Parks & Recreation System Master Plan

PRELIMINARY OPPORTUNITIES ANALYSIS

Building on the Parks and Recreation Commission comments on the geographic analysis, the preliminary opportunities analysis presents this memo and a series of maps and information illustrating potential opportunities for enhancing the park and recreation system through the year 2040. Four opportunities are presented for discussion:

- Opportunity A: Expand the System
- Opportunity B: Connect the System
- Opportunity C: Foster Natural Systems
- Opportunity D: Diversify Recreation Facilities

These four opportunities will be discussed with the Parks and Recreation Commission to provide guidance for the Needs and Opportunities Analysis. The packet includes the City's park and facility inventory matrix and maps in the order they are referenced. The maps are numbered by the opportunity they represent (A-C), except where maps from the previous Geographic Analysis are cross-referenced for comparison (i.e., Map 1B). There is a summary series of "big" questions about key topics at the end of the document.

OPPORTUNITY A: EXPAND THE SYSTEM

The City of Cupertino uses two metrics to measure park land needs: park acreage (level of service) and park access (distance traveled from a home to a nearby park). Both are considered in the discussion of opportunities to expand the park system by acquiring park land.

Park Acreage

The City currently owns or manages 223.5 acres of park land.[1] This means the City provides park land at a level of service of approximately 3.6 acres per 1,000 residents.[2] General Plan Policy RPC-1.2 directs the City of Cupertino to provide a minimum of three acres per 1,000 residents. The City currently exceeds that target. Strategy RPC-1.2.2 recommends exploring increasing the park land standard to five acres per 1,000 residents in this current master planning effort.

[1] As noted in the inventory matrix in the materials that follow, this includes City owned community parks, large neighborhood parks, small neighborhood parks, special use parks and trails corridors. It also includes the school sports fields managed by the City through a joint use agreement with the School District.

[2] As per City estimates, the current population is 62,545 (2015). The future population is estimated at 71,200 (2040 ABAG Projection), as noted in the Demographic Analysis (RHAA, April 2016).

To evaluate acreage needs associated with expanding the park system and to discuss target service levels for the future, Table 1 illustrates acreage needs at 3, 3.6, and 5 acres per 1,000 residents in 2040. Since the City is projected to grow through the year 2040 (increasing by 8,655 residents), more park land (32.8 acres) will be needed just to maintain the existing level of service of 3.6 acres per 1,000 residents. A substantial amount of land (132.5 acres) would be needed to achieve a level of service of 5 acres per 1,000 residents.

*TABLE 1: PARK LAND LEVEL OF SERVICE AND ACREAGE NEEDS IN 2040**

	3 ACRES /1,000	3.6 ACRES /1,000	5 ACRES/1,000
Gross Acres Needed	213.6	256.3	356.0
Existing Park Acres	223.5	223.5	223.5
Net Acres Needed	(9.9)	32.8	132.5

**To serve a population of 71,200.*

To evaluate the feasibility of expanding the park system, Table 2 looks at the role different types of City parks play currently in supporting the existing level of service (LOS). It also notes the existing service level provided by other local serving parks, County parks and regional open space not managed by the City. Finally, it notes the types of parks where the City has planned to expand or has an opportunity to expand in the system in the future.

*TABLE 2: PARK LAND LEVEL OF SERVICE BY PARK TYPE**

	PARK TYPE	EXISTING ACRES (#)	EXISTING LOS (ACRES/1,000)	FUTURE LAND NEEDS
City Parks	Community Parks	85.8	1.4	No new parks anticipated
	Large Neighborhood Parks	66.4	1.1	No new parks anticipated
	Small Neighborhood Parks	6.4	0.1	Acquire more park land (10.5 additional acres as per General Plan)
	Special Use Parks	10.7	0.2	No new parks anticipated
	Trail Corridors	8.7	0.1	Acquire more park land
	School Fields (managed by City)	45.5	0.7	Opportunity to explore additional joint use areas
	Subtotal	223.5	3.6	
Other Sites	Other Local Parks	63.0	1.0	
	County Parks/Regional Preserves	5962.0*	95.3	
	Subtotal	6025.0	96.3	

**The park types and acreage coincide with the Park & Facility Inventory Matrix presented in the packet.*
***County parks and regional open space preserves include acreage both inside and outside the city limits.*

