

**CITY OF CAMPBELL
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
CAMPBELL, CALIFORNIA
August 3, 2016
STUDY SESSION MINUTES**

The Parks and Recreation Commission convened in a study session on Wednesday, August 3, 2016, at 6:30 pm, at City Hall, Council Chambers, 70 N. First Street, Campbell, California.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Ptaszynski, Davidson, Chair Scholberg, Walker, Gibson (Hughes arrived late)
Absent: None
STAFF: Recreation and Community Services Director Maurantonio, Public Works Director Capurso, Superintendent Mordwinow, Recreation Services Manager Bissell

Oral Requests:

None

Announcements:

None.

New Business

A. Park Dedication Funds*

Ms. Bissell stated the purpose of this study session is to discuss and understand the Parkland Dedication Fund, review feedback given by Council and projects approved for FY17, and discuss a draft policy on prioritizing allocation of the Parkland Dedication Fund. She then presented the information contained in her report.

Questions:

Commissioner Davidson asked how we estimate the upcoming revenue. Director Capurso stated it is based on the number of units in the development.

Director Capurso stated what you're seeing are actual balances in the finance system and Ms. Bissell is backing out what was appropriated. For some of the FY 16 projects it is unlikely we will do them in the way they were appropriated (as general park improvements). We have now put some definition to those.

Ms. Bissell stated the Finance department will send out the AB1600 report in January. The AB1600 shows where the money has gone.

Director Capurso said capital projects do not end in a fiscal year. Once it's appropriated it does not continue to show up in a capital budget document because it has been encumbered. He stated it's less important to know what's been spent, and more important to know what is allocated. If it is unspent it will roll back into the fund balance.

Commissioner Davidson asked about rehabilitation, not like when the soccer field got trashed, that money can't come out of here. Director Capurso, no, it can't if it's a maintenance project. Rehabilitation means rehabilitation of a fixed asset. To do top dressing and reseeded would not qualify, but re-grading and new irrigation would qualify. Council would like to be closer to the improvement side than the renovation side. We need to demonstrate that we're extending the life of an asset.

Commissioner Gibson stated that if it's recurring it's probably a maintenance item.

Chair Scholberg said reading the fees paid by developers, the parks would be available to the people in the new developments.

Commissioner Davidson asked if there is no new development taking place what happens to the fees? Director Capurso said there's a lot of development occurring on parcels that are being redeveloped.

Commissioner Gibson asked if we are talking about the Quimby Act. Director Capurso responded yes. Commissioner Gibson said there is a park impact fee that can be assessed against developers for people that use facilities during daytime hours that don't live here.

Director Capurso said AB1600 is how we report all impact fees we collect in the City, park fee, storm fee and road impact fee.

Chair Scholberg said previously we talked about how it costs less to develop in Campbell because we don't collect the use impact fee. Director Capurso said not many cities collect that fee.

Commissioner Davidson asked if the pool had to go off line and we lose fees from classes can we use fees from this fund. Ms. Bissell said no.

Commissioner Gibson asked how many hours of the day does the pool run on average. Ms. Bissell responded it runs from 6 am to 10 pm.

Commissioner Gibson thanked Ms. Bissell for a good report, lots of good information. He wanted to point out he has done some research and the city of Belmont hired a consulting group in 2014 to come in and do an evaluation of the possibility of developing a park impact fee. He then read about the fee. He feels the Quimby act does a good job on how to determine fees. He feels strongly that those fees truly need to be devoted to land acquisition. He thinks that's the spirit of it. Staff has done an exquisite job of the asset management here. He feels the money needs to be put away for future generation needs. Also is there a possibility staff or a consultant could look at a park impact fee such as for Dell Avenue. We need to have a very substantive plan to preserve open space for future generations.

Commissioner Ptaszynski asked if the park in lieu fee or impact fee - what we charge people to develop per unit, does it take into account the cost of land. Director Capurso said it does, but it doesn't put us in a good position to acquire land. It's kind of market driven. It can be set based on a needs assessment. Our needs assessment relies on a 16 year old general plan. Once the general plan is updated and we recalculate where we are in our 3 acres per 1,000 that would be an opportunity to recalculate the parks in lieu fee. The population has changed, we've done two annexations since the last update, and there are two parks that are not in the map Ms. Bissell showed. We need to do an up to date inventory of our park system and equate that to our population and then see how park deficient we are.

Chair Scholberg asked what is the fee per unit and has that fee amount changed in the 16 years, and if not could we change it. Director Capurso said it's around \$7,000 per unit. He does not know when it was last changed.

Commissioner Walker said so it could be theoretically based on what land was selling for. Director Capurso said it could be based on how deficient the City is. How many acres are needed to be acquired to meet your service level. We can't set it without doing that analysis.

