## CORRESPONDENCE

### Parks and Recreation Commission

**Wednesday, December 6, 2017**  
**5:30 P.M.**

**City Hall**  
**Room W 118 & 119**  
**200 E. Santa Clara Street**  
**San Jose, CA 95113**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Daphna Woolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Charles Dougherty Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Kelly Snider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Gregory Lovely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>Demerris Brooks-Immel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>Trami Cron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 8</td>
<td>Chet Mandair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>Rudy Flores, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 10</td>
<td>Brian Quint, Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>George Adas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Councilmember Tam Nguyen,  
Council Liaison

Angel Rios, Jr., Director, PRNS
Teresa- Please distribute this to each of the Commission Members. Thank you. Patrick p. Pizzo

All right. I attempted to read Matt Cano’s Memorandum and tried very hard to make some sense of it. After all, I am not a Rocket Scientist… oh wait a minute, I am! And, I have no idea what the hey is going on. This is pure razzle/dazzle if I ever saw it.

I don’t know if developers are being asked to pay their fair-share of Park fees or not. I don’t know whether the expressed policy will increase fees for developers, or reduce them. I don’t have an idea from this if a general citizen will have access to these park-facilities or not. I don’t know if there will be increased parcel tax for parks from homeowners (Attachment B: 2017 Proposed Parkland In-Lieu Fees) or not. I am confused by the significance of the newly defined ‘Downtown Core’. The Downtown core is no more relevant to me than the rest of this humungous City, in terms of park access; so is this re-definition further confining Developments in the downtown solely to benefit property owners and residents of the downtown core? I have no idea.

- Provide 3.5 acres per 1,000 population of neighborhood/community serving parkland through a combination of 1.5 acres of public park and 2.0 acres of recreational school grounds open to the public per 1,000 San José residents. (General Plan Policy PR-1)

This is a joke. When are these school grounds open to the public and under what conditions. The City counts acreage for school districts that will not support this position. In effect, this is reducing the Charter goal of 3.5 acres per 1,000 population of recreational park land to 1.5 acres per 1,000 population; and now it is termed neighborhood/community serving parkland rather than recreational parkland, further diluting the Charter’s goal. What does ‘open to the public’ mean and how is that enforced? Being able to walk onto the turf or my neighborhood school after 3:30 p.m. does not constitute recreational access, and this access, for what it is, is limited nine months out of the year.

- Provide access to an existing or future neighborhood park, a community park, recreational school grounds, a regional park, open space lands, and/or a major City trail within a 1/3-mile radius of all San José residents by either acquiring lands within 1/3 mile; or providing safe connections to existing recreation facilities outside of the 1/3-mile radius. This is consistent with the United Nation’s Urban Environmental Accords, as adopted by the City for recreation open space (PR-3.2).

This paragraph does nothing to inform the tax payer and/or resident…. I know something is inferred by this statement, and I know the City has something specific in mind, but I don’t have any idea of what it is. There has to be a serious intent to inform the public, in an understandable way, as to what is intended, what will be the impact with respect to the generation of, and maintenance of, their parks… and if one lives in a district that has limited development, how is their park-live altered by these policies? What about underserved areas of our fair City? How are those people served?
I am more than a little cynical about our City Government, having participated in a few park-sports complex related issues. This memorandum does little to alter that cynicism. Will I come down and make a 2-minute statement about his before the Parks Commission? Not likely. Eighteen years anticipating a Sports Complex for Softball and one for Soccer, promised by the City in 2000, money set aside, and no concrete result to date would make most anyone cynical! On the other hand, I have a degree of optimism from prior Parks Commission meetings, watching the evolving advocacy-for-the-people by the Commission members- critical questions and constructive discussion. Please, find out what all this is about: what is the intent and who will be served?

If I were in a position of critique, my first request would be for the document/memorandum be re-written from politicalize to recognizable English, with all the cards on the table, face-up! Something is going on here and it will impact this City tremendously!

