

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION QUESTIONS

August 18, 2021 MEETING

Item 3.1 – Minutes Approval

1. In the minutes on item 5.4 it says that we voted to “approve the...” can only Council “approve” that type of item? Should it read “recommend approval” from our level if Council is the approving authority?

The original staff recommendation for this item was: “Review and approve the Fiscal Year 2021-22 Parks and Recreation and Urban Forestry Board Work Plan to be forwarded to the City Council for approval.”

Staff concurs that the language should have been written to include the word “recommend” rather than “approve.” However, the existing recommendation does speak to the next step of requiring City Council approval. Therefore, an amendment to the minutes is not required.

Item 6.1 – Heritage Tree Appeal – 1100 Carlos Privada

1. Did this staff decision include any tree replacement requirements linked to the two trees approved for removal?

The two trees approved for removal were partially considered based on the fact that they were planted very close together given their eventual size. They were likely planted for the purposes of providing screening to the property. Based on the overall canopy cover on and around the site, staff will require one tree replacement on site.

2. As it related to City tree Regulation Sec 32.16 (cited in the appeal letter), what are some examples of “...a type or species apt to destroy, impair, or otherwise interfere...”? Would a fern pine generally fall in that bucket?

This section of the code relates specifically to public improvements and this tree is wholly situated on private property and is technically not interfering with any public improvements. To answer the second part of the question, Redwoods, Magnolias, Modesto Ash, Raywood Ash and Liquidambar are examples of what we no longer plant as street trees because of their general aggressive roots. We continue to offer Fern Pine as an option. Staff does not consider this tree to be exceptionally problematic and would be similar to other large trees on our street tree list.

Item 6.2 – Rengstorff Park Maintenance and Tennis Building Replacement, Project 21-48

1. Could staff present a visual of what the building façade facing the park will look like (from the park, not from the parking lot).

At the June PRC meeting, the commissioners requested a landscape plan for the façade facing the parking lot and directed the consultants to prepare an elevation for the north side only. During this meeting staff recommended vegetation along the southern fence including vines that will grow and create natural screening to the maintenance building.

2. How long of a fence will the public have to walk along?

The fence, including vegetation and vines, adjacent to the pathway is approximately 60 feet.

3. Is there a way to add some trees along the fence to provide a more pleasant view?

Trees are not recommended because they would grow tall enough that a person can use them to climb and gain access to the maintenance yard. The existing plan does not provide adequate space between the fence and pathway for trees to grow over time. Any trees added would then need to be on the inside of the fence line, taking away storage and parking access. Staff is recommending other vegetation to work with the fence and space provided to add green elements along the path.

4. Did staff discuss using more California natives for the planting palette facing the parking lot? For example, California grasses such as California fescue instead of Atlas fescue, manzanitas and ceanothus instead of callistemon?

- *The side facing the parking lot will have significant shade, therefore the planting palette takes this into consideration.*
- *To accommodate the shade exposure, the consultant suggests replacing Callistemon with Rhamnous California 'Eve case' or 'Mound San Bruno'; change out Festuca mairei to Festuca California. Ceanothus and manzanita needs full sun exposure.*

Item 6.3 – Cuesta Park Fitness Court

1. Does the \$20K CPRS grant have to be added to the project total (\$150,000 + \$201,500 + \$20,000 = \$371,500), or could the \$20K be used to backfill City funding, reducing the Park Land Dedication amount to \$181,500, and leaving \$20K for other future Park Land Dedication funded projects?

Staff recommends keeping the full budgeted amount in the CIP, apply the additional \$20,000 from the grant, and then refund any excess funds at completion of the project. Any excess funds in the Cuesta Park Fitness Court CIP at the completion of the project will be refunded to the Park Land Dedication Fund and used for other projects after that. Staff recommends waiting until project completion to refund the Park Land Dedication Fund in case the additional funding is needed to cover cost escalation of goods or address unforeseen shortfalls or contingencies.

2. Does the Greenfield's equipment allow for varying the resistance (or weight) or is it "one size fits all"?

Greenfield's equipment uses the individual's own body weight as the resistance. This type of equipment provides fitness opportunities for a broader audience and is consistent with other exercise equipment in the City located at Del Medio and Rengstorff Parks. The City has not installed equipment with adjustable weights to date due to anticipated staff time and costs of replacement parts to maintain the equipment.

3. It says in the first paragraph on the background and analysis “Cuesta Park was identified.” Since this started before I was on the Commission, could you give me some background on who identified/initiated/how it was identified (i.e. part of the Parks and Open Space Plan, input from someone, etc.)

A fitness area was installed at Rengstorff Park in 2010. Due to the number of park users, access, and space provided, the area is well utilized by the community. In 2018, the City was approached by a company that was providing grant funding to install a specific type of preconfigured fitness court. Staff saw this as an opportunity to provide residents with an additional fitness area at the City’s other community park, Cuesta Park, which has similar benefits as Rengstorff Park. The park has the appropriate space for this type of fitness area without interfering with existing uses of the park. The grantor encouraged partnering with local organizations so staff engaged with El Camino Health (ECH) to gauge interest in partnering. ECH agreed to conceptually participate as there was an interest in providing options for personal health and wellness to the community. Prior to moving forward with the company offering the fitness grant, it was determined that the project would be less expensive and more successful if we installed equipment recommended through other sources. This other equipment would provide more access and accommodate a wider range of users compared to the pre-configured system.

4. While checking out the area of the proposed fitness court, I noticed while walking most of the park that the turf (grass) seems to be quite challenged throughout the park. Am I wrong or does it need some serious attention?

Staff is aware of the numerous gopher mounds/holes at Cuesta Park and began utilizing a trapping service at the park within the last few months. To date, 527 gophers have been trapped. Staff does close down sections of the park and attempt to fill in the holes and re-seed the areas as time allows. The recent construction taking place adjacent to the Park is believed to have been one of the causes of the population increase.