

Exhibit D
Public Comment

The City of Fresno has made a diligent effort to engage the public and has considered each comment. The comments are not verbatim but are summarized from letters received by the commenters, attached. The first two commenters (Ray McKnight and Lisa Y. Flores) made their comments by telephone, therefore there are no letters that correspond to their comments. This matrix includes comments received through November 2017. One letter was received on December 1, 2017 and that is attached but not included in the matrix.

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|---|-----|--|------------------------|------------|--|------------------|
| 1 | 5 | Chapter 5: Guidelines for Design does not include guidelines for Neighborhood Parks. Were they accidentally omitted? If not, please include them, even if that means extending the time period to adoption | Ray McKnight | 10/19/2017 | Language has been changed in chapter 5 to include neighborhood parks and to clarify that the design guidelines should be used in tandem with the park type definitions. See 5.4 Design Guidelines for Community and Neighborhood Parks: Community Centers. | Y |
| 2 | 5 | Table 5.1 is 184 sqft for a gymnasium accurate? This seems small | Ray McKnight | 10/19/2017 | Table 5.1 has been corrected; the square footage for a gymnasium now reads 6,500-8,000 sqft.' | Y |
| 3 | B | Please paginate Appendix B | Ray McKnight | 10/19/2017 | Appendix B has been updated with page numbers. | Y |
| 4 | | Concerned about the readability of the text and whether or not the font type or size was ADA compliant | Lisa Y. Flores | 10/31/2017 | Language has been added to the first page of the document regarding how to acquire alternate formats of the document. The front page now reads "Alternate formats of this document will be provided by the City upon request. To request alternate formats contact Shannon M. Mulhall, Certified Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinator at (559) 621-8716." | Y |
| 5 | | We wish to commend the City and WRT for undertaking this plan...in particular, the insights for each park and their priorities. Several opportunities merit further considerations: Expand Roeding Park | Lee Ayers, Tree Fresno | 11/3/2017 | Roeding Park has a current master plan that was adopted in 2011. The City is adhering to the Master Plan for the development of Roeding Park. The master plan does not include expansion of the park. | |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|---|-----|---|---------------------------|-----------|--|------------------|
| 6 | | Add a new SE Regional Park | Lee Ayers, Tree Fresno | 11/3/2017 | The urban greening recommendations for Council District 5 include a recommendation to add a new park site between Fowler and Clovis (see page 230) | |
| 7 | | Fund O&M for the entire San Joaquin River Parkway | Lee Ayers, Tree Fresno | 11/3/2017 | The Parks Master Plan (PMP) identifies the current maintenance funding needs of the City of Fresno parks and open space system. | |
| 8 | | Create a special district to provide fresh, focused leadership, similar to what we did 61 years ago for flood control. | Lee Ayers, Tree Fresno | 11/3/2017 | Special districts like the Fresno Metro Flood Control District are created through ballot initiatives and are outside of the scope of the PMP. | |
| 9 | | We will follow up separately on the tree palette. Thanks for pointing out the need for more trees throughout the parks system | Lee Ayers, Tree Fresno | 11/3/2017 | No response required. The PMP calls out the need for more shade in parks. | |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|---|------------------|--|------------------|
| 10 | | <p>Eaton Plaza: It appears that there has been a significant misunderstanding about Eaton Plaza. First Eaton Plaza is just that, a 4.2 acre plaza bounded on the East by "O" Street, on the West by "N" Street, on the north by Fresno Street, and on the south by Mariposa. There is an existing Eaton Plaza Master Plan. The Eaton Plaza Master Plan identifies improvements including an existing amphitheater (Currently in use), decorative walkways, seating, shade trees and ground cover/vegetation, artwork, lighting, a central fountain, and retaining the existing water tower.</p> | <p>Downtown Fresno Coalition letter</p> | <p>11/3/2017</p> | <p>The Eaton Plaza Master Plan was a conceptual design for Eaton Plaza that was brought before Council in August 2004 and again in May 2009 for design revisions. While the original staff proposal included recommendations to amend several specific plans as well as the General Plan to incorporate the Eaton Plaza Master Plan, there is no record of Council action on those proposed plan amendments. Further, the plans that were proposed for amendment to include the Eaton Plaza Master Plan, have since been repealed by Council action. Therefore, while the conceptual design was approved by Council, it is not incorporated in any of the specific or community plans that currently apply in City jurisdiction, nor is it incorporated in the Fresno General Plan. As such, enforcement of the General Plan as well as applicable specific plans, supersede application of the conceptual design.</p> | |
| 11 | | <p>The Draft Parks Master Plan that is the subject of these comments is internally inconsistent in its treatment of Eaton Plaza. The Draft Master Plan describes Eaton Plaza three ways, all incorrect. It is not an existing park (p 81), nor a pocket park (Appendix B), nor a neighborhood park (p.83). Eaton Plaza is a plaza, as identified in the Eaton Plaza Master Plan of 2004</p> | <p>Downtown Fresno Coalition letter</p> | <p>11/3/2017</p> | <p>The PMP has been revised to clarify that Eaton Plaza is an existing neighborhood park. See response to Comment 10 for further information.</p> | <p>Y</p> |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|--|---|------------------|---|------------------|
| 12 | | <p>The Draft Parks Master Plan is also inconsistent with the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan (FCSP). The FCSP designates Eaton Plaza as an "important public park located between the Memorial Auditorium, Fresno Library, Federal Courthouse and Fresno Police Station. It hosts a number of events and activities, including food truck events and movie nights." (FCSP 3. Civic Center) Importantly, the FCSP describes Eaton Plaza as encompassing "the entire block bounded by O Street, Mariposa Street, N Street, and Fulton (sic[Fresno]) Street." (FCSP 2. Civic Center, Section B Plan.) Furthermore, in the Vision portion, the FCSP clearly calls for eliminating parking lots in the area. The Draft Parks Master Plan fails to recognize this by assessing a parking lot on Eaton Plaza as in need of repair. (Draft Parks Master Plan, Appendix B.) In light of these inconsistencies and inaccuracies, all treatment of Eaton Plaza in the Draft Parks Master Plan should be brought into line with and adhere to the existing facts of a 4.2 acre plaza currently including an in use water tower, an in use amphitheater, and a master plan for the remaining area</p> | <p>Downtown Fresno Coalition letter</p> | <p>11/3/2017</p> | <p>The PMP classifies Eaton Plaza as a neighborhood park because it meets the size criteria. This is not inconsistent with how it is described in the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan. See responses to Comments 10 and 11 for further information.</p> | <p>N</p> |
| 13 | 5 | <p>p. 157, under Community Parks, it shows that a community park could/should have a gymnasium of 184 sft ("sft"). Is this a typo? If so it must be corrected. If not, this is far too small to even approximate a useable basketball court considered that a highschool basketball court is approximately 84ftx50ft, for 4,200sqft. Clarification is necessary for this section to be of use.</p> | <p>Downtown Fresno Coalition letter</p> | <p>11/3/2017</p> | <p>See response to Comment 2</p> | <p>Y</p> |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|----------------------------------|-----------|--|------------------|
| 14 | 5 | Guidelines for Design. In this chapter there are discussion for pocket parks, joint-use sites, for community parks, community centers, for regional parks. Where is there nothing about neighborhood parks? Moreover, as to the information that is provided, the entire section contains too much boilerplate and far too original commentary specific to Fresno and its unique needs. | Downtown Fresno Coalition letter | 11/3/2017 | See response to Comment 1 | Y |
| 15 | 1 | p16-17 the proposed Parks Master Plan refers to the Quimby Act as a potential source of funds. However, the reference is so general as to be of little use. The proposed Parks Master Plan fails to recognize that Quimby Act funds are specifically designated for park development and, importantly may be used for capital improvement of existing parks. | Downtown Fresno Coalition letter | 11/3/2017 | Chapter 8 of the PMP offers greater detail regarding the Quimby act and the City's Park Impact Fee, see page 239 | |
| 16 | | Based on Quimby, Fresno developed its own, more limited version of Quimby, known as Urban Growth Management (UGM). For approximately four decades the City used funding from its UGM program to develop existing neighborhood parks, notably in newer areas of the City where fees were being collected. Is the UGM program still in effect? Are the funds still being collected for the development of future parks sites? Are the funds being utilized at all for the capital improvements to existing parks, re-master planning, etc., which are permissible uses? If funds are not still being collected, what is the primary funding source for development of neighborhood and community parks? If the funds are being collected, are they pursuant to an articulated long-term capital improvement program, and how are they being appropriated? The proposed Parks Master Plan fails to discuss any of this information. | Downtown Fresno Coalition letter | 11/3/2017 | The Urban Growth Management Program is no longer in use; the City now uses a Park Impact Fee (PIF). Chapter 8 of the Parks Master Plan offers greater detail regarding the Quimby act and the City's Park Impact Fee, see page 239 | |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|--|-------------|-----------|---|------------------|
| 17 | | <p>Good planning cannot make up for lack of funding. The plan calls for the first two goals to be (1) funding and (2) maintaining our parks. I hope the City will adopt these goals and commit to improving our greenspaces. Without adequate funding, there is no reason to discuss long term planning as there will be nothing to plan</p> | Jeremy Clar | 11/3/2017 | Introductory remarks; no response required. | |
