

Agenda Item: ID18-0126 (4:00 P.M.)

Date: 1/25/18

REC'D JAN 24 '18 PM 1:22  
FRESNO CITY CLERK

# FRESNO CITY COUNCIL



## Supplemental Information Packet

Agenda Related Item(s) – ID18-0126 (4:00 P.M.)

**Contents of Supplement: Letter from Lisa Flores**

### Item(s)

**File ID 18-0126 (4:00 P.M.)** - CONTINUED HEARING to consider Plan Amendment Application No. A-17-016, and related environmental finding filed by the Development and Resource Management Department Director pertaining to the Parks Master Plan as follows:

1. **ADOPT** Environmental Assessment No. A-17-016 a Mitigated Negative Declaration dated November 14, 2017;
2. **RESOLUTION** – Adopting the Parks Master Plan and Approving Plan Amendment Application No. A-17-016, amending the narrative of section 5.1 and the language of policy POSS-1-a, of the Fresno General Plan, Parkland Standard, to reflect the Parks Master Plan

### **Supplemental Information:**

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed. The Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office, 2600 Fresno Street, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2)). In addition, Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2600 Fresno Street. Supplemental Packets are also available on-line on the City Clerk's website.

### **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):**

The meeting room is accessible to the physically disabled, and the services of a translator can be made available. Requests for additional accommodations for the disabled, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or translators should be made one week prior to the meeting. Please call City Clerk's Office at 621-7650. Please keep the doorways, aisles and wheelchair seating areas open and accessible. If you need assistance with seating because of a disability, please see Security.

January 24, 2018

**VIA EMAIL TRANSMISSION AND HAND DELIVERY**  
**[yvonne.Spence@fresno.gov]**

Honorable Esmeralda Soria  
Councilmember, District 1  
2600 Fresno Street  
Fresno, California

Re: City of Fresno Parks Master Plan (FPMP)

Dear Councilmember Soria:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Final Fresno Parks Master Plan (FPMP), in regard to the impact to Roeding Park, a 114-year-old regional park located in District 3.

After reviewing the Roeding Park Facilities Plan referenced in the FPMP, I have identified the following issues which must be addressed before the Plan can be approved by the City Council:

1. Due to the elimination of the Golden State Boulevard entrance [resulting from the development of the High Speed Rail (HSR) Project and the reduced access from the Belmont Avenue entrance], the traffic circulation analysis must be reconsidered, due the lack of the continuity of traffic paths, accessibility, and levels of service.
2. The construction of a nine-acre paved parking lot in the middle of the park is in direct opposition to the proposed Final FPMP. The City has well documented the lack of green open space for its population. It is inconsistent with the City General Plan Open Space Element requirements to convert acreage from green space to a parking lot. Therefore, given the close proximity of Roeding Park to the additional population in the new and proposed high-density multi-family housing in the downtown area, there will be a significant lack of active and passive open space/Parks, as required by the City General Plan.
3. The usage of "test concepts" was never adequately reviewed by the public. For instance, the Dog Park was a "new test concept;" but, actually, it was a relocation of an existing dog park. The approximately 500+ dog park users were never provided adequate notice of an opportunity to provide input on these "test concepts". The subsequently relocated Dog Park has a major design flaw, including the lack of mature trees and other amenities. In fact, the public representation of the **relocation** as a "test concept" is deceptive, when it was a relocation and or mitigation due to the expansion of the Fresno Chaffee Zoo.
4. The Roeding Park Facility Master Plan does not meet the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Guidelines definition of a specific, area, or community plan. In December 2017, the City Planning Department provided an updated mapping of the Facilities Master Plan which includes a vacant lot and water basin located to the south of Belmont Avenue, outside of the boundary of Roeding Park. According to the City of Fresno's GIS system, the landowner is not designated on any mapping, and is also included in the Downtown Community Plan.

Neither I, nor the public, has been provided with documentation addressing the issue of how the drainage basin can be included in or considered part of Roeding Park. Also, there is no information or resolutions, or other documentation regarding the transfer of title to, or right to use, the lot south of Belmont Avenue. Therefore, it is unclear how the drainage basin located outside of Roeding Park can properly be included in the Final FPMP without such information and/or documentation.

5. Likewise, in view of the apparent need for off-site parking for Roeding Park and the Fresno Chaffee Zoo, as discussed in paragraph 2 above, the Final FPMP should also include an update on the amount of additional on-site parking that is actually required in Roeding Park for the 14-15 days a year when over-flow crowds may require it. Since the Roeding Park and Chaffee Zoo Master Plan amendments and EIR adopted and certified in 2011 required the Zoo to prepare and a Parking Management Plan (PMP), which has not yet been prepared, the City, as the monitoring agency for the preparation of the PNP is required to include it in the Final City FPMP for review by the public.

With 20 years State and federal level transportation planning experience, as well as community outreach, the solution I propose to the City of Fresno is to: (1) Postpone final approval of the parks master plan; (2) Direct staff to clear up the inconsistencies and to bring back a document that complies with the legal requirements set forth above; and (3) provide for additional public input.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Y. Flores

cc: Richard L. Harriman, Esq. [harrimanlaw1@sbcglobal.net]  
Yvonne Spence ([yvonne.spence@fresno.gov](mailto:yvonne.spence@fresno.gov))