

## BPR Commission Commentary on Proposed Master Plan

### Pertinent Background

On 06/02/99, the Council adopted the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. The plan was site-specific, and prepared by a committee made up of residents, the Parks and Rec Commission, the Golf Committee, the San Clemente Youth Advisory Committee, the San Clemente Task Force for Youth, and city staff. The only out of pocket expense was for the random phone survey conducted by Research network LTD.

On 02/10/15, the BPR Commission – at the request of City Council and the BPR Department – established a BPR Master Plan Sub-Committee to begin the process of updating the 1999 Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Members were appointed.

On 04/14/15, the BPR Commission dissolved the BPR Master Plan Sub-Committee (the Department advised that “due to pending large projects and changes occurring in the City,” the master plan process would be delayed one year).

On 03/09/16, the City issued an RFP calling for a professional update to the 1999 Parks and Recreation Master Plan which fully addressed “beaches, parks, recreation and golf.”

On 04/12/16, Pros Consulting submitted a proposal which promised to cover open space planning, beach use, trails and golf course facilities. The proposal promised bilingual community outreach, multiple presentations to the Commission, and complete integration with the Centennial General Plan and the 1999 Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

On 06/14/16, the BPR Commission approved the Department’s selection of Pros Consulting.

On 07/05/16, the Council approved and authorized retention of Pros Consulting “to update the 1999 Parks and Recreation Master Plan”

On 10/24/17, the BPR Commission received its first presentation on the updated Master Plan. This was the one and only time that a Pros Consultant appeared before us. Following review of the first draft, the Commission made significant substantive recommendations.

On 11/14/17, the BPR Commission reviewed a second draft of the Master Plan. Commissioners voted to include 24 changes to the document.

On 12/12/17, the BPR Commission reviewed a third draft of the Master Plan. Commissioner voted to include 57 changes to the document.

On 01/09/18, the BPR Commission reviewed a fourth draft of the Master Plan. Commissioners noted that the majority of prior recommendations were not incorporated in the new version. Commissioners voted to re-adopt all prior recommended changes, as well as 24 new changes.

On 02/13/18, the BPR Commission received for review the same fourth draft. Commissioners were advised that Pros Consulting would not include changes/additions voted on by the Commission, or respond to Commissioner concerns, because “they were either not revealed as priorities through the statistically valid portion of the master plan process, not included in the scope of work, or not recommended by Pros Consulting.” No action was taken on the Master Plan; instead, Commissioners voted unanimously to memorialize our concerns in writing for Council’s consideration.

*BPR Commission Concerns with Pros’ Proposed BPR Master Plan*

1. The proposed plan does not include a **beach element**
  - a. The RFP called for inclusion of a beach element;
  - b. Pros’ said in its proposal it would address beaches;
  - c. The Executive Summary makes passing reference to beaches;
  - d. The updated Master Plan is supposed to integrate with the Centennial General Plan, which includes a beach element;
  - e. The updated Master Plan is supposed to update the 1999 Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which contained a beach element;
  - f. San Clemente has 10 beaches;
  - g. The BPR Commission specifically asked for a beach element, or to remove reference to beaches.
  
2. The proposed plan does not include a **golf element**
  - a. The RFP called for inclusion of a golf element;
  - b. Pros’ said in its proposal it would address golf;
  - c. The Executive Summary makes passing reference to golf;
  - d. The updated Master Plan is supposed to integrate with the Centennial General Plan, which makes reference to golf;
  - e. The updated Master Plan is supposed to update the 1999 Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which contained a golf element.
  
3. The proposed plan does not include a **beach trails element**
  - a. Pros’ said in its proposal it would address trails;
  - b. The updated Master Plan is supposed to integrate with the Centennial General Plan, which makes reference to trails;
  - c. The updated Master Plan is supposed to update the 1999 Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which contained a trails element;
  - d. The BPR Commission specifically asked for a trails element (beach trail + access arteries).
  
4. The proposed plan does not include an **open space element**
  - a. Pros’ said in its proposal it would address open spaces;
  - b. The Executive Summary makes passing reference to open spaces;
  - c. The updated Master Plan is supposed to integrate with the Centennial General Plan, which makes reference to open spaces and amenity development/acquisition;