| 18 | 2 | <p>Although acknowledging the large deficits of park acreage, the plan insufficiently addresses how to improve such deficits in already developed areas. The PMP should focus less on [sic] new areas of development and more on the present and future core of the city. The development areas described in the PMP (See pg. 35) divide the vast majority of the populated, developed areas of Fresno into four areas, North of Shaw, South of Shaw, Downtown, and BRT corridors, where there are eight development areas. Each area is discussed basically equally, and therefore more effort is spent in the PMP describing undeveloped areas. Why is there not further detail on how to improve parkland in areas South of Shaw with 220,000 people than areas that are either lightly populated or undeveloped, and even when developed, will never have near the population of the established areas? Further, by aggregating such large areas of the city, the data does not indicate smaller regions where the park deficient is likely much worse. Spending undue focus on areas of development where only roughly a tenth of Fresno's population currently live or for that matter, are expected to live should not be the focus of the PMP.</p> | Jeremy Clar | 11/3/2017 | <p>The development areas depicted in Figure 2.1 (Residential Capacity Allocation) of the Parks Master Plan are used for consistency with the General Plan, as these are the city's official development areas and consistency is necessary for tracking of plan implementation. However, most of the focus of the Parks Master Plan was in fact in Established Neighborhoods South of Shaw, and in other development areas with existing park needs. All of the outreach activities were conducted within existing city limits and the majority in neighborhoods south of Shaw. Fig. 6.6 shows the areas of need (all within existing city limits) and this was the base map for Chapter 6, Needs Assessment. Furthermore, Chapter 8 includes financing strategies for parks, and Tables 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3 include recommendations for improvements in specific parks. These are all existing parks located in existing urbanized areas of the city and within existing city limits.</p> | |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|------|------|---|------------------|
| 19 | | <p>The reliance on the potential use of public schools is not an adequate remedy the lack of adequate parks and should not be the focus of how to remedy lack of park acreage.</p> <p>a. The plan to have joint use agreement with public schools was already described in the 1989 parks plan (See e.g., pg. 22.) but was never put into place. Recently, there has been an attempt to incorporate school facilities on weekends, it is still very tentative. It begs the question as to if this was such an easy fix and suggested by our currently operative planning document, then why has it not been done already? Is FUSD is willing to enter into such agreements, and what are the true costs of re-developing school green spaces to truly be utilized as park space? As an example, the 1989 PMP proposed in planning area 15 to develop Hamilton Middle School and Fremont Elementary into neighborhood park facilities, after noting that the areas only had .48 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents. (See 1989 plan, pg. 84-85.) Nearly thirty years have passed and nearly nothing has changed.</p> | | | <p>The use of public schools is considered as part of the solution given the fiscal challenges involved in the acquisition and development of new parks, however school acreage is not included in the city's Level of Service (LOS) calculations for park land. Narrative was added explaining this on page 184.</p> | Y |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|--|-------------|-----------|---|------------------|
| 20 | | <p>Access to school playfields is a poor and limited substitute to additional park space. They are constrained by their primary use as a school, thereby limiting availability, and it is unclear what other amenities could feasibly be built on school property. By making a chart subtracting school acreage from the additional facilities needed (see PMP pg. 184-85), it creates an appearance that the city is not serious about really addressing the lack of parks, and moreover, is just wanting to apply school acreage as park facilities without investing appropriate effort and resources to enter into long term joint use agreements that would really allow proper recreational use at school facilities. As an example, it shows that 239 acres of school property could be used as park space in areas South of Shaw. The area currently only has 228 acres of actual neighborhood parks. Not only would the inclusion of the school property be greater than the number of actual parks, the city would still need an additional 175 acres to reach its target. From attending meetings, it appears the public is not keen on the use of schools as a permanent solution. At best, this is seen as a stopgap measure.</p> | Jeremy Clar | 11/3/2017 | <p>Language has been added to the introduction to Table 6.3 to clarify that school acreage is not included in the LOS calculations, but is included in the table as a demonstration of how school acreage could be <u>part</u> of of the solution to the lack of park acreage given the fiscal challenges involved in the acquisition of new parks.</p> | Y |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|--|-------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| 21 | 7 | <p>Other strategies that WRT set forth for new parkland are really exciting and should be elaborated upon! (See pg. 203-209.) While I am no expert on demographic shifts, it appears that box retail may be on a permanent decline. More effort should be used to think of redeveloping vacant retail spaces, especially along newly proposed BRT routes, to include recreational spaces. There should be plenty opportunity for acquiring underperforming retail locations in the future. I could see linear parks, pedestrian trails, and mixed use building along the Blackstone corridor. Fresno is also plagued with blighted homes - what about looking into whether the end result of code enforcement actions could provide an opportunity to eminent domain residential parcels that could serve as pocket parks? Ideas like making plazas or linear parks out of streets in dense neighborhoods is a fantastic idea! I would love to see illustrative examples of these and other more "out of the box" ideas.</p> | Jeremy Clar | 11/3/2017 | Comment noted; no response required. | N |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|--|-------------|-----------|---|------------------|
| 22 | | I believe there is extremely strong interest for recreational trails, such as along railways and the canals. With some beautification, they could be really an amazing asset. I would like to see the trail system be a higher priority. | Jeremy Clar | 11/3/2017 | The PMP acknowledges that trails are an important open space asset that should connect to the parks system. See Chapter 9, Goals and Recommendations, Goal 6: Connect. This section discusses ways to improve parks accessibility in multiple ways, including through trails, greeways and other green connections. It builds upon the City's primary document for trail development, the Active Transportation Plan, adopted in March of 2017. | |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|--|------------------|---|------------------|
| 23 | | <p>The San Joaquin River Parkway was first envisioned as a major amenity to the Fresno-Madera Metropolitan Region in the mid-1980s. As the Parkway started becoming a reality with the purchase of land starting in the mid-1990s and construction of the first mile of the Lew S. Eaton Trail inside of Woodward Park in 1996, the City was a full partner in the effort to create the San Joaquin River Parkway.</p> <p>Since 2008, the City seems to have moved away from its previous commitment to build a better future for local residents by fully participating in the effort to create the San Joaquin River Parkway. This movement is reflected in the description of the Parkway in the Parks Master Plan as a "related effort" located "adjacent" to City Parks.</p> <p>In fact, the San Joaquin River Parkway is an amenity desired and heavily used by Fresnans, and should be central to the Parks Master Plan. Elements of the Parkway such as the Lewis S. Eaton multi-use trail currently exist within City Parks, and creation of the Parkway is the greatest opportunity for new parks and open space that is currently available to the City of Fresno.</p> <p>We encourage you to renew your commitment to the San Joaquin River Parkway by including it as a critical element of the Parks Master Plan.</p> | <p>Sharon Weaver, San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust</p> | <p>11/3/2017</p> | <p>The City recognizes that the San Joaquin River Parkway is a unique and valued open space amenity in the Fresno region. Page 77 describes the Parkway as a "great ecological asset" for Fresno. While the PMP focuses mainly on the City of Fresno Parks system and it's needs, it acknowledges that more integration of parks and greeways is a worthy goal. See Chapter 9, Goal 6: Connect for further reference.</p> | <p>Y</p> |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|-----------------|-----------|---|------------------|
| 24 | | <p>Your plan recommends that Eaton Plaza be “Recommended for Re-Master Plan/Redevelopment”. Actually, Eaton Plaza (EP) has been in the planning stage since 1918, for almost 100 years. It underwent very substantial public input and scrutiny and final City Council adoption as Eaton Plaza Master Plan (EPMP) in 2004, with construction of phase 1 of 5 planned phases in 2005-06.</p> <p>The plan shows removal of both parking lots, one on the east side and one on the west side of the block. In conjunction with the design of the EPMP, the city constructed two (2) parking areas within four (4) blocks of EP. One parking lot was constructed just east of the Amtrak station, consisting of approximately 700 parking spaces, and a multi-level structure was built to house 2,300 vehicles, east of Saroyan Theater. The first lot was subsequently used largely for parking city vehicles, mostly pickups and employee parking by permit. The parking structure is largely unused. These were built, in part, to make up for losing the less than 200 off-street parking spaces that were to be lost at EP. 3,000 spaces to 200 spaces, that’s better than a 15:1 ratio. And still the parking lots remain, for the convenience of city employees at the police station and visitors of Superior Court. (continued)</p> | Larry W. Taylor | 11/3/2017 | <p>The PMP calls for the re-master planning of Eaton Plaza, and calls for it to reflect a civic image (pg. 248). This is not conflict with the original ideas about Eaton Plaza. Because of the changing nature of downtown and it's demographics, a new planning process is warranted. See responses to Comments 10 and 11 for more information.</p> | |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----------|---|-----------------|-----------|----------|------------------|
| 24 | continued | <p>(Continued from previous page)The EPMP is consistent with the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan, as shown on the plot plan, page 3:13. That rendering shows the layout of the EPMP. If the State of California building, the Fresno County Superior Court and the Fresno Police Department would allow traffic past their buildings, on what would become Mariposa Street, I am sure the EPMP could be revised to include traffic through there too.</p> <p>The design of the EPMP cost nearly \$250,000 and phase 1 construction (the Amphitheater) cost \$500,000. The estimated cost for the whole Plan was around \$6,000,000 spread over five (5) phases. Phases 2 to 5 were never completed, however they were planned for and the planning stage was paid for. It seems a waste of money to start this fine project and then stop after it's only 20% complete, and nearly \$1,000,000 has been put into it.</p> <p>Eaton Plaza was designed as a pedestrian park, for passive enjoyment of city workers, city residents and a signature location for visitors to enjoy, next to the historic Water Tower. With completion of the California High Speed Rail, Fresno should look forward to increased visitor traffic and, therefore, expand its open space in the center of its governmental operations, next to the Visitors' Center and in its City Center. The Eaton Plaza Master Plan is just waiting to be implemented.</p> | Larry W. Taylor | 11/3/2017 | | N |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|--|-----------|--|------------------|