Key Findings

- Other local parks (under private ownership and management) help meet needs beyond what the City provides. With them, Cupertino residents currently have access to 4.6 acres per 1,000 residents.
- The large County park and regional open space add far more park land within the city and just beyond the city limits. City park land guidelines should consider the availability of this acreage.
- Maintaining the joint use agreements with schools is important. If the school sport fields managed through joint use agreements were not available, the City would provide only 2.84 acres per 1,000 residents currently. In the future, there may be an opportunity to expand the joint use agreements to include other schools or additional outdoor recreation spaces at schools. That would help expand the system.
- The General Plan proposed the addition of three new neighborhood parks at 3.5 acres each to serve underserved residential areas. The City has planned additional trail development as well. Given those plans, the City has an opportunity to maintain its existing level of service at 3.6 acres of per 1,000 residents, potentially by providing a mix of more neighborhood park land, trail corridors and expanded school joint use sites.
- If the City wants to increase its park land standard to 5.0 acres/1,000 residents, it will need to prioritize land acquisition. Given other important community priorities, the high cost and low availability of land, and the availability of additional park space provided by the County and other providers, it does not appear that this higher level of service standard is warranted.

Park Access

Map 1 of the geographic analysis evaluated access to neighborhood park facilities, consistent with Cupertino General Plan Policy RPC-2.4. This policy guides the City of Cupertino to ensure that "each home is within a ½ mile walk of a *neighborhood park* or a *community park with neighborhood facilities* (emphasis added)."

The Park and Recreation Commission requested a broader consideration of the types of park space counted in satisfying Policy RPC-2.4. This is important because of the direction it provides in expanding the system of park land.

Opportunity Map A uses Network Analyst Extension[3] to illustrate areas served within a ¼ mile (easy walking distance) and ½ mile (walking or biking distance) of the following types of parks:

- City community parks;
- City large neighborhood parks;
- City small neighborhood parks;
- City special use sites;
- School athletic fields (managed by the City; available during non-school hours);

[3] *ArcGIS Network Analyst* provides network-based spatial analysis tools. It uses a configurable transportation network data model, allowing organizations to accurately represent their unique network requirements (e.g.: determining areas around the parks that fall within a specified distance from the parks along the road network rather than using a simple buffer around the parks without taking the mode of travel into consideration).

- Quasi-public local parks and recreation resources (in private ownership but open for public use), such as Deep Cliff Golf Course, Rancho Rinconada, SCVWD Percolation Pond, Cali Mill Plaza, Town Square, and Cupertino City Center Park; and
- County parks.

The map excludes linear trail corridors (e.g., Saratoga Creek Trail and Don Burnett Bridge) and Midpeninsula Regional Open Space Preserves (e.g., Fremont Older).

The map highlights unserved areas zoned for residential use in yellow:

- Bright yellow illustrates Single Family Residential (R1), Single Family Residential Cluster (R1C), Residential Duplex (R2), Multiple Family Residential (R3), and Mixed Use Planned Development (P) inclusive of residential uses. The R1, R2, R2 and R1C allows for various residential uses with densities ranging from 2.0 to 9.0 dwelling units per acre. The P district allows higher density residential uses within a mixed-use urban setting as densities can vary per district.
- Pale yellow illustrates less-dense Residential Hillside (RHS) areas. The RHS district allows large lot single-family residential development with minimum lot sizes ranging from a half acre to 10 acres in size to accommodate hillside terrain. Residential densities can range from 0.1 to 2.0 dwelling units per acre.

Several of these zoned residential areas are not currently developed, but could be developed over the next 20 years.

This map can be compared to Map 1B[4] from the Geographic Analysis (see map packet) showing access to neighborhood parks and community parks providing neighborhood facilities. Neighborhood facilities were defined as containing play areas and picnic facilities or tables for gatherings.

Key Findings

- There are six opportunity areas to improve park service in denser residential areas. Most are in north Cupertino (Gap areas 1, 2 and 3).
- Homes in the Residential Hillside areas are unserved. There is an opportunity to rethink the provision of park land in RHS areas. Given the lower density of residential development in RHS zones, these homes may not need park land with ½ mile.
- School sports fields managed by the City play a key role in meeting close-to-home park needs. The City could investigate the opportunity to include Lawson Middle School and Sedgwick Elementary in joint use agreements and/or explore the joint development of neighborhood park facilities on land in that area to better serve Gap area 4.
- The City also could investigate the opportunity to expand joint use agreements with School Districts to make play equipment and outdoor sports courts available after school hours. These amenities are not included in current joint use agreements.
- Gap areas 2, 3 and 5 are near proposed trail corridors. If neighborhood park land is not available for acquisition, the City may consider opportunities to provide pocket parks along the trails with play elements (e.g., outdoor exercise equipment or nature play), seating areas and other elements to help address needs.