Hail to the sign with the dancing, bow-tied pig! Ppizzo

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Meyer-Calvert, Teresa" <teresa.meyer-calvert@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: December 6, 2017 Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) Agenda
Date: November 27, 2017 at 1:03:26 PM PST

Good Afternoon,

Attached you will find the agenda for the upcoming December 6th PRC meeting. The agenda and supporting documents are also posted on the City’s website: http://www.sanjoseca.gov/prc

Sincerely,

-Teresa

Teresa Meyer-Calvert | Staff Specialist, Parks
Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services
City Hall | P. 408-793-4186
200 E. Santa Clara St., San Jose Ca, 95113
Building Community Through Fun
Website | Twitter | Facebook

SAN JOSE
PARKS, RECREATION & NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES
December 2, 2017

Parks Commission
San Jose, California

RE: December 6, 2017 Item VIIA Second Reading Parks Fees

Chairman Flores and Honorable Commissioners,

On behalf of San Jose Parks Advocates, thank-you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the PDO/PIO Park Trust Fund.

San Jose Parks Advocates is a group of about 150 park passionate advocates and neighborhood leaders from throughout the city. We advocate on behalf of parks in order to stop the ongoing degradation due to lack of funding. We have sponsored forums, tours, and information nights. Our members serve as advisors and resource people to less experienced “Friends of” groups. Our recent events include a tour of South San Jose parks and a Bio-blitz event in Overfelt Park. Our Facebook page is regularly updated with activities and information about our City Parks. San Jose Parks Advocates have actively followed the High rise PDO/PIO discount program since first launched in 2006.

As you heard at the last commission meeting, we are appalled that the changes to the highrise fees were buried in a routine item about the annual adjustment to Park Trust Fund fees. Further, we were distressed that you were not allowed to bifurcate the issues in the item and vote on each of them separately since they are not interlinked. We are please that staff’s second reading memo has made clear that you may split up the various changes and evaluate separate portions.

Specifically, San Jose Parks Advocates believes that you should

• Approve the routine adjustments to PDO/PIO fees. This is the chart where property values for different parts of the city are indicated. This fee adjustment is handled annually.
• **Not approve** the expansion of the Downtown Highrise discount program to the area west of Highway 87. The Diridon Station Area plan clearly illuminates that this area is covered by an Airport Safety Overlay called “One Engine Inoperative” (OEI). This overlay prevents highrise buildings that would qualify for the discount. Some Downtown advocates hope that the OEI will be eliminated, but according representatives of the Caltrans Airport Division’s Santa Clara Clara County Airport Land Use Commission, this change is not under consideration and is not expected to be under consideration for an indeterminate number of years. If highrises become possible, ie OEI is lifted, the council can consider expanding whatever programs might be in place at that time.

• **Not approve** the new high rise fee structure of 1.5 persons per unit for downtown or citywide.

These changes belong in the Greenprint process in spring 2018 as indicated in the staff memo. It should not be buried in a routine update to park fees—violating best open government “sunshine” and transparency practices. There is no reason to accelerate the changes for highrises since there is a pre-existing program for downtown highrises under development. From the staff memo:

PRNS is currently updating the Greenprint, which is the long-term strategic plan guiding the future of San José’s parks, recreation facilities and community building programs. Once the Greenprint update is complete (expected in 2018), PRNS will analyze how park impact fees are assessed under the current PIO/PDO. The study will evaluate all park fees and may address such occupancy concerns through the inclusion of a scaling mechanism like housing square footage, occupancy by bedroom, or other appropriate and defensible metric. Any adjustment of park impact fees must be consistent with the Quimby Act and supported by defensible data. Annual adjustments must also be easy to implement and update. The study will include a community engagement plan including PRNS stakeholder groups, park advocates, and the development community.

There has been no community outreach to community stakeholders. This will be a complete surprise to community members who have participated in the urban village planning process. Outreach has focused on meetings with only the development community. Robust community outreach should be carried out with community stakeholders, focusing on the urban village planning participants.

There is **no evidence** that highrises that may be built in the future in areas outside of downtown will have the same resident per unit profile as the two rental units studied in downtown San Jose. The research cited from Marsten Keyes was based on Downtown parameters and not locations similar to areas near the Apple Spaceship and the west San Jose schools which may have completely different residential products when they come online.
There is **no evidence** that for-sale downtown highrise units will have the same resident profile. Only rental units were evaluated. It is not clear whether the ACS analysis was based on rentals or owner-occupied. Further analysis is needed.

There is **no immediate need** to change the high rise rate. Downtown highrises already have discounts.

The method of computation should be fully vetted prior to implementation in downtown or citywide. From our view, the US Census American Community Survey (ACS) which can be regularly updated and can be computed for different parts of the city should be the basis of resident count. We applaud the staff’s thoroughness at comparing the ad hoc two tower survey with the more rigorous ACS results. We look forward to seeing more of this work as part of the Greenprint Program Evaluation in Spring 2018.

