

EL DORADO COUNTY CALIFORNIA
Chief Administrative Office

March 6, 2008

Memo To: Board of Supervisors

From: Laura S. Gill, Chief Administrative Officer

Subject: Update/Request for Direction Regarding Parks Master Plan
(Agenda Item # 24 for March 11, 2008 BOS Meeting)

The Parks and Recreation Element of the 2004 General Plan, through Policy 9.1.1.8, calls for the County to develop a Parks and Recreation Master Plan:

The County shall prepare, implement, and regularly update a Parks Master Plan and Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Program to meet current and future park and recreation needs.

To implement this policy, Measure PR-A calls for the County to “prepare and implement a Parks Master Plan and Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Program.” The master plan is to be adopted within five years of General Plan adoption, or by July 2009.

The FY 2007-08 Budget includes an appropriation of \$150,000 for the completion of a Parks Master Plan. Staff in General Services has prepared a draft Request for Proposals (RFP), provided as Attachment A, which was reviewed and approved by the Parks and Recreation Commission at its meeting of February 7, 2008. In the course of reviewing the draft RFP, I have learned of a number of issues that need input and direction from the Board prior to its release.

As discussed previously with the Board, I have engaged the services of The Houston Group (“consultant”) to help identify sources of State grant funds for the implementation of projects associated with the 56-acre project in South Lake Tahoe. The consultant arranged a meeting with the Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) to discuss possible projects for Proposition 84 funding¹. At that meeting, SNC representatives expressed interest in contributing funds for a County parks master plan that is prepared to address water quality issues. The California Tahoe Conservancy has also expressed interest in contributing funds for a parks master plan.

On February 7, 2008, the CAO Administrative Analyst and I met with two consulting firms to ask questions regarding the preparation of a parks master plan. We asked questions concerning the components of the scope of work and the potential cost of the master plan. We learned that several master plans are either underway or have recently been completed:

¹ Proposition 84, approved by voters on November 7, 2006, provides \$5.4 billion in bonds for projects that promote water safety, rivers, beaches, levees, watersheds, parks, and forests.

- El Dorado Hills Community Services District has completed a master plan for its parks system.
- El Dorado Irrigation District has completed a master plan for the Sly Park Recreation Area.
- The City of Placerville has just hired a consultant to complete its Parks Master Plan.
- In May 2005, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency completed its *Regional Recreation Plan, Recreation Assessment*. This assessment included an assessment of existing facilities, identification of service populations and alternative planning concepts, and recommendations regarding revisions to threshold standards. This document provides much of the background needed to establish a master plan for the Tahoe Basin.²

In addition, given the limited parks inventory that the County currently has available, it is not likely that the County could receive a complete master plan document within the \$150,000 currently available. An additional amount up to \$100,000 may be necessary to complete the master plan. Given the County's current fiscal situation, I cannot recommend appropriating additional funds for the parks master plan at this time.

Given this information, I recommend that the County proceed with efforts to produce a parks master plan using the following approach:

- *Prepare two master plans – one for the West Slope and one for the Tahoe Basin.* Given the efforts already completed within the Tahoe Basin through TRPA, more information is already available on which to base a master plan. Information concerning inventory needs to be further developed for the West Slope. Upon completion of the two master plans, County staff will evaluate and prioritize the needs identified in the plans in order to develop one unified capital improvement plan.
- *Participate with the City of Placerville in its master plan activities to produce a West Slope Parks Master Plan.* I have approached the City Manager about possible participation with the City in its master planning efforts. The City Manager welcomes this approach, as up to three-quarters of the city's recreation users reside outside of the Placerville city limits. If the Board supports this approach, appropriate City and County staff will work together to develop scopes of service to meet the need of each jurisdiction. I would then report back to the Board about the viability of this approach no later than the Board's April 1 meeting.

The City ran a competitive process to select its master plan consultant. The City received two responses to its RFP. Section 7.5 of the County's purchasing policy allows for the Board to contract for services without seeking proposals.

² The TRPA document includes evaluations of County recreational opportunities in Regional Planning Areas #9 - #14, pp. 106-173.

- *Prepare grant application for a master plan that addresses watershed issues.* SNC representatives are interested in helping the County develop a master plan that addresses watershed issues, which would be applicable to the West Slope portion of a parks master plan.

I remain available to answer any questions you may have concerning this report.