million in total for Phases 1-3.
- The stakeholder group supported the enhancement of historic, cultural and educational facilities and programs at that site. The survey showed historical education and preservation as the lowest programming priority for community members.

Questions:

What role should we take in the partnership with the Historic Site given the level of investment required?

How much of a priority should this be in the plan, considering the impact to the City's operations and maintenance budget and the trade-offs involved?

If improvements are going to be made, what should be included (e.g., enhanced venue rental opportunities, educational farm, orchard, etc.)

How can this site be integrated into our park system, given its proximity to downtown and the new parks there?

Options:

A) Historic Society's proposal

B) Hybrid proposal (City staff works with Historic Society to refine their proposal to include more moderate costs)

C) Maintain current relationship

Implications:

Options	A	B	C
Capital Costs	H	M	L
O&M Costs	H	M	L
Cost Recovery	M (City investment should allow for revenue collection)	M (City investment should allow for revenue collection)	L

6. Improvements and Changes to Existing Parks and Facilities

Background: Some of our existing properties and facilities could be re-purposed for other City uses. The Friendly Inn currently operates as a non-profit center for regional-serving agencies. This neighborhood has been identified as under-served and the Friendly Inn could be expanded to support both the non-profits and a community center, or re-purposed as a community center if the Friendly Inn relocated to another location that met its needs.

The City owns a corporation yard at Community Park. The previous Master Plan for Community Park identified this as a potential tennis center.

There are opportunities to re-purpose some of these facilities as the City grows. These changes will likely occur within the plan horizon, but are complex and will take time to address.

Questions: **Do we want to re-purpose the Friendly Inn at Galvan Park as a new Community Center? What would the best uses of this be?**

How could we use the corporation yard at Community Park to best meet our needs?

Considering the expressed need for sand volleyball courts and new aquatic facilities, how do those priorities compare to improving the Friendly Inn and the Corporation Yard?

Options: TBD

7. Community and Senior Services

Background: Counties typically provide social services and cities typically facilitate the provision of those services to local residents. The City's current role is as a facilitator and host of community services (e.g., YMCA and Senior Center at CRC) in partnership with many nonprofit entities. This helps bring services to Morgan Hill and has been successful to date, but there are unmet needs for community and senior social services.

Question: Should the City expand its role in providing these services, or maintain its current functions?

If our role expands, what should the focus areas / priorities be?

- Options:**
- A) Expand and become a direct provider of more social services.
 - B) Focus on partnerships and collaborate with organizations to expand senior services
 - C) Maintain its current role and level of service provision.

Implications:

Options	A	B	C
Capital Costs	M (limited capital improvements)	L (use existing facilities)	L
O&M Costs	H	M	L
Cost Recovery	M (Assumes taking on services = access to state or county funds, or grants)	M (Assumes taking on services = access to state or county funds, or grants)	L

8. Outdoor and Mobile Programs

Background: There is a high level of interest among staff and from survey respondents for adding programs to parks and taking park amenities and features "on the road". This is a way of extending current services to under-served neighborhoods and populations as well as testing out new programs and features before the City invests in permanent changes.

Ideas we have heard so far include:

- Mobile games like large jenga and chess
- Zumba and yoga in the parks; other trending fitness programs
- Free play for youth
- Mobile rock-climbing walls
- Pop-up food and drink

Questions: **Do you agree? Which programs should be priorities?**

Brainstorm!

9. What did we miss?

10. Wrap-Up: Confirm direction, highlight trade-offs and next steps