San Jose’s park system is dependent on the Park Trust Fund PDO/PIO fees. In park deficient areas, such as the urban villages, the fees will provide the park space needed for the new residents. In areas like downtown with large parks nearby (eg Guadalupe River Park), the fees are used to help with major refurbishment projects. At Wednesday’s meeting you will hear about the inadequate funding to maintain the park infrastructure. Any discount or changes to fee computation should be carefully considered with transparency and full community dialog.

The commission should request that changes to highrise fees should be deferred until after robust community outreach and the release of the Greenprint in Spring 2018.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jean Dresden
Coordinator
Here you go. It's basically what I sent Randy and Justin with a few tweaks as I had some more time.

- Brandon Hummel

Founder and CEO, Dynamic Sport & Social Club
Founder and Proprietor, Dynamic Archery Tag

408-831-2824 general line and voicemail box
brandon@dynamicssc.com
www.dynamicssc.com
info@dynamicarcherytag.com

Do you know that we offer awesome team building events for your work group from 20 people to 5000? Ask me about planning your next event!

Follow us on...
Submitted by: Brandon Hummell

Dynamic Proposal to SJ Parks Division Regarding Field Rental Allocations for Sports Activities

The Current Situation:

1. There is a large supply (43 by my count) of parks with grass athletic fields in the City that do not have lights. These fields are basically unusable after 6pm for adult groups for most of the year and always unusable after 8pm due to lack of lights.
2. There are 6 lighted grass fields and 2 lighted “high use” grass fields, which is a very low supply, given the high demand for evening sports.
3. There are currently 5 synthetic fields with lights and 1 synthetic field without lights (unusable on weeknights), which is, again, also a low supply.
4. The youth get first priority over field rentals which I agree with, however, becomes problematic because:
   a. They pay at least 50% less than what adult users pay, which means they can rent an abundance of fields for $4 per hour.
      i. If I paid $4/hour I would rent everything I could “just in case” we needed it. It is too cheap and there is no “skin in the game” to make the renters use the field.
      ii. Many weeks we come to play at our time slot, say 8pm, when someone is supposed to be there until 7:30 and no one is there even at 7pm, wasting a full hour of usable space.
   b. They have no time restrictions for when they can rent fields.
      i. Adults can typically only use fields from 6:30pm-10:30pm at the very earliest on weekdays.
      ii. If the youth reserve a field from 4-7pm, the earliest an adult group can use the field is 7:30pm, which is at least a half an hour later than ideal time.
      iii. 6:30-10:30pm is ideal for working adults but parks close at 10pm.
   c. They have no limitations for which fields they can rent.
      i. Youth groups can rent a field with lights until 7:30 when the sun is down and they do not need to purchase lights.
      ii. This renders the field almost unusable for league play for the rest of the evening, as it is hard to run a full league from 8-10pm. If we have two fields from 8-10pm, we can make a league work but only with 2 fields, which is nearly impossible to obtain.
5. The majority of fields are not well maintained. When there is a problem (sprinklers damaged, gophers, potholes etc.), it is not quickly addressed, causing more field damage and/or unsafe conditions. Some of the fields aren’t mowed regularly and when they are, it appears that large parts are still neglected and grass clippings are not cleaned up.
6. Taking out fields for renovation 3 at a time results in a huge shortage of supply, and lower revenues for the City.
7. On occasion, the lights are not turned on, causing our group to have to cancel games and creating unhappy customers. Most lights are manually activated and low staffing is often problematic for the lights to go on at the right time. This past year we were delayed at least 6 times on various fields due to lack of light.

The Proposal:
1. The youth groups maintain priority over adult groups with the following restrictions (all of these together or individually as there is some overlap):
   a. Youth Groups cannot rent lighted fields on weekdays after 6pm unless:
      i. Each youth group that wishes to rent lighted field space after 6pm on weekdays must pay the adult rate from 6pm on.
      ii. Youth groups cannot rent lighted field space past 7pm or 7:30pm except on weekends, until after the adults get a chance to rent fields.
      iii. Adults must always have at least 4 lighted fields available per night of the week for use from 6:30pm on.
      iv. Out of the 5 synthetic fields, one must be dedicated for adult use every night of the week (same field/same night but can rotate – ie Mondays is Watson, Tuesdays is Mise, Wednesdays is Sheppard, Thursdays is Vista Montana, Sundays is O’Malley – not Mondays this week at Watson and next week at Mise).
   b. Youth Groups have no restrictions on un-lighted fields at any time.
2. Increase the cost of lights to $50 per hour from $40 per hour.
3. Increase the cost of un-lighted fields from $4/hr without lights to $15/hr without lights.
4. Standardize the light system for all groups based on sunset tables and adhere to them.