[4] Map 1B displays all properties with residential zoning that lie outside the ½ mile walking or biking distance to a public park with a play area and picnic facilities. (Map 1A, previously shown but not included here, displayed the unserved residential zoned parcels that are inhabited.)

- The small unnumbered gap south and west of Somerset Park is near a potential trail corridor that is currently being evaluated for feasibility (U.P. Railroad trail). (See Opportunity B.)
- There is an opportunity to define guidelines and minimum requirements for "neighborhood park" and "neighborhood facilities." This will influence the sites considered for acquisition, plus provide direction for park development and partnerships in underserved areas. The following should be considered:
    - Whether the park is open and available during regular park hours.
    - The amenities and facilities provided (e.g., whether the site includes basic amenities such as play features and gathering space).
    - Park size. [Note: RPC-1.2.1 notes the preferred size for neighborhood parks is 3.5 acres. Six existing parks are smaller, with four less than 1.0 acre and one less than 0.5 acres.]
    - Whether the park is owned by the City and/or managed by the City, or is dedicated for public use (versus sites that are not).
    - Whether the park is designed for general, multi-purpose neighborhood or community use (i.e., not a golf course, dog park, urban commercial plaza, trail corridor, open space preserve, or community/recreation building).
- There is an opportunity to explore other options to address needs in unserved areas, such as using street rights of way for permanent or temporary park space and mobile recreation programming and pop-up activities to address neighborhood needs in underserved areas.

OPPORTUNITY B: CONNECT THE SYSTEM

In a well-designed community, homes, parks, schools and other public facilities are connected by safe walking and biking routes. Such routes improve access to parks, connect community destinations, reduce traffic congestion and support recreation and health benefits.

The City of Cupertino has already begun the work of reviewing the existing street network and looking for new opportunities to improve alternative modes of transportation through the construction of Class I Bike Paths, Class II Bike Lanes, Class III Bike Routes and Bike Boulevards and Class IV Protected Bikeways.

- Class I Bike Paths are all-weather, separate off-street rights-of-ways mostly in parks and along natural, utility or transportation corridors. The key element of a Class I bike path is that it is "separated" from street traffic, providing safer conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians. Note that as used in this Master Plan, a Class I designates a bicycle-pedestrian off-street path, but does not necessarily adhere to design criteria for a Caltrans Class 1 path.
- Class II and III Bike Lanes and Bike Routes provide designated on-street areas or shared lane use for bike travel.
- Class IV Protected Bikeways provide on-street bike routes that are buffered from traffic.

Opportunity Map B illustrates existing and proposed pedestrian and bicycle connectivity throughout the City. Proposed routes are based on recommendations in the City's adopted General Plan, the 2016 Bicycle Transportation Plan and the in-process Draft Pedestrian Plan. The map also highlights paths and trails that represent key opportunities to connect parks with multi-use trails and/or Class I paths.

Key Findings

- There are three existing Class I-style bike paths in Cupertino: Don Burnette-Pedestrian Bridge and Homestead Road to Mary Avenue Trail, Stevens Creek Trail and Saratoga Creek

Trail. There are opportunities to better connect these popular multi-use paths to more locations, such as extending the Mary Avenue Trail to Memorial Park.