| 25 | 5 | p152-153. There are statements about not fencing the entire basin perimeter, which is contrary to the District's policies and practices. While the District does fence the entire perimeter of its basin sites, access points are also provided. Since District basins fill with stormwater, an unfenced perimeter would allow public access to impounded stormwater, which is a public safety and liability concern. | Brent Sunamoto, Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District | 11/3/2017 | The PMP has been updated. A caption has been added to Figure 5.2 on pages 152, 153 that reads "Figure 5.2 is conceptual, any park planning and park design at flood control basin sites would be done in full consultation with FMFCD, taking into consideration all FMFCD requirements and policies." | Y |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|---|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| 26 | 5 | <p>Graphic on page 152-153. No perimeter fence is shown on the south side of the basin. No fence is shown that separates the low flow (lower floor where water initially collects) and the upper floor. This suggests public access to the low and the impounded stormwater, which the District does not allow.</p> <p>During a storm even, the upper floor where soccer fields are shown could get inundated with 10-15 vertical feet of stormwater. Therefore, some of the features shown in the recreation floor would be subject to being submerged during the winter months.</p> <p>The District requires a 10-foot wide path around the upper perimeter of the basin. It is unclear if vehicle access is provided.</p> <p>The graphic suggest some grading work that would create a rolling topography within the basin. District basins are designed to maximize storage capacity and creating an aesthetic topography would decrease the storage capacity of the basin.</p> <p>The walkways/viewing piers shown in the low flow would have to be discussed further and could not provide public access to impounded stormwater. Please address these concerns in the final Parks Master Plan document. While the District is willing to assist the City in providing green space to the community, we cannot allow the development of basin sites to compromise our policies, operations, or maintenance.</p> | <p>Brent Sunamoto, Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District</p> | <p>11/3/2017</p> | <p>See response to Comment 25</p> | <p>Y</p> |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|--|----------------|------------|--|------------------|
| 27 | | <p>The Draft Parks Master Plan was not produced in a readable font or size that was readable to the average citizen. The tables and mappings had visual printing errors (p. 169) that diminishes the public ability to read, and comment on the data in a timely manner. It is my recommendation that future documents use Times, so as to lessen issues under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Also, please let the public know how to obtain large print and alternative languages formats - no one should have to be as insistent as I had to be.</p> | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | See response to Comment 4 | Y |
| 28 | | <p>As the 114-year-old regional Park, Roeding Park is not fully discussed nor analyzed in this document. The draft Parks Master Plan fails to discuss the historical significance of the past, present, and future of this park. The limited analysis provided within this document consists of an incomplete windshield survey performed in August 2017. This survey does not include monuments, historical structures or nearby aesthetic (i.e. mural) within the park nor mention the lease with Chaffee Zoo (which took out more than 25 acres of prime park space).</p> | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | <p>The park assessment form in Appendix B was revised. However, details of Roeding Park, including it's relation to the Fresno Chaffee Zoo, are contained in the Roeding Park Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report, adopted and certified respectively in 2011.</p> | Y |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|----------------|------------|--|------------------|
| 29 | | There is no biodiversity survey of trees and wildlife that are a major assets to the park system. Nor is there an adequate discussion on the health and maintenance of the largest sand of trees within the city limits. As well, as the four Swainson Hawks and other mitigatory birds that inhabit the park. Why? | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | See response to Comment 28. | N |
| 30 | | The document can not substantiate a fair rating of Roeding Park, since the data gather is incomplete and is presented in an erroneous manner. The August 2017 window shield survey was not inclusive of the actual elements of the park and made assumptions of the relationship with Chaffee Zoo that were not substantive in any way within the document. There was no empirical data sources cited or provided in this document that justifies the statement that most people who go to Roeding Park to go to Chaffee Zoo. | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | See response to Comment 28. | Y |
| 31 | | There are no adequate discussions regarding accessibility of free parking to those low income park users, and the closure of a vital access gate to Roeding Park for pedestrians. Specifically the closure of the small gate along Belmont that has been wield shut. This gate closure now forces park users to walk approximately a quarter mile to enter the park, and worse if you have a disability but no placard. | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | There is a pedestrian park entrance at Belmont and Delno, in addition to one on West Avenue with free parking. | N |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|----------------|------------|--|------------------|
| 32 | | <p>There are no multimodal data for park users (i.e. bicycle riders and transit users). Nor are there any discussion about increasing the availability of secure bicycle parking within the park.</p> | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | See Design Guidelines, Accessibility on pages 146, 147 | N |
| 33 | | <p>There is no discussion of the possible expansion of Roeding Park nor is the City willing to discuss this matter. Currently the City of Fresno is going through the Transformative Climate Communities grant process through the State of California/Strategic Growth Council. Within this grant program, there are planning grants for up to \$250,000.</p> <p>At the public workshops, the consultants informed the public that the City of Fresno is looking for any and all funding opportunities for parks. Yet, attempts have been made to push forward a proposed grant proposal for a Roeding Park Expansions/Specific Plan through the TCC planning grant process- to no avail. Per the City Mayor office (H. Spees), the City staff is too busy, so can the City want to seek alternative funding yet not want to address potential projects that would provide a clear path for park growth?</p> | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | <p>Transformative Climate Community funding is beyond the scope of this plan. With regard to expanding Roeding Park, the city is currently adhering to the Roeding PMP as to the future development of the park.</p> | N |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|----------------|------------|---|------------------|
| 34 | | The concept for prime time pricing including, but not limited to rentals and parking will systematically limit, discriminate, and prevent low income, people of color, the elderly and those with disabilities from participating in the parks system. This is in direct opposition of demographic user information provided in this document. The park system needs to be accessible to all and should not be limited to high income individuals/groups. | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | Prime time pricing is used in Roseville , Las Vegas, and Livermore Area Recreation and Park District to name a few other jurisdictions who employ this system for maximizing recreation assets. It is one of many suggested strategies. | N |
| 35 | | The prime time cost formula should not be 125-150% of actual cost, but should be the cost. Also a sliding scale structure should be implemented to better accommodate low income individuals/groups. This would even out the playing field during prime times usage and would prevent disharmony in the community | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | The discussion of primetime pricing includes reducing the price during non-prime time, see pg. 119. | N |
| 36 | | Consolidating the functions of Public Works and the Parks Department appears to be a cost savings mechanism, however this savings should not be lost in any redundant administration and needless upper management staff. My only concern is that the number of new full-time permanent hires should be increased. | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | The PMP recommendation is for 13 FTE Maintenance Workers (pg. 125). | N |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|---|----------------|------------|---|------------------|
| 37 | | The actual weekly users of the park (i.e. Roeding) were not given information on the online or paper surveys. Thus, the three organized dog play groups at Roeding Park, which represent close to 500 park users could not proactively participate. At no time, has the consultant or the City of Fresno reached out to these groups for input or to solicit their membership for input. Nor were they identified as stakeholders at any point in the development of this document. | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | Outreach for the PMP consisted of inviting key stakeholders and the general public to provide input on the plan throughout the process. Specifically, there were 2 rounds of stakeholder meetings in 2016, -17, 13 mobile workshops in the fall of 2016 and 1 community meeting; in the spring of 2016 there were 7 public workshops (one in each council district) and a public meeting on October 12, 2017. In addition, an in-person and on-line survey was conducted to determine park needs from the general public (over 800 respondents). Dog park advocates attended the meetings and provided survey input, and as a result, opportunities for development of new dog parks are identified at Einstein, Basin O (First/Bullard), Fink-White, Selma Layne and Quigley Park. | N |
| 38 | | The lack of parks in the areas of downtown and Chinatown are problematic based on lack of space and the quality of land. The document fails to adequately address the issue of environmental justice with regards to potential/proposed parks located near the vicinity of the railroad lines and highway that border these areas. Especially, since these two areas have had heavy industrial/manufacturing sites with the potential toxicity issues. | Lisa Y. Flores | 11/10/2017 | The Fulton Corridor Specific Plan (FCSP) shows potential park sites within its boundaries, which includes Chinatown-see Figure 8.3E Existing and Proposed Open Space in the FCSP. | N |
| 39 | | p 169 "Feedback" on this page is illegible | Mike Ratajski | 11/13/2017 | The PMP has been updated and the image has been replaced with a sharper version | Y |
| 40 | 8 | 8.2 Capital expenditure plan: Need a Senior/Community Center in District 1 | Mike Ratajski | 11/13/2017 | Comment noted; Senior center is identified as a need in the PMP in Council District 4. This is based on the community outreach conducted for the PMP. | N |