Benefits
1. Youth Groups still have plenty of options for field space.
2. Adult Groups get more options to play on weeknights and allocation split goes from 10% or less to up to 30% (still 70% in favor of children).
3. The City increases revenue by increasing utility hours available to adults who spend more incrementally.
4. The City can use increased revenues for preventative maintenance of existing fields, which will cut the costs of renovating since they should last longer.
5. Since renovations should be required less often, fewer revenues will be foregone.
6. Better field quality equals happier customers, which reduces injury and leads to repeat business.
Perception
Dynamic Sport & Social Club is only one of many businesses in the area that utilizes San Jose Sports Fields. We cater to the young professional market, and we are trying to promote a favorable opinion of living in SJ and patronizing the Downtown area. We offer sports, and social events, which includes going to local bars and restaurants after games. We not only utilize the field space here, but we contribute to the Downtown economy every night we play in the area. Part of our goal is to help change the perception that San Jose is not a great place to live and play. So far, we’ve done a good job of this and I can get support from several bar/restaurant owners in the Downtown area who love what we do for their business. Besides Dynamic Sport and Social Club, several other sports club owners have not been able to rent adequate space for leagues or practices. For small business owners like myself, who rely on field space for leagues to house 1500-4000 athletes per week, and for our own livelihood, we are requesting a change.

I feel the solutions provided above can make a big difference in helping adult groups get a fair shot at lighted field space, while having only a small impact on youth groups, and increasing revenues for the City. Even if only a portion of revenue is applied to preventative maintenance, it will make a big difference in the life of each field and save the City a lot of money in the long run. Thank you for your consideration and hopefully we see some positive change for our negotiations in January and February.

I can provide some examples of how other clubs like ours have worked with municipalities across the nation to make everything better for the majority. A good friend in Kansas City has done phenomenal work with the local government and their public/private partnership has done tremendous things for the City. I am very open to discussing how we can all work together to move San Jose Parks forward.
November 28, 2017

Mayor Liccardo and Members of City Council
City of San Jose
200 East Santa Clara St
San Jose, CA 95113

Re: November 28, 2017 Council Agenda Item 10.1(k): “General Plan Text Amendment: Diridon Station Area Plan”

Dear Honorable Mayor Liccardo and Honored Members of City Council,

On behalf of the Shasta / Hanchett Park Neighborhood Association, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed General Plan Text Amendment for the Diridon Station Area Plan.

The Shasta / Hanchett Park Neighborhood Association represents 1,400 households in neighborhoods immediately West of Diridon Station, an area of the City that is already severely underserved in parks. As additional residents move into the area, as part of The Alameda Urban Village and surrounding developments, the residents-to-parks ratio will continue to worsen. While this widening disconnect is not unique to our neighborhood parks, it has been exacerbated by previous City policies, including, but not limited to, the inclusion of school lands in parkland calculations. As a result, the partial pave-over of the greenspace at the former Hester School campus has made a bad situation far worse, and puts more pressure on our undersized and underfunded parks.

Our neighborhood parks are not alone in these deficiencies; some of the best of San Jose’s parks have been determined to merely be in ‘acceptable’ condition, while more than thirty of them are well below that admittedly low bar. These deficiencies have been exacerbated by continuously deferred maintenance, Parks Maintenance staffing vacancies, and the drought of recent years. Significant capital investment is needed to simply bring the parks up to a minimum standard, with a current estimated maintenance backlog in excess of $250 million dollars. However, restoring our parks to a “minimum standard” is not enough. Resources should be devoted to meet a long-term sustainable maintenance goal – one that acknowledges the value and return on investment inherent within properly constructed and maintained parks, libraries, community centers, and trails.

The proposed rethinking of the Greenprint heard this evening is an excellent step in the right direction, with the pursuit of smaller parks a complete reversal from the previous Greenprint. In the last few years, S/HPNA has advocated for smaller-scale parks at 292 Stockton Avenue (later sold to a developer), the parking lot at Hanchett Avenue and The Alameda (later sold to a developer), and the corner of Tillman Avenue and Park Avenue (later redeveloped by Public Works). Had the proposed Greenprint’s policies been in place at the time, one or more of these parcels might already be designated as a future neighborhood-focused park. Instead, $6 million dollars in park fees from two developments in our area directly benefited the Del Monte area, with the creation and expansion of the park and soccer field there.