- An extension of the Stevens Creek Trail southward is planned to connect McClellan Ranch Preserve to Linda Vista Park via a Class I-style bike path, at such time as use of the property becomes available. The City could explore these additional opportunities: 1) connect Linda Vista Park to Stevens Creek County Park in the south; and 2) connect Stocklmeir Ranch to Varian Park to the north, if feasible, which could also provide a safer route to school for Stevens Creek Elementary students. This could ultimately connect Varian Park to the County Park via the Stevens Creek corridor.
- On the south side of I-280, the City is studying the feasibility of implementing a trail along the Junipero Serra Channel. The City could explore options to connect the east end of a Junipero Serra Channel trail to the Saratoga Creek Trail.
- The planned Union Pacific Railroad Trail, if it is found feasible, presents an opportunity to provide better connectivity to adjoining schools, as well as the SCVWD Percolation Pond and proximity to Hoover Park. The City could investigate the opportunity to connect this trail north to Somerset Park which borders the railroad, and then continue and eventually connect to trails on the eastern edges of Rancho Antonio County Park.
- There is an opportunity to extend the proposed Class 1-style path near Wilson Park along Regnart Creek, connecting the Library, City Hall and Community Hall to Wilson Park and Creekside Park. There is an additional opportunity to extend the trail north from Creekside Park, along the Calabazas Creek, to the trail along the Junipero Serra Channel. Depending on the nature of improvements at Library Field and the Civic Center (see Opportunity D), then the City could strengthen the path trail connection from the Library to Cupertino High School.
- Buffered Class IV bike boulevards are proposed on several arterials, which would connect Memorial Park to the Stevens Creek Corridor and to Jollyman Park, as well as the Civic Center and Wilson Park.
- There is an opportunity to connect other parks through transportation improvements to provide Class II or III bike lanes or bike routes.

OPPORTUNITY C: FOSTER NATURAL SYSTEMS

Nature is very important to Cupertino residents. Habitat is also essential to a variety of species in Cupertino. There are numerous species of birds and bats that live in or frequent Cupertino. There are also a wide range of urban animals and wildlife species. The steelhead in Stevens Creek and their habitat are federally protected. Outside the City, additional sensitive species live in the surrounding foothills and along San Francisco Bay.

Cupertino is also located between the Santa Cruz foothills and San Francisco Bay, which are both rich with a diversity of plant and animal life, both resident and migratory. The western edge of Cupertino abuts a series of regional open space preserves with large acreages of intact natural systems and habitats.

In contrast, there is very little habitat in City parks. Most of Cupertino's park system is composed of large manicured turf areas, whether used for programmed recreation or open use areas. Within the City park system, the major stands of existing habitat are limited to seven locations, six of which are in the Stevens Creek Corridor. Habitat areas include the following:

- Stevens Creek Corridor is the richest natural resource area within the City park system given its continuous, riparian nature. Stocklmeir Ranch, Blackberry Farm Golf Course, Blackberry Farm Park, McClellan Ranch Preserve, McClellan Ranch West, and Linda Vista Park all provide habitat and natural resource areas.
- Three Oaks Park has an established tree canopy which covers the entire site and defines the park.
- Adjacent open space preserves and County parks provide significant amounts of habitat.
- Creek corridor lands owned by others, such Saratoga, Calabazas, Regnart and Permanente creeks, provide important habitat and wildlife benefit.

Key Findings

- Most neighborhoods in Cupertino lack access to habitat areas.
- The largest amount of habitat is provided by adjacent open space preserves and County parks.
- Stevens Creek corridor is the primary habitat area within the City park system. There are opportunities to extend and further enhance the Stevens Creek corridor's natural and riparian areas for habitat.
- There are opportunities to enhance the riparian corridors along segments of the Regnart, Calabazas and Saratoga Creeks, as well as along the Junipero Serra Channel and potentially Permanente Creek, to provide habitat corridors through the City to better connect with existing habitat in the foothills and along the Bay. Restoration and habitat enhancement in these corridors will require coordination with other agencies. Removing invasive species, addressing bank erosion and improving water quality and flood capacity would increase the functional aspects of these corridors as well as improve habitat and connectivity to larger natural areas for native species. The opportunities are greater along those sections that connect to and through City parks – such as from City Hall to Wilson and Creekside Parks – and where more continuous sections of habitat are more likely to be achieved and City property can be best leveraged.
- There are more opportunities to foster natural systems by creating pollinator pathways through the City, taking advantage of the rights-of-way along some of the larger arterials to create a gridded network of habitat within the urban core of Cupertino. This can help supplement the riparian corridors which are typically more protected and removed from traffic by providing additional connectivity to habitat to our critical pollinator populations.
- In many cases, the opportune locations to provide natural and riparian areas as well as pollinator pathways overlap with trail corridors; where these coincide are opportunities to provide multi-beneficial corridors which leverage resources and budgets, maximizing the positive impacts of these investments. Some of the proposed corridors involve Santa Clara Valley Water District infrastructure which adds considerable challenge given the complexity of flood control practices and the coordination needed.