| # | Ch. | Comment | Name | Date | Response | PMP Change (Y/N) |
|----|-----|--|---------------|------------|--|------------------|
| 41 | 8 | 8.2 Capital expenditure plan: District 7: limited number of urban greening streets? | Mike Ratajski | 11/13/2017 | Comment noted. The focus of the PMP was urban greening within parks and open space. | N |
| 42 | 8 | 8.2 Capital expenditure plan: El Cap: Only 1 bench, one sign, 4 trash (it's a well used dog park) - reconsider needs | Mike Ratajski | 11/13/2017 | See Tier 2 pn page 246, which shows the following improvements for El Capitan: Recommended improvements now include "upgrade area light to LED; add large shade trees, shade structure, dog park, picnic tables. | N |
| 43 | 8 | 8.2 Capital expenditure plan: Mosqueda: add splash park and benches | Mike Ratajski | 11/13/2017 | A splash park is in the process of being installed at Mosqueda. | N |
| 44 | 8 | 8.2 Capital expenditure plan: Vinland: Complete existing splash park with play elements | Mike Ratajski | 11/13/2017 | Completion of splash park in progress. | N |
| 45 | 8 | 8.2 Capital expenditure plan: Holmes: Splash Park | Mike Ratajski | 11/13/2017 | Comment noted. | N |
| 46 | 8 | 8.2 Capital expenditure plan: Manchester: add parking, splash park | Mike Ratajski | 11/13/2017 | Comment noted. | N |