We are therefore very concerned by aspects of the text amendment before you tonight, which is the first step toward reinstating the Downtown Core, and modifying the boundaries of the Midtown Specific Plan and the Downtown Growth Area. Removing the cap on the number of high rises because of a procedural error is a troublesome precedent. From the outside looking in, it would seem that the more appropriate response would have been to use the rules motion by Vice Mayor Herrera. We all know that residential units are a net drain on City services. Drastically increasing the number of potential units, while asking for reduced park fees, is a recipe for disaster.

The extension of the Downtown Core will have little, if any, positive impact on the area within the current flight path. The current OEI restrictions all but guarantee that the only viable area in the newly expanded core are the lots along the East side of Stockton Avenue. These sites are within District 3, on the border with District 6. The already-reduced park funds will be spent within District 3, but one look at an aerial photograph of the area makes it clear that the streets and parks of S/HPNA and District 6 will bear the brunt of the change; an area that
will not receive a single dime of the reduced park fees. They will be close to the underfunded Theodore Lenzen Park, and the already-hobbled Hester Campus artificial turf. Developers will be given the opportunity to increase their profit margins, in the name of additional housing units, while District 6 feels the strain of the new units, and received little to none of the financial benefit. This perpetuates a disturbing trend, and very clearly prioritizes the number of high rise units allowed over the quality of life for the new and existing residents of the Shasta / Hanchett Park Neighborhood Association.

In lowering the fees for the Diridon Station Area Plan, the plan puts at risk the ‘green fingers’ concept within the plan, the likelihood of a park at the Fire Training Station, and the Los Gatos Creek Trail. When fees are cut, amenities must follow.

Last year, Council directed the Parks Department to look at the whole of the Park Fee program. Now, instead of moving forward hand in hand with the Greenprint update and city-wide results, the proposal is to accelerate this single piece of the study. Parks is tasked with the acquisition and maintenance of parks and trails. For Planning and the City Council to undercut this mission will have an adverse effect on both the new developments and those residents who currently call the City of San Jose home. The Parks Commission correctly took issue with the “2017/2018 Annual Adjustment to Park Impact Fees” on November 1st.

Most of the current park fee discount programs do not sunset for another couple of years. What is the purpose of pushing the expansion before that time? The optics of asking for an expansion of discounted high-rise park fees, while preparing for a potential bond measure to repair and maintain our "current" parks are troubling, to say the least.

We are similarly concerned about the expanded Downtown Core’s impact upon nearby Urban Villages. The entirety of The Alameda Urban Village is within the borders of S/HPNA. When high-rise discounts were first proposed in 2006, advocates claimed they were only being proposed for Downtown (East of 87), as a very special case, and then solely as a means of temporarily jumpstarting the construction of Downtown housing. I believe the exact term was “a proven market”. Downtown is clearly a proven market today, yet the discounts have been extended and broadened. Now you have before you the text to expand the park fee reduction to the Diridon Station Area. Putting the high-density housing and reduced park fees in close proximity to the surrounding Urban Villages will hamstring then at the earliest, most fragile stages of development. The City would therefore be throwing out years of community engagement and planning, for the sake of a finite number of developers and developments. Any gains Downtown will come at the cost of surrounding neighborhoods and Urban Villages.

Rather than potentially reducing the financial allocations for parks and neighborhood services, please take this opportunity to make a strong statement in favor of the social, economic, and health benefits of a properly maintained Parks system. In the face of recent difficult budget cuts, PRNS staff has struggled valiantly to maintain our parks at a level well-beyond the staffing and resources allotted to them. Now is the time to correct those deficiencies, and make clear that the Mayor and Council’s vision for a vibrant, growing San Jose include parks and recreation facilities worthy of the Capital of Silicon Valley.

We take pride in our neighborhood; S/HPNA Board members and volunteers have been diligent advocates and volunteers in our parks for many years, and will continue to do so. Therefore, we ask you to match this dedication. Our community can only benefit from your support today. We look forward to being a part of the process to address quality urban planning, public safety, and truly livable amenities for our diverse community.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Saum
President, Shasta/Hanchett Park Neighborhood Association