Commissioner Gibson it's not just parks, in our general plan its park and open space. In our general plan there's 150 acres of open space associated with the reservoirs, it does not qualify as useable or not. In the calculation for all this the retention ponds here are calculated in to factor in to make this number. It's probably the largest component in the calculation for the City's park and open space. Director Capurso it would not count in our 3 acres per 1,000. That needs to be useable park space.

Chair Scholberg stated we should talk about the policy. She was struck by Sunnyvale, how they separated this out and how they focused on funding. She's a little leery about setting priorities and not getting past 1, 2 and 3. She likes the structure that is in there.

Director Capurso said that's where they would like the Commission's input. Staff is trying to get a sense of priority. Even though we may have hypothetically defined rehabilitation as the highest priority, the Commission might want to start creating a reserve for land acquisition and let the money sit till you get an opportunity.

Commissioner Gibson stated but there is a 5 year horizon on this money. Director Capurso said to program it not expense it. It is a state requirement to show that we have allocated the money.

Director Maurantonio suggested adjourning the study session, going to the regular meeting and coming back after that meeting.

Commissioner Gibson asked when you're listing items 1 thru 5 in this priority how is the money allocated for these different levels, and how do we know how much money is allocated and how does it go back and forth. Director Capurso we don't know that yet. We need to set the framework first. The funding question is not as relevant as the priority exercise.

Commissioner Gibson asked isn't the Quimby Act all about acquiring land. Director Capurso responded, no, it is not.

Commissioner Gibson would switch priorities 1 and 2.

Commissioner Davidson asked if they would be reviewing the policy every 1 or 2 years. Ms. Bissell said yes, you have the right to review and change it.

Director Maurantonio said having the priorities defined, staff would come to the Commission every year with how much money came in and there always has to be some flexibility in the policy. Every year you have an opportunity to weigh in on what the recommendations are in the policy. You have to take a leap of faith, put something down then work with it and refine it. If you feel like we need more land for parks in Campbell then put land as number 1. This gives staff direction on what to recommend.

Study session adjourned at 7:30 and will reconvene at the close of the regular Parks and Recreation Commission meeting.

Study session resumed at 8:22 pm.

Commissioner Ptaszynski agrees with Commissioner Gibson.

Commissioner Walker feels it's a shame that the general plan hasn't been updated and to the degree that the Commission can guide the philosophy for at least this portion of where the City is going is a valuable conversation. She would agree that watching what's happening now in Los Gatos, trying to back track that huge project, the City doesn't want to find itself in the same situation.

Chair Scholberg liked the idea of partnerships, leasing or partnering with the schools. She feels this is equally important as acquiring land.

Director Maurantonio said one way to do that is to say your first priority is to increase open space in Campbell. That can be done either through acquisition or partnership.

Chair Scholberg asked if in stating that do we need to reference the target of 3 acres per 1000 people. Ms. Bissell said she thinks it's implied that the General Plan is the guideline.

Commissioner Ptaszynski asked if that goal is expected to change. Director Capurso said it is possible. Our plan says 3 acres per 1,000 people and 1 acre of school land per 1,000. You can just say to meet the General Plan goals.

Commissioner Davidson feels like this is really guidelines, not a policy.

Chair Scholberg said it's most important to do an annual review of the possible projects and the fund allocation.

Chair Scholberg asked if the purpose of this is to ensure that we are conducting this activity on an annual basis.

Commissioner Gibson feels this is contradictory. It is the policy of the City of Campbell to provide the maximum possible park acreage for present and future Campbell residents. But if we're spending the money on other projects then we're certainly not banking that money to buy additional land. He thinks again, in spirit and philosophically, this money from the Quimby Act is supposed to be going to the acquisition of open space and preserve open space in the community. He feels these park renovations/improvements should be capital improvement projects.

Chair Scholberg said it's our policy to comply with the General Plan. We need to be clear on what the goal is here.

Commissioner Walker said again, the problem is the General Plan.

Commissioner Gibson said we don't have a composite picture here. It's very hard to visualize this when we're looking at a draft here.

Commissioner Davidson said part of her feels like the Commission's responsibility is to set some general prioritizations with instructions that review as needed until the new General Plan is set. The General Plan is sorely lacking. Is everyone in agreement that the Quimby Act is the basis we're starting from, if it is then that drives the rest of the content. As the General Plan is getting developed and we have input, that's where we come in and say what we think the acreage should be or raise the fees.

Commissioner Ptaszynski said for the \$7,000 fee you need to build 430 units to buy an acre of land. He thinks putting the emphasis on purchasing land may drive change to that. If we make that our priority maybe that would drive changing the General Plan.

Director Capurso said you would have to have a nexus sturdy. The other thing that may enter into this is the Council may elect not to raise the fees if the City is not in competition with its neighboring cities.