Amber Piona

From: Lee Ayres <lee@treefresno.org>
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2017 4:28 AM
To: ParksPlan
Subject: Public Comment

We wish to commend the City and WRT for undertaking this plan. . . in particular, the insights for each park and the priorities. Several opportunities merit further consideration:

- . Expand Roeding Park
- . Add a new se regional park
- . Fund o&m for the entire San Joaquin river parkway . Create a special distrct to provide fresh, focused leadership, similar to what we did 61 years ago for flood control.

Separately - we will follow up on the tree palette . Thanks for pointing out the need for more trees throughout the parks system!

Thanks you

Lee Ayres
Tree Fresno
3150 E. Barstow Avenue
Fresno, California 93740
559-221-5556 office
559-285-3906 mobile
lee@treefresno.org

Downtown Fresno Coalition
c/o linda68@gmail.com
(559) 266-1443

November 2, 2017

Amber Piona
City of Fresno
amber.piona@fresno.gov

Dear Ms. Piona:

We submit the following comments on the Draft Parks Master Plan recently released by the City of Fresno.

Eaton Plaza

It appears that there has been a significant misunderstanding about Eaton Plaza. First, Eaton Plaza is just that, a 4.2-acre plaza bounded on the east by "O" Street, on the west by "N" Street, on the north by Fresno Street, and on the south by Mariposa. There is an existing Eaton Plaza Master Plan. The Eaton Plaza Master Plan identifies improvements including an existing amphitheater (currently in use), decorative walkways, seating, shade trees and groundcover/vegetation, artwork, lighting, a central fountain, and retaining the existing water tower.

The Draft Parks Master Plan that is the subject of these comments is internally inconsistent in its treatment of Eaton Plaza. The Draft Master Plan describes Eaton Plaza in three ways, all incorrect. It is not an existing park (p. 81), nor a pocket park (Appendix B), nor a neighborhood park (p. 83). Eaton Plaza is a plaza, as identified in the Eaton Plaza Master Plan of 2004.

The Draft Parks Master Plan is also inconsistent with the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan (FCSP). The FCSP designates Eaton Plaza as an "important public park located between the Memorial Auditorium, Fresno Library, Federal Courthouse, and Fresno Police Station. It hosts a number of events and activities, including food truck events and movie nights." (FCSP 3. Civic Center.) Importantly, the FCSP describes Eaton Plaza as encompassing "the entire block bounded by O Street, Mariposa Street, N Street, and Fulton (sic [Fresno]) Street." (FCSP 3. Civic Center, section B. Plan.) Furthermore, in the Vision portion, the FCSP clearly calls for eliminating parking lots in the area. The Draft Parks Master Plan fails to recognize this by assessing a parking lot on Eaton Plaza as in need of repair. (Draft Parks Master Plan, Appendix B.)

In light of these inconsistencies and inaccuracies, all treatment of Eaton Plaza in the Draft Parks Master Plan should be brought into line with and adhere to the existing facts of a 4.2 acre plaza currently including an in use water tower, an in use amphitheater, and a master plan for the remaining area.

Gymnasium

Page 157, under Community Parks, it shows that a community park could/should have a gymnasium of 184 square feet ("sft"). Is this a typo? If so it must be corrected. If not, it is far too small to even approximate a usable basketball court considering that a high school basketball court is approximately 84 feet long, and 50 feet wide, for 4,200 square feet. Clarification is necessary for this section to be of use.

Guidelines for Design

In this chapter there are discussions of guidelines for pocket parks, for joint-use sites, for community parks: community centers, for regional parks. Why is there nothing about neighborhood parks? Moreover, as to the information that is provided, the entire section contains too much boilerplate and far too little original commentary specific to Fresno and its unique needs.

Funding Sources

At pages 16-17 the proposed Parks Master Plan refers to the Quimby Act as a potential source of funds. However, the reference is so general as to be of little use. The proposed Parks Master Plan fails to recognize that Quimby Act funds are specifically designated for park development and, importantly, may be used for capital improvement of existing parks.

Based on Quimby, Fresno developed its own, more limited version of Quimby, known as Urban Growth Management (UGM). For approximately four decades the City used funding from its UGM program to develop existing neighborhood parks, notably in newer areas of the City where fees were being collected.

Is the UGM program still in effect? Are the funds still being collected for the development of future parks sites? Are the funds being utilized at all for capital improvements to existing parks, re-master planning, etc., which are permissible uses? If funds are not still being collected, what is the primary funding source for development of neighborhood and community parks? If the funds are being collected, are they pursuant to an articulated long-term capital improvement program, and how are they being appropriated? The proposed Parks Master Plan fails to discuss any of this information.

Based on the size of the Draft Parks Master Plan it is apparent that a lot of work went into it. However, review of the Draft reveals that additional study and

discussion are required to provide Fresno with a truly viable Parks Master Plan. We look forward to your response to our concerns, and it is to be hoped, to further public outreach.

Sincerely,

Downtown Fresno Coalition

Joyce Aiken

Celeste DeMonte

Jill Fields

Dianne Hanzlicek

Ray McKnight

LeRoy Milavich

Dixie Salazar

Larry Taylor

Linda Zachritz

Amber Piona

From: Jeremy Clar <jclar440@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2017 2:00 PM
To: Amber Piona
Subject: Parks Master Plan Comments

City of Fresno
Development and Resource Management Department
2600 Fresno Street, Rm. 3065
Fresno, CA 93721

Dear Ms. Piona,

Please accept these comments to the Fresno Parks Master Plan Draft released on October 12, 2017.

