

**Public Spaces Master Plan Implementation Advisory Committee
Written Public Comment- 03/31/2022**

Entry Date	Comment
03/30/2022 11:44am	<p>Greetings. Thank you for the Agenda and the Presentation. I have 2 public comments and requests regarding the Zoning Ordinance Study, page 10 of the Presentation.</p> <p>First, based on information provided by Mr. Gonzalez, Associate Planner, DPR, on December 20, 2021, and reflected on page 10, there are no PSMP-related zoning studies underway in this Fiscal Year. It is possible that one or more zoning studies will be included in the "Next Up" category in the Planning Division's Workplan for FY2023, as on-going studies are completed.</p> <p>Please post on the PSMP-IAC website a copy of, or a link for, the Planning Division's FY2023 Workplan when it is completed for the information of PSMP-IAC and the public.</p> <p>Second, based on Mr. Gonzalez's information, work will be organized for approved Zoning Studies when they begin, as follows. CPHD staff will prepare a Scoping Document for each Zoning Study, which will (1) formulate the Study objectives; (2) identify anticipated zoning provisions that would be evaluated (and the rationale for selection of those zoning provisions); (3) outline the expected community engagement process; and (4) indicate a preliminary timeline for the Study. In addition, phasing of the Study with other related Studies would be addressed in the Scoping Document.</p> <p>Please post on the PSMP-IAC website a copy of, or a link for, the Scoping Document for each approved Zoning Study when that Study's Scoping Document is completed for the information of PSMP-IAC and the public.</p> <p>Please respond to those 2 requests during the discussion of page 10.</p>
03/30/2022 1:28pm	<p>Thanks for circulating the agenda for this week's meeting of the Public Spaces Master Plan Implementation Committee. As always, I'm impressed by the scope of your work and the number of challenging topics the staff and the Committee are, or will be, examining (biophilic designs, casual use, bicycle infrastructure, park master plans etc.).</p> <p>I have a few questions below. I suspect that they will be raised and answered during the meeting in any event, but thought I would put them in writing to make sure.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Slide 7 indicates that a second public engagement process will be invoked in the spring/summer of this year regarding field utilization. What will this involve (another survey, community meetings, additional data collection,

	<p>poster sessions etc.)? What is its goal? How will it further inform or refine the Framework for Athletic Field Availability and Utilization? What opportunities will the public have to influence the planning and execution of this engagement process?</p> <p>2. Slide 10 mentions a “Public Review and Modernization” process for the various zoning studies, including a review of “approval mechanisms” for S-3A and P-S districts. What does this mean? What kinds of options for approval are under consideration?</p> <p>3. Slide 24 mentions in passing that the staff is anticipating an “urban parks lighting pilot.” What can you tell us about this? What is the purpose of the study? What sites are under consideration?</p>
<p>03/31/2022 8:54am</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PUBLIC COMMENTS OF ROY GAMSE PUBLIC SPACES MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MARCH 31, 2022</p> <p>I am Roy Gamse, a resident of the Rock Springs Community Association. I want to remind you how important it is that athletic field capacity be based on <u>actual</u> field utilization, not on <u>scheduled</u> field utilization. If you believe the PSMP analysis, which was based on <u>scheduled</u> field demand, the County would need to spend millions of dollars to expand field capacity either by creating new fields or by converting grass fields to turf or by lighting fields. Turfing one grass field, for example, could cost \$800,000 or more. The previous PSMP analysis suggested the need for expanded capacity at a number of locations, so a lot of money is at stake.</p> <p>At the end of the PSMP process, the County Board asked that projections of field capacity needs be based on <u>actual</u> usage not <u>scheduled</u> usage, because past data show there is a huge difference. This was demonstrated by the use of roving DPR field monitors in 2016-17:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Of 54 evenings with enough data for analysis, on 31 evenings at least half of fields observed were either unutilized or underutilized by sports organizations assigned to use them.</i> • <i>On 10 evenings, substantially more than half the fields were unutilized or underutilized.</i> <p>Look at those County data yourselves if you don’t believe them. I hope these data are outdated by changed DPR procedures, but we don’t know. I do know that at the last PSMP-IAC meeting, the presentation assumed only <u>scheduled</u> field utilization, not <u>actual</u> utilization.</p> <p>When I raised this issue at previous meetings, the gist of the response was that the County can’t afford to budget for roving monitors to take these data, so DPR would depend instead on self-reporting by coaches. I recommend that the</p>

County revisit that decision. With millions of capital and operating dollars at stake, it must be worth a few thousand dollars to get accurate, consistent, unbiased data on actual field use rather than rely on reporting by many harried volunteer coaches. Don't be penny-wise and pound foolish with millions of dollars in future capital and operating spending at stake.

If the County does rely on self-reported data on actual field use, then I urge DPR to:

1. make available for public comment the specifics of the reporting forms and procedures before instituting the process, and
2. adopt some supplementary verification process, either by sampling by County monitors or via reporting by referees or neighbors.

I volunteer to meet with DPR staff on this issue if doing so would be helpful.

In the same vein but on a different point, I request that a draft of the Field Availability and Utilization Public Engagement #2 be presented to the PSMP-IAC before it is implemented with the public. Hopefully, that engagement will elicit more data relevant to the issues we have been raising than did the first Engagement.