Commissioner Gibson asked Director Capurso about the Envision Campbell comment, on page 4, it says "An alternative to acquiring land may be to identify goals and strategies through the Envision Campbell process that revolve around long-term....." How would they do that? Do we know where our deficient areas are. Director Capurso said we know half of the equation. Half the equation is where are the acreages, and then you take that ½ mile radius and draw it on the map. The more complex way to do it is to plot your population. That's where we are deficient. Most cities use the single metric of the concentric circles.

Commissioner Gibson said the third dimension to this is accessibility.

Chair Scholberg asked what does staff need from the Commission.

Director Maurantonio said the one thing that everyone seems to agree on is starting some kind of process where the fees are collected yearly, are reviewed by the Commission and you could see where it was collected, what projects could that fee be used for. Incorporating the time line for yearly review is good. The tricky part is whether or not there should be a priority of where the money goes. That will take some time to develop or we could just start with we're going to have a process and continue with the General Plan and provide an idea of all the appropriate projects that the fee could go to. If there's not a priority it's just a discussion of each of the fees.

Chair Scholberg stated without the needs assessment it's difficult to set priorities.

Director Maurantonio said what could happen is for each fee we could categorize the projects as Acquisition, Development and Rehabilitation. As we continue with the General Plan there will be an open space update and the needs assessment will come from that.

Director Capurso agreed, it won't be as well defined as what you would call a policy because there will be that wiggle room. Staff could take out the reference to the maximum possible acreage.

Commissioner Gibson said it's not clear, too general.

Chair Scholberg said the Quimby Act says "adequate" not maximum. Is the policy you're seeking for prioritization or a process to help us on an annual basis.

Ms. Bissell said it is also as a guideline for Council so when we take your recommendations to Council we say this is what their guiding prioritizations are in choosing projects and why they chose them.

Director Capurso said we want to develop a sound recommendation based on some sort of criteria. If it gets changed, so be it.

Commissioner Davidson has no issue with flexibility in this document, but she thinks the commission needs guidelines or policy to say the Parks and Recreation Commission should do an annual review of where park in lieu funds are being spent and how they're being spent and maybe here is this year's general guideline for priorities as opposed to here are the priorities that we need to follow x y and z. It's more about convening every year, reviewing it, having a conversation to see what was recommended and where was it appropriated and how do we want to see it go next year.

Ms. Bissell said it's more about the timeline and the annual review process and less about the policy for the Commission.

Chair Scholberg said it would be useful to indicate what our goals are. If we think in terms of what we're trying to achieve that gives us more flexibility.

Ms. Bissell said she will toss this draft and go with attachment 5 and keep that staff would then prepare a recommendation from the Parks and Recreation Commission on an annual basis to present to Council as part of the budget and CIP process. This would include what the Commission's goals were and how they align with the General Plan and why the Commission sent those recommendations forward. This will be the review process.

Chair Scholberg said she thinks the top priority is more of these spaces and to rehabilitate existing spaces.

Commissioner Gibson said in the absence of a General Plan you would want to write this as generically as possible. Remove the numbers. Simply say it is the policy of the City of Campbell to provide sufficient park acreage for present and future Campbell residents and other community use. On Attachment 4, under Policy, remove the two middle sentences. Leave in the Recommendation sentence. What we're saying is this is really a fluid situation and we have kind of a partial picture of what the needs of the community are. That should be a goal of this group to come up with a park and open space plan so we have a comprehensive evaluation of the community where the needs are and where the opportunities exist and then start whittling away from there and then that's going to help with allocating the funds, if you want to go after land if an opportunity pops up. We're looking at a horizon of a couple years. Belmont is doing a 20 year horizon study. Over the next 15 to 20 years there's probably going to be quite a bit of money coming into this community as a result of residential and if you want to expand this to a park land fee on new development in general.

Chair Scholberg mentioned we only have a two year projection, but we should be able to look back and see the trends.

Commissioner Gibson mentioned the resident that owns the property at the corner of Campbell and Dot and how he really wants to retain that as open space. That pops up red flags; we should talk to this person and see what he envisions. If we had some kind of a plan this would help staff.

Chair Scholberg asked if the city keeps an eye on properties like that and nurture the relationship. Director Capurso said it's easier to maintain contact with other government agencies or school districts. What we don't know as much about are parcels that are older retail or residential areas that have the potential for redevelopment. They tend to have a higher and better value that we wouldn't be able to compete with our relatively limited funding.

Chair Scholberg asked Ms. Bissell if she has what she needs.

Director Maurantonio said the game plan would be to come back to the Commission in September with a more formal draft of the procedure or policy and if the Commission is satisfied with that staff would like to go to Council. Staff would like Council's blessing on the idea of a yearly process.

Commissioner Davidson asked if we need a study session before the September meeting. Director Maurantonio responded no, this can come in as new business at the meeting and the Commissioners can vote on it then.

Meeting adjourned 9:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joy Francois", is written over a horizontal line.

Joy Francois
Recording Secretary

Respectfully submitted:

Joy Francois, Recording Secretary