First, let me commend the City for drafting a plan that does not shy away from the significant challenges facing the Fresno park system that has been created due to a lack of sufficient spending and lack of will to invest in our city's future. I think of investment in our public spaces as a benefit to every citizen of Fresno, but mostly as an obligation we have to our children to make our city a better place to live. We cannot change the past, and I hope this plan will play a significant role in re-shaping our city's future. I spoke at length with John Gibbs of WRT and found him very knowledgeable, and believe that with proper funding the proposals set forth in the PMP could help to significantly improve our park system.

With that said, there are some concerns, as described below.

1. **Good planning cannot make up for lack of funding.** The plan calls for the first two goals to be (1) funding and (2) maintaining our parks. I hope the City will adopt these goals and commit to improving our greenspaces. Without adequate funding, there is no reason to discuss long term planning as there will be nothing to plan.
2. **Although acknowledging the large deficits of park acreage, the plan insufficiently addresses how to improve such deficits in already developed areas.** The PMP should focus less on new areas of development and more on the present and future core of the city. The development areas described in the PMP (See pg. 35) divide the vast majority of the populated, developed areas of Fresno into four areas, North of Shaw, South of Shaw, Downtown, and BRT corridors, where there are eight development areas. Each area is discussed basically equally, and therefore more effort is spent in the PMP describing undeveloped areas. Why is there not further detail on how to improve parkland in areas South of Shaw with 220,000 people than areas that are either lightly populated or undeveloped, and even when developed, will never have near the population of the established areas? Further, by aggregating such large areas of the city, the data does not indicate smaller regions where the park deficit is likely much worse. Spending undue focus on areas of development where only roughly a tenth of Fresno's population currently live or for that matter, are expected to live should not be the focus of the PMP.
3. **The reliance on the potential use of public schools is not an adequate remedy the lack of adequate parks and should not be the focus of how to remedy lack of park acreage.**
 - a. **The plan to have joint use agreement with public schools was already described in the 1989 parks plan (See e.,g, pg. 22.) but was never put into place.** Recently, there has been an attempt to incorporate school facilities on weekends, it is still very tentative. It begs the question as to if this was such an easy fix and suggested by our currently operative planning document, then why has it not been done already? Is FUSD willing to enter into such agreements, and what are the true costs of re-developing school green spaces to truly be utilized as park space? As an example, the 1989 PMP proposed in planning area 15 to

develop Hamilton Middle School and Fremont Elementary into neighborhood park facilities, after noting that the areas only had .48 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents. (See 1989 plan, pg. 84-85.) Nearly thirty years have passed and nearly nothing has changed.

- b. **Second, and access to school playfields is a poor and limited substitute to additional park space.** They are constrained by their primary use as a school, thereby limiting availability, and it is unclear what other amenities could feasibly be built on school property. By making a chart subtracting school acreage from the additional facilities needed (see PMP pg. 184-85), it creates an appearance that the city is not serious about really addressing the lack of parks, and moreover, is just wanting to apply school acreage as park facilities without investing appropriate effort and resources to enter into long term joint use agreements that would really allow proper recreational use at school facilities. As an example, it shows that 239 acres of school property could be used as park space in areas South of Shaw. The area currently only has 228 acres of actual neighborhood parks. Not only would the inclusion of the school property be greater than the number of actual parks, the city would still need an additional 175 acres to reach its target. From attending meetings, it appears the public is not keen on the use of schools as a permanent solution. At best, this is seen as a stopgap measure.
- c. **Third, the other strategies that WRT set forth for new parkland are really exciting and should be elaborated upon!** (See pg. 203-209.) While I am no expert on demographic shifts, it appears that box retail may be on a permanent decline. More effort should be used to think of redeveloping vacant retail spaces, especially along newly proposed BRT routes, to include recreational spaces. There should be plenty opportunity for acquiring underperforming retail locations in the future. I could see linear parks, pedestrian trails, and mixed use building along the Blackstone corridor. Fresno is also plagued with blighted homes - what about looking into whether the end result of code enforcement actions could provide an opportunity to eminent domain residential parcels that could serve as pocket parks? Ideas like making plazas or linear parks out of streets in dense neighborhoods is a fantastic idea! I would love to see illustrative examples of these and other more "out of the box" ideas.

4. **I believe there is extremely strong interest for recreational trails, such as along railways and the canals.** With some beautification, they could be really an amazing asset. I would like to see the trail system be a higher priority.

Sincerely,
Jeremy Clar
573 E. Terrace Ave.
Fresno CA, 93704
559-681-0517



San Joaquin River
Parkway and
Conservation Trust, Inc.

November 3, 2017

Amber Piona

City of Fresno

Submitted by electronic mail to amber.piona@fresno.gov

**BOARD OF
DIRECTORS**

Bart Bohn
President

Anna Wattenbarger
Vice President

Janice Bissonnette
Treasurer

Julia O'Kane
Secretary

Coke Hallowell
Chairman of the Board

Susan Anderson
Candy Barnes
Karin Chao-Bushoven
Ryan Commons
Debbie Doerksen
Greg Estep
George Folsom
William Golden
Thomas Harmon
Wilma Hashimoto
Tom Holyoke
Ron Manfredi
Elise Moir
Edward B. Morgan
Carol Ann Moses
Lyn Peters
Susan Ryan
Marcia Sablan, M.D.
Frances Squire
Betty Wang-Garcia

Dowling Aaron Inc.
Christopher A. Brown
General Counsel

Sharon Weaver
Executive Director

Dear Ms. Piona:

The San Joaquin River Parkway & Conservation Trust appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Parks Master Plan Public Draft.

The San Joaquin River Parkway was first envisioned as a major amenity to the Fresno-Madera Metropolitan Region in the mid-1980s. As the Parkway started becoming a reality with the purchase of land starting in the mid-1990s and construction of the first mile of the Lewis S. Eaton Trail inside Woodward Park in 1996, the City was a full partner in the effort to create the San Joaquin River Parkway.

Since 2008, the City seems to have moved away from its previous commitment to build a better future for local residents by fully participating in the effort to create the San Joaquin River Parkway. This movement is reflected in the description of the Parkway in the Parks Master Plan as a "related effort" located "adjacent" to City Parks.

In fact, the San Joaquin River Parkway is an amenity desired and heavily used by Fresnoans, and should be central to the Parks Master Plan. Elements of the Parkway such as the Lewis S. Eaton multi-use trail currently exist within City Parks, and creation of the Parkway is the greatest opportunity for new parks and open space that is currently available to the City of Fresno.