- d. The updated Master Plan is supposed to update the 1999 Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which discussed open spaces;
  - e. The BPR Commission specifically asked for an open spaces element.
5. The proposed plan does not include enough **community input**
  - a. Pros obtained input from approximately 1.5% of the community (see 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 2.1.2 fig.2, 3.2.1, 3.3).
  - b. The 1999 Parks and Recreation Master Plan was based on input from approximately 9.2% of the community.
6. The proposed plan does not include enough of our **Spanish-speaking residents**
  - a. Hispanics account for nearly 20% of San Clemente's population (pg. 20, fig. 5);
  - b. The "statistically-valid" survey was not offered in Spanish;
  - c. The on-line "SurveyMonkey" survey was not offered in Spanish;
  - d. The "caught in the act" surveys were not conducted in Spanish;
  - e. A Spanish interpreter was present during the second and third community workshops, but neither workshop had significant attendance (see 1.2.2).
7. The proposed plan does not fairly **weigh the responses**
  - a. Pros developed its priority rankings based 60% on its "statistically valid survey" (see 1.7), but that survey had only 496 respondents. There is no indication as to the number of surveys actually sent out, how recipients were selected, which recipients were followed up with, and whether any of the recipients requested the survey in a language other than English.
  - b. Pros set its priority rankings based on only 40% of the aggregate responses from the 24 stakeholders (1.2.1), 140 community workshop attendees (1.2.2), 361 online survey takers (3.3), and an undisclosed number of responses to the "caught in the act" interviews and website submissions (3.1.3, 3.1.4).
8. The proposed plan does not address **ocean activities** (surfing, swimming, SUP, etc)
  - a. These activities were not included in the market potential key findings (see 4.2.3);
  - b. There is no substantive discussion of these or any beach/ocean activities because the proposed plan all but ignores our beaches and ocean.
9. The proposed plan does not adequately address **skateboarding**
  - a. Residents desire more skateboarding amenities (see 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.11.1, 2.2.1, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.3.1);
  - b. The proposed plan does not include any substantive discussion of this;
  - c. Skateboarding was not included in the market potential findings (see 2.2.1, 4.2.3);
  - d. Pros refused to include in the proposed plan this Commission's unanimous findings that we should be open to exploring possible skateboarding

amenities at Forster Ranch Community Park, Pico Park, and San Gorgonio Park.

10. The proposed plan does not adequately address **dog beach**
  - a. There is a strong public desire for a dog beach (see 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3.4, 1.7.1, 1.11.1, 3.1.2, 3.2.5, 3.2.8, 3.3.1, 4.5.1, 6.4.1);
  - b. The proposed plan does not include any substantive discussion of this, or even a suggestion for an appropriate location.
  
11. The proposed plan does not adequately address **off-leash dog options**
  - a. There is a strong public desire for more off-leash dog options (see 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3.4, 1.7.1, 1.11.1, 3.1.2, 3.2.5, 3.2.8, 3.3.1, 4.5.1, 6.4.1);
  - b. The proposed plan does not include any substantive discussion of this;
  - c. Pros refused to include in the proposed plan this Commission's unanimous findings that we should be open to exploring possible off-leash areas at Bonito Canyon Park, Forster Ranch Community Park, Linda Lane Park, San Gorgonio Park, Tierra Grande Park, and Verde Park.
  
12. The proposed plan does not adequately address **pickleball**
  - a. Pros acknowledged a growing interest in pickleball (see 1.2.2, 1.11.1, 3.1.2, 3.3.1);
  - b. Pickleball was not included in the market potential findings (see 2.2.1, 4.2.3);
  - c. Pros refused to include this Commission's unanimous findings that we should be open to exploring possible pickleball amenities at Liberty Park, San Gorgonio Park, San Luis Rey Park, and Verde Park.
  
13. The proposed plan does not fairly assess, or substantively discuss, **lawn bowling**
  - a. San Clemente's largest age segment is the 55+ group, at 30.5% (see 2.1.2, fig. 2);
  - b. Pros acknowledged a continued interest in lawn bowling (see 1.2.2);
  - c. Lawn bowling was not included in the market potential findings (see 2.2.1, 4.2.3);
  - d. Pros did not evaluate the lawn bowling facility, which users describe as disheveled and in need of substantial repairs.
  
14. The proposed plan does not adequately address **BMX riding**
  - a. Pros acknowledged a growing interest in BMX riding (see 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2);
  - b. BMX riding was not included in the market potential findings (see 2.2.1, 4.2.3);
  - c. There is no discussion of possible locations for a BMX riding option.
  
15. The proposed plan does not fairly connect to the **Capital Improvement Plan**
  - a. The RFP indicated that the updated master plan should connect to the CIP;
  - b. Pros' said in its proposal it would connect its findings to the CIP;

- c. The proposed plan is supposed to integrate with the Centennial General Plan, which makes reference to the CIP;
- d. Pros recommends \$2 million in repairs at Richard T. Steed, despite its separate findings that “amenities are in good to excellent condition” and that softball is apparently a low priority in San Clemente (see 1.7.1, 1.7.2, 2.2.1, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.3.1, 4.2.3);
- e. Several Commission recommendations to move or remove items from the proposed CIP Action Plan were disregarded (compare 12/12/17 Minutes to final draft).

16. The proposed plan does not address the City’s **special use parks** (Community Center, Ole Hanson Beach Club, Courtney’s Sandcastle, Park Semper Fi), despite a call for such in the Centennial General Plan.