Focusing on humans, there are opportunities to make nature more accessible and provide connection to nature for Cupertino residents by removing unused or under-used areas of lawn in City parks and replacing them with pollinator gardens, native plant species and trees with large canopies.

Pollinator gardens attract birds, bees, butterflies and beneficial insects while also providing seasonal and visual interest for residents. Removing under-utilized lawn areas and replacing them with native plants reduces water needs, changes maintenance from frequent mowing and fertilizing to weeding and seasonal trimming, provides people to nature connections throughout the City increasing access both

for the pollinators and people. Pollinator gardens can vary in size – even small areas of native plantings can provide habitat and thereby enrich residents' park experience with nature viewing and connections. Pollinator gardens need shallow areas of standing water for the pollinators. Bird baths or rocks with shallow depressions that are filled frequently by irrigation or manually are important. Water can evaporate during the day and should to avoid vector control issues. Bird houses, bee nesting blocks, vegetation for forage and cover, and protected, non-mulched ground areas for ground-nesting bees should also be included.

Several of the larger parks have the space that would allow for denser native tree plantings to achieve a "forest" in time. "Park forests," in this case, refers specifically to a concentrated native tree planting that establishes a large, contiguous tree canopy. Most of Cupertino's parks are planted with ornamental and non-native species. These native forest "islands" of tree density add to the overall tree canopy, create islands of native habitat refuge and connectivity for species with larger home ranges, and provide additional respite areas for people. In addition to shade, a continuous tree canopy also provides above-ground habitat continuity. While trees have numerous environmental benefits, they also have proven psychological and physical benefits to lower stress, increase productivity, reduce aggression, and generally improve health. Additional tree canopy provides increased habitat for many bird species which again benefits both birds and people; bird watching is one of the fastest growing forms of recreation.

There are opportunities to create or enhance "park forests" at the following City parks:

- Jollyman Park
- Linda Vista
- Three Oaks Park – there is an existing canopy but successional plantings are needed to sustain it as well as there being opportunities to improve the existing park forest

There are opportunities to create pollinator gardens at most City parks including the following:

- Creekside Park
- Wilson Park
- Portal Park
- Library Field
- Jollyman Park
- Three Oaks Park
- Hoover Park
- Memorial Park
- Somerset Park
- Varian Park
- Linda Vista Park
- Monta Vista Recreation Center & Park

Note: while components such as nature play areas and community gardens also engage people with nature, for this discussion they are classified as forms of recreation and are discussed as part of Opportunity D: Diversify Recreation Facilities.

OPPORTUNITY D: DIVERSIFY RECREATION FACILITIES

Cupertino provides a range of recreation facilities in its parks and recreation system. Some facilities are unique and only occur in a single location – such as the Mary Avenue Dog Park – whereas other facilities occur at numerous locations throughout the system – such as playgrounds.

Currently, the City's recreation amenities and facilities are fairly similar across the park system. There is little to differentiate one facility from another. There are opportunities to diversify the recreation facilities to provide a broader range of facilities, more unique facilities and experiences at those facilities and/or facilities that respond to their site, their neighborhood's culture, or other special considerations.

The community, through surveys and meetings, has identified a variety of recreation facility needs. These include but are not limited to:

- Performance/fine art center
- Universal play area
- Dog park
- Nature play area
- Community garden
- Cricket field
- Year-round Pool or indoor/outdoor aquatic facility
- Gymnasium
- Expanded senior center
- Improved Teen center/maker center
- Expanded event space
- Covered picnic shelters or picnic pavilions

There are few opportunities to acquire new land for these facilities. While the City may strive to acquire additional land to meet neighborhood park and trails needs [see Opportunity A: Expand the System], these parcels are likely to be smaller sites and linear corridors. This implies that any desired larger facility would need to be in an existing park, on existing City property or developed jointly with another party, such as the School District.

Most park lands are already developed, so locating a new facility into an existing park may require moving or eliminating an existing facility to provide capacity. Not all parks are suitable for the provision of larger scale specialized or unique facilities, which tend to draw a great level of use. For this reason, Memorial Park is frequently mentioned as an opportunity for these new facilities. Memorial Park, being centrally located and with reuse potential of the existing concrete pond, has the capacity to absorb some new facilities but not everything proposed. Examining the existing parks and recreation system for potential locations for these new facilities reveals some clear opportunities and areas for discussions about trade-offs.