We encourage you to renew your commitment to the San Joaquin River Parkway by including it as a critical element of the Parks Master Plan.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,



Sharon Weaver
Executive Director



CREATING AND PROTECTING THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PARKWAY

11605 Old Friant Road • Fresno, California 93730-9701 • 559.248.8480 • Fax 559.248.8474 • www.riverparkway.org



Larry W. Taylor
PO Box 6125
Fresno, CA 93703
taylorlw@sbcglobal.net
CI: 559-779-8666

Amber Piona
City of Fresno
amber.piona@fresno.gov

Friday, November 03, 2017

Remarks, Re:
Fresno Parks Master Plan, Draft

Eaton Plaza

Your plan recommends that Eaton Plaza be "Recommended for Re-Master Plan/Redevelopment". Actually, Eaton Plaza (EP) has been in the planning stage since 1918, for almost 100 years. It underwent very substantial public input and scrutiny and final City Council adoption as Eaton Plaza Master Plan (EPMP) in 2004, with construction of phase 1 of 5 planned phases in 2005-06.

The plan shows removal of both parking lots, one on the east side and one on the west side of the block. In conjunction with the design of the EPMP, the city constructed two (2) parking areas within four (4) blocks of EP. One parking lot was constructed just east of the Amtrak station, consisting of approximately 700 parking spaces, and a multi-level structure was built to house 2,300 vehicles, east of Saroyan Theater. The first lot was subsequently used largely for parking city vehicles, mostly pickups and employee parking by permit. The parking structure is largely unused. These were built, in part, to make up for losing the less than 200 off-street parking spaces that were to be lost at EP. 3,000 spaces to 200 spaces, that's better than a 15:1 ratio. And still the parking lots remain, for the convenience of city employees at the police station and visitors of Superior Court.

The EPMP is consistent with the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan, as shown on the plot plan, page 3:13. That rendering shows the layout of the EPMP. If the State of California building, the Fresno County Superior Court and the Fresno Police Department would allow traffic past their buildings, on what would become Mariposa Street, I am sure the EPMP could be revised to include traffic through there too.

The design of the EPMP cost nearly \$250,000 and phase 1 construction (the Amphitheater) cost \$500,000. The estimated cost for the whole Plan was around \$6,000,000 spread over five (5) phases. Phases 2 to 5 were never completed, however they were planned for and the planning stage was paid for. It seems a waste of money to start this fine project and then stop after it's only 20% complete, and nearly \$1,000,000 has been put into it.

Eaton Plaza was designed as a pedestrian park, for passive enjoyment of city workers, city residents and a signature location for visitors to enjoy, next to the historic Water Tower. With completion of the California High Speed Rail, Fresno should look forward to increased visitor traffic and, therefore, expand its open space in the center of its governmental operations, next to the Visitors' Center and in its City Center. The Eaton Plaza Master Plan is just waiting to be implemented.



FRESNO METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

File 170.27

November 3, 2017

Sophia Pagoulatos
Development and Resource Management Department
City of Fresno PARCS
2600 Fresno St., Room 3065
Fresno, CA 93721

Dear Sophia,

District Comments to the City of Fresno's Draft Parks Master Plan

The District has reviewed the City of Fresno's Parks Master Plan and has the following comments.

On Pages 152-153, there are a few concerns regarding references to District basins. First, there are statements about not fencing the entire basin perimeter, which is contrary to the District's policies and practices. While the District does fence the entire perimeter of its basin sites, access points are also provided. Since District basins fill with stormwater, an unfenced perimeter would allow public access to impounded stormwater, which is a public safety and liability concern.

There are also several concerns related to the graphic on Pages 152-153.

- No perimeter fence is shown on the south side of the basin.
- No fence is shown that separates the low flow (lower floor where water initially collects) and the upper floor. This suggests public access to the low and the impounded stormwater, which the District does not allow.
- During a storm even, the upper floor where soccer fields are shown could get inundated with 10-15 vertical feet of stormwater. Therefore, some of the features shown in the recreation floor would be subject to being submerged during the winter months.
- The District requires a 10-foot wide drive path around the upper perimeter of the basin. It is unclear if vehicle access is provided.
- The graphic suggests some grading work that would create a rolling topography within the basin. District basins are designed to maximize storage capacity and creating an aesthetic topography would decrease the storage capacity of the basin.
- The walkways/viewing piers shown in the low flow would have to be discussed further and could not provide public access to impounded stormwater.

Please address these concerns in the final Parks Master Plan document. While the District is willing to assist the City in providing green space to the community, we cannot allow the

Wprocess\bhs\2017\PARCS master plan comments

Sophia Pagoulatos
Development and Resource Management Department
City of Fresno PARCS
November 3, 2017
Page 2

development of basins sites compromise our policies, operations, or maintenance. If it would be helpful, we could set up a meeting to discuss our concerns further. The current draft of the City's Parks Master Plan gives a false impression of how District basins will be laid out and our intent is to provide a more realistic perspective.

Very truly yours,



Brent Sunamoto
Operations Engineer

BS/mcf

Lisa Y. Flores
1611 North Wishon Avenue
Fresno, California 93704
559-779-3436
lisayflores@aol.com

November 10, 2017

City of Fresno
Development and Resource Management Department
Attn: Sophia Pogoilatos
2600 Fresno Street, Room 3065
Fresno, California 93721

Draft Fresno Parks Master Plan

Thank you for the extend time to review the 2017 Draft Fresno Parks Master Plan due to its unreadability. Here are my comments:

Non-Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act

The Draft Parks Master Plan was not produced in a readable font or size that was readable to the average citizen. The tables and mappings had visual printing errors (i.e. page 169) that diminishes the public ability to read, and comment on the data in a timely manner. It is my recommendation that future documents use Times, so as to lessen issues under the American with Disabilities Act. Also, please let the public know how to obtain large print and alternative languages formats - no one should have to be as insistent as I had to be.

Importance of Regional Parks - Roeding Park

First, as the 114-year-old regional park, Roeding Park is not fully discussed nor analyzed in this document. The draft Fresno Parks Master Plan fails to discuss the historical significance of the past, present, and future of this park. The limited analysis provided within this document consist of an incomplete windshield survey performed in August 2017. This survey does not include monuments, historical structures or nearby aesthetic (i.e. mural) within the park nor mention the lease with Chaffee Zoo (which took out more than 25 acres of prime park space).

Second, there is no biodiversity survey of trees and wildlife that are a major assets to the park system. Nor is there an adequate discussion on the health and maintenance of the largest stand of trees within the city limits. As well as, as the four Swainson Hawks and other mitigatory birds that inhabit the Park. Why?

Third, the document can not substantiate a fair rating of Roeding Park, since the data gather is incomplete and is presented in an erroneous matter. The August 2017 window shield survey was not inclusive of the actual elements of the park and made assumptions of the relationship with Chaffee Zoo that were not substantive in any way within the

document. There are no empirical data sources cited or provided in this document that justifies the statement that most people who go to Roeding Park to go to Chaffee Zoo.

Fourth, there are no adequate discussions regarding accessibility of free parking to those low income park users, and the closure of a vital access gate to Roeding Park for pedestrians. Specifically, the closure of the small gate along Belmont that has been wiled shut. This gate closure now forces park users to walk approximately a quarter mile to enter the park, and worse if you have a disability but no placard.

