

Parks Plan 2025 Comment Tracking

QUESTIONS

Ref #	Question	Response (no changes made to plan)	Relevant Page Numbers
PRAB/NRAB Joint Meeting 6/20/12			
Q1	What are "community connectors" in relation to the trails plan	Community Connectors are one of the types of trail (one step below regional trails) identified in the Pathways and Trails Master Plan.	5-4
Q2	How does this plan address interconnectivity and trails	Trails were a part of the geographic analysis and feature in recommendations to close geographic gaps. Recommendation 1.2 bolsters the work of the Trails and Pathways Master Plan and connects it to meeting park needs.	5-3
Q3	How does the Luscher Area Master Plan fit into this system plan?	The Luscher Area Master Plan Update is a separate parallel process that is an implementation of the system plan ideas at a very site-specific level. This plan is on hold until the completion of Parks Plan 2025 and will restart in the fall.	None
Q4	How does this plan address the balance of habitat protection and use by people?	Overall the plan envisions that the public will have access to natural areas across the system but there will likely be sensitive areas within individual sites that will need to be protected. This determination is site-specific and would be addressed in natural resource management plans (recommendation 4.3).	5-39
Q5	Should the plan address urban services areas outside of the city limits?	This question was asked early in the process and the direction from City Council was to focus on service within the city limits.	None
Q6	Is the population projection developed for the comprehensive plan update referenced in Parks Plan 2025	Yes, Parks Plan 2025 used the same demographic information to ensure that this plan aligns with the Comprehensive Plan.	2-10, A-4
Q7	Urban agriculture may require special expertise, one of many subjects that the Parks Department needs to be knowledgeable about.	No specific change identified.	None
HRAB Chair Meeting, 6/22/12			
Q8	Luscher Farm is not clearly differentiated from parks in the plan. It is an historic dairy farm, not a park and should be noted as such in the plan.	"Park" is used generically to distinguish lands that are under the jurisdiction and management of the Parks & Recreation Dept. Parks Plan 2025 identifies three categories of parks: Local Parks, City-Wide Parks, and Special Purpose Sites. The <i>Special Purpose Site</i> designation is reserved for those sites that are single purpose (i.e. Golf Course, Swim Park, etc.). Luscher Farm is categorized as a "City-wide park" because it contains both a variety of uses, including special purpose activities. The special purpose elements at Luscher Farm include historic dairy farm & buildings, historic designation, urban ag, and community gardens. The inventory in Appendix D defines the special purpose activities.	2-19; Appendix D
Planning Commission Meeting, 6/25/12			
Q9	The name "Parks Plan 2025" is confusing in that it makes it appear as if the plan only addressed parks and not the recreational aspects of the plan	"Parks Plan 2025" was selected by the joint PRAB/NRAB advisory board committee overseeing the planning process as the title of the project. The original name "Parks, Recreation, Natural Area System Plan" was viewed as too cumbersome.	

Parks Plan 2025 Comment Tracking

Q10	Master plans for parks need a land use capability review by the Planning Commission, particularly for large scale projects, similar to large scale development.	It was clarified that this statement related to site specific park master plans. Staff reviewed the Parks & Natural Area zone (PNA) parameters contained in the City's development code (Article 50.13B). PNA requires all park master plans to go through a review process to insure compliance with City codes, including review and public hearing with the Planning Commission and a recommendation from this body to the City Council. This process should address this comment.	5-21 to 5-22
Q11	Was Oswego Lake considered as part of the Parks Plan?	Similar response to comment #20 above. Access to Oswego Lake was not mentioned during public outreach as a priority, and as such did not become incorporated into the Parks Plan.	
SAB Chair Meeting, July 5, 2012			
Q12	Ensure that updating Parks Plan 2025, as described on page 6-23 includes all stakeholders.	The steps identified on pgs 6-23 and 6-24 is a listing of the technical components of the plan that will need to be considered in updating the plan in the future. The modification made to #40 above adds the need to include all stakeholders, so this should address this adequately.	6-23
Q13	Action Step 3 – Add the following text: These strategies need to take a balanced approach between the extremes such as “sustainably harvesting” invasive species and seeking to completely eradicate them. One way to do this is to undertake a cost/benefit analysis.	The scope of Parks Plan 2025 is a broad vision document describing the community's desires and priorities for the future. Doing a cost/benefit analysis to determine the best approach for removing invasive species is a good idea, and one which is beyond the scope of this planning tool, or the capacity of City staff. It has been discussed regionally amongst park and land management professionals as something that would be worth doing. It may be a regional project for consideration.	5-39
Q14	4.3 Action Step 2 – see page 5-39 recommendation above.	See comment in Q13 above	5-41
Q15	Strengthen the use of private foundation support for the parks & recreation system	Foundation funding to support the parks, recreation, and natural area system is addressed on page 6-19 of the plan.	6-19