Key Findings:

- Several factors should be considered in planning and distributing specialized facilities. A market study and feasibility analysis would help identify the size, amenities and potential locations for major facilities such as a performing arts center or aquatic facility. These studies would take into account factors such as revenue-generating options and operational needs that, in part, would drive space requirements and siting needs.
- Memorial Park is a civic core park facility. It has the capacity to accommodate other facilities that complement existing uses and increase the usability of the park. Per an agreement with DeAnza College, this site also offers nearby parking for large group use. One of Memorial Park's main functions is as the City's large event venue. Improvements could be made to this site to improve functionality for events, improve the amphitheater and enhance opportunities for

indoor/outdoor events. A performing or fine arts center could be provided as an expansion of the Quinlan Community Center to provide a mid-size theater and additional program/meeting space, maximizing the staffing and oversight that already exists at this location. Expanding the existing senior center to include fitness space would keep programs focused there. There is an opportunity to provide a universal play area at Memorial Park. A pool, depending on size and programming needs, could be added to Memorial Park or Sports Center. However, there are nearby (non-city) pools in this part of the city, and the pool size/footprint would likely need to be larger than the space available given other existing and proposed uses for these sites.

- Library Field is under-utilized as a cricket field, and a larger space for a full-size cricket field is needed. Relocating cricket to a better sized location would both improve cricket play as well as open the Library Field space for other uses. Any new uses should be consistent with the community function of this area as a civic center and event space, recognizing planned changes addressed in the Civic Center Master Plan. There may be an opportunity to provide an indoor facility to provide a maker/incubator space and additional community meeting and programming space at Library Field. This move would build on library use for teen programs and programs for all ages, plus address the lack of programming space at Community Hall. Relocating cricket to another site such as Jollyman, Wilson or Creekside Parks might allow for an improved facility that is sized appropriately for youth and adult play. However, existing soccer and/or ball fields would be displaced, and programming at other fields may need to be modified to accommodate some of the displaced use. A study is being initiated this fall by Public Works to evaluate feasible locations for a full-size cricket field.
- A fenced off-leash dog park (or a dog run, which is a smaller neighborhood-friendly version of a dog park) could be located in a variety of locations throughout the City. This includes opportunities such as using open lawn areas that are not active sport fields at various city parks.
- Nature play areas could also be incorporated into almost any park with existing play areas, either as an additional form of play or as a replacement of existing play equipment as it needs replacing. As nature is expanded in parks, the City should consider adding nature play in at least a few locations. Pilot projects are an effective way to test options for new amenities and facilities. The city may want to test nature play options at one site before incorporating them into additional play areas.

QUESTIONS ABOUT PRELIMINARY OPPORTUNITIES

This memo raises the following questions for discussion by the Parks and Recreation Commission:

- Should the City strive to maintain its existing level of service (3.6 acres per 1,000 residents) as the population grows? (See Opportunity A: Expand the System)
- Should the City expand the system by focusing on neighborhood parks, trails and increased partnerships with schools? (See Opportunity A: Expand the System)
- Are parks needed with ½ mile of homes in Residential Hillside zones? (See Opportunity A: Expand the System)
- Should General Plan Policy RPC-2.4 be interpreted to refer to any City, County or privately managed park or school recreation area that is open to the public for use—regardless of what facilities are provided? (See Opportunity A: Expand the System)
- Does the City need acquisition/design guidelines for neighborhood parks to identify minimum size and facility needs? (See Opportunity A: Expand the System)

- Should the Master Plan expand on what's noted in the 2016 Bicycle Transportation Plan to emphasize bike/pedestrian connections that will 1) maximize access and connections to major parks and recreation facilities; 2) support recreational uses? (See Opportunity B: Connect the System)
- Should the City strive to incorporate and restore habitat and native plantings in 1) all parks; 2) parks along pollinator, habitat or riparian corridors; 3) additional riparian corridors; or 4) all of the above? (See Opportunity C: Foster Natural Systems)
- What are the best "big moves" for Memorial Park? (See Opportunity D: Diversify Recreation Facilities)
- What are the best "big moves" for Library Field, if any? (See Opportunity D: Diversify Recreation Facilities)
- Is the City more likely to support several big projects, lots of smaller enhancements or a mix of large and small options? (See Opportunity D: Diversify Recreation Facilities)