Finally, there are no multimodal data for park users (i.e. bicycle riders and transit users). Nor are there any discussions about increasing the availability of secure bicycle parking within the park.

Failure to discuss expansion plans for Roeding Park

There is no discussion of the possible expansion of Roeding Park nor is the City willing to discuss this matter. Currently, the City of Fresno is going through the Transformative Climate Communities grant process through the State of California/Strategic Growth Council. Within this grant program, there are planning grants for up to \$250,000.

At the public workshops, the consultants informed the public that the City of Fresno is looking for any and all funding opportunities for parks. Yet, attempts have been made to push forward a proposed grant proposal for a Roeding Park Expansion/Specific Plan through the TCC planning grant process - to no avail. Per the City Mayor office (H. Spees), the City staff is too busy, so how can the City want to seek alternative funding yet not want to address potential projects that would provide a clear path for park growth?

Pricing Policy based on classification of programs and services

The concept of prime time pricing including but not limited to rentals and parking will systematically limit, discriminate, and prevent low income, people of color, the elderly and those with disabilities from participating in the parks system. This is in direct opposition of demographic user information provided in this document. The park system needs to be accessible to all and should not be limited to high income individuals/groups.

The prime time cost formula should not be 125-150% of actual cost, but should be the cost. Also, a sliding scale structure should be implemented to better accommodate low income individuals/groups. This would even out the playing field during prime times usage and would prevent disharmony in the community.

Department Consolidation

Consolidating the functions of Public Works and the Parks Department appears to be a cost savings mechanism, however, this savings should not be lost in any redundant administration and needless upper management staff. My only concern is that the number of new full-time permanent hires should be increased.

Methodology

The actual weekly users of the park (i.e. Roeding) were not given information on the on-line or paper surveys. Thus, the three organized dog play groups at Roeding Park, which represent close to 500 park users could not proactively participate. At no time, has the consultant or the City of Fresno reached out to these groups for input or to solicit their membership for input. Nor were they identified as stakeholders at any point in the development of this document.

Strategies for closing the gaps in Chinatown/Downtown

The lack of parks in the areas of downtown and Chinatown are problematic based on lack of space and the quality of land. The document fails to adequately address the issue of environmental justice with regards to potential/proposed parks located near the vicinity of the railroad lines and highway that border these areas. Especially, since these two areas have had heavy industrial/manufacturing sites with the potential toxicity issues.

In conclusion, I appreciate the opportunity to forward my concerns regarding this document. If you have any questions regarding issues raised in this letter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Lisa Y. Flores

cc: Richard Harriman, Esq.
Joaquin Arambula, Assemblyman - District 31
Esmeralda Soria, Councilwoman - District 1, City of Fresno
Randall Winston, Strategic Growth Council
Ashley Warner, Attorney - Leadership Counsel
Venise Curry, Executive Director, CNCED Fund
United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
Xavier Becerra, CA Attorney General

From: [Mike Ratajski](#)
To: [ParksPlan](#)
Subject: Park Master Plan Comments
Date: Monday, November 13, 2017 8:58:53 AM

I have the following comments:

- "Feedback" on page 169 is illegible
- Need Senior/Community Center in District 1
- District 7: Limited number of urban greening streets?
- El Cap: Only 1 bench, one sign, 4 trash (it's a well used dog park) – reconsider needs
- Mosqueda: Add splash park and benches
- Vinland: Complete existing splash park with play elements
- Holmes: Splash park
- Manchester: Add parking, splash park

Mike Ratajski

Senior Planner

6051 N. Fresno Street
Fresno, CA 93710
(559) 449-2400 ext. 3040 Office
(559) 733-7821 Fax
www.qkinc.com



Comments Received After November 30



**Amber Piona
Long Range Planning
City of Fresno
Parks Master Plan
2600 Fresno Street
3rd Floor
Fresno, CA 93721**

Dear Ms. Piona,

I want to thank you for the opportunity other day to talk about how the sport of Disc Golf could fit into the City of Fresno's Parks Master Plan.

The City of Fresno has had a disc golf course (named: "Legacy Disc Golf Course") at Woodward Park for a little over 14 years. It is a fine course although we have lost about 20 trees in the last five years. However for a city of 500,000 plus citizens, Fresno has only one course, while the City of Visalia has 3 courses and City of Bakersfield has 7 courses. They have found that disc golf courses are very low in initial cost to put in and require almost no additional park grounds maintenance.

I am secretary on the board of "Fresno County Disc Golf" (FCDG). FCDG is 501(c)3 nonprofit organization that was formed to encourage and support the game of Disc Golf in Fresno and the surrounding communities.

We are affiliated with Professional Disc Golf Association (PDGA).

We have identified following locations (although not limited to these) that could be utilized for disc golf courses:

The first is the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District (FMFCD) ponding basin at Ashlan and Hwy 168 (northeast corner of Barton & Ashlan), which is in the City of Fresno.

The second is Kearney Park at 6725 W Kearney Blvd. (Kearney & Grantland, ½ mile south of Hwy 180), which is in the County of Fresno.

The third is Riverbottom Park at 6038 Bluff Ave. (Upstream on the San Joaquin River from Riverside Golf Course), which is in the City of Fresno.

The fourth is Lost Lake Park at 16385 Friant Road (Lost Lake Road & Friant on the San Joaquin River), which is in the County of Fresno.

Other potential course locations could be cohabitating on City of Fresno owned or private golf courses. This has been done in many towns throughout the United States for reasons including, better use of land and to raise additional income.

Another option would be adding a second 18 hole course at Woodward Park. Disc Golf brings in the most consistent income to Woodward Park. Woodward has more acreage than both Mooney Grove and Hart Park that both have two 18 hole disc golf courses.

FCDG is presently working with the County of Fresno to develop an 18 hole disc golf course at Kearney Park.

FCDG would like to work with the City of Fresno (and the FMFCD) to develop a 9 hole course at Ashlan & Hwy 168 (We like the name "Ashlan Pond Disc Golf Course")

FCDG would like to work with the City of Fresno as Riverbottom Park is being developed to include an 18 hole course.

FCDG is in long range discussions with the County of Fresno to develop additional courses at Lost Lake Park and other county parks.

Disc Golf (through the PDGA) is in the process of being considered for the Olympic Games. Also we have had talks with the CIF (the organization that is in charge of all high school sports in California) about disc golf becoming a statewide sanctioned school sport. It is a sport that all students (anyone) can afford to play, all you need are a few discs. And it can be enjoyed at all skill levels.

FCDG is open to any and all ideas that will help include more opportunities for individuals and groups to know the enjoyment of disc golf.

Please inform us as to how FCDG and the disc golfing community can be part of the City of Fresno's Parks Master Plan.

Sincerely,



**Jack Wilkinson
Secretary FCDG
(559) 906-1099**