



## Parks and Recreation Committee

March 21, 2019

To: DPR Dody Erickson  
DPR Mark Tabor,  
City Council  
Parks and Recreation Advisory Board

Review of Game Plan by INC Parks and Rec Committee using the INC Parks and Rec Urban Platform as a guide along with review by the committee.

Thank you for the time and effort that went into creating the Game Plan. Below is our review of the second draft of the Game Plan. We have found in the second review additional items that we believe should be addressed before the final draft is presented to City Council.

---

### General Comments on the Game Plan Document

- Transparency is one of the key issues the committee refers to in all discussions related to DPR and the Denver Park System.
- We believe the Game Plan could be made to be more user friendly. There is a need for editing and being concise, consistent and clear.
  - Example: page 117 Strategy 3.1 Acquire land and build facilities to keep pace with growth and meet 10 minute walk standard and service goals.  
In the explanation “Locating new parks to be walkable and/or connected by transit access will support greater use.
  - Example: page 126 Strategy 3.5 is Ensure a ten minute walk for park and open space for every neighborhood.  
In the explanation it includes “Mayor Hancock is one of 134 mayors who have partnered to support a nationwide campaign for all to live within a 10-minute walk to a high-quality park or open space.”  
*To be concise could these two strategies be combined? And include in the strategies the appropriate underline phrases.*
- We have read through the Game Plan more than once and still are finding inconsistencies with something that has been written in another section.
- The maps are not helpful because of size and lack of landmarks i.e. I-25, I-70 and Pena Blvd.. The landmarks are necessary when looking at equity, access and increasing parkland. The map on page 123 “walking access to parks” is not readable.
-

- A Map of current developments and upcoming developments and future planned areas of development would enhance the ability for residents to understand where there is needed land for future parks.

---

## **INC Parks and Rec Committee's edits for Game Plan draft #1 which were not addressed in draft #2**

Our letter to Denverlight Committee for the Game Plan was the accumulation of input by the INC Parks and Rec committee. In many cases we have not seen changes that we asked for to be addressed. If our suggested changes have been addressed we would like to know where to find the references

Our Requests:

- 1. Define and include the riverbanks and riverbeds, gulches and waterways as Denver park land and develop a time line to designate them as such.
- 2. Identify parkways, boulevards and develop a timeline to designate them as such.

*Designation only mentions Parkways page 160 strategy 5.1, gulches and waterways are mentioned in various strategies but plans for designation is not mentioned. We recognize the designation of Sand Creek, but need more plans for the future of South Platte and its wildlife protection.*

- 3. Develop a transparent and publicly available Parks and Rec. Budget which breaks down the budget to show annual costs of pocket parks, neighborhood parks etc. and includes monies raised by pocket parks , neighborhood park etc. through permitted events including all permits. The ask, open the budget to the public to be able to understand from which fund the department's budget is being spent.

*Page 214 mentions budget as do other pages but no plans appear to be in place to show annual cost or show monies raised by permits associated with parks.*

- 4. Create a consistent and transparent and inclusionary engagement policy which involves the public when exploring new projects, policies or changes.

Page 110-111

Strategy 2.6 Ensure transparency of departmental decision-making for internal and external partners.

*There still seems to be a disconnect about involving the public in policy making and decision making at the beginning in addition to decision-making explanation. It also says in the explanation that "Existing processes are standardized and major decisions usually have a process for public input." What major decisions wouldn't use public input?*

Strategy 2.7 develop capabilities to deepen community and employee outreach and engagement to better understand perspectives.

*These two strategies 2.6 and 2.7 would be a place to reference budget and costs: the financial portion included during community discussion. Finance effect how decisions are made.*

- 5. Create and regularly update a calendar that includes all park permits, permitted picnics, special events and rentals.

*Two mentions of calendars page 108, 168, but not specific to this request.*

- 6. Define nature to include living creatures. Development of habitat that supports, encourages and protects living creatures is critical to a healthy park and green open space. Evaluate and develop a plan to increase living creatures in parks and green open spaces.

*Could not find a definition of nature in the Game Plan. We are aware there is a new partnership with the National Wildlife Foundation to protect and promote wildlife.*

- 7. Change the 3 year plan to a 5 year plan with details of which parks, rec centers, green spaces etc will be the priority.

*Plan states that it will be reviewed and renewed every 3 years however within 20 year breadth that this is for that would require 6 reiterations.*

---

## **Additional requests for edits of Game Plan draft #2**

Page 69 Goal 12

Add **community** to “Broaden system investments and services with allied individuals, agencies and organizations.”

Pages 81 and 84 Strategy 1.2 and 1.4

No mention of **permeable materials** when planning hard scape to prevent/reduce flooding and improve climate friendly projects.

Page 93

Add a policy for owners maintaining the ROWs to be required to apply to the City if changing from open space to hardscaping .

Page 117 Strategy 3.1 Acquire land...and meet 10 minute walk to standard and service goals.

Need to add **and/or transit** which is significant and used in the explanation.

Strategy 3.1

No mention of creating new regional park(s) which are more heavily used and meet more users needs at one time than smaller parks .

Page 126 Strategy 3.5

The quality of the park for a 10 min walk is not established. In the explanation there is reference to **high quality parks**

*Could these two strategies be combined?*

Page 127 Strategy 3.6

Add, create alternative access across major transit corridors and interstate in the explanation

Page 139 Strategy 4.4 ...development of a department-wide foundation to help promote and fund park and recreation improvements

Request: removal of this strategy as it is in competition with various 501 c organizations already raising money for parks and since written the sales tax passed by the citizens give a continuous revenue stream.

Having the foundation under DPR instead of being independent creates a possible conflict of interest for the foundation.

Page 140 Strategy 4.5 Achieve cost recovery

Add, financial record keeping will be available to the public.

Page 143 Strategy 4.10 “Enhance opportunities to utilize golf courses for a variety of functions, events, and experiences consistent with their core function as golf facilities.

DPR owns and operates eight public golf courses. Denver Golf manages the courses as an independent enterprise fund; profits from sales are reinvested directly into golf facilities and services, and the division maintains its own website and communications arm separate from DPR.

...As trends in golf evolve, sustaining Denver's golf courses will require continuing to diversify offerings:

- Complete research on what other courses around the country are doing to diversify revenues and golf course related experiences.
- Market golf course clubhouses for off-season rentals and special events.
- Develop a marketing plan to increase tournaments and outings.
- The existing vision and mission of the courses refers to environmentally sustainable operations—develop an open house for golfers that reviews the courses' commitment to sustainable practices. In order to draw people to the program, personalize it and let golfers know how they can contribute to sustainable practices.
- Offer general recreation programs at clubhouses that can accommodate a group of class participants.
- Monitor demand and use, and consider conversion of selected holes or courses to different park and recreation amenities if demand significantly drops

• **Develop golf courses as learning laboratories for urban agriculture and alternative land uses.”**

*The last bullet bolded should be removed from Strategy 4.10*

*The last bullet point is not consistent with core function as golf facilities and opens the possibility of various non golf uses.*

### **Missing in the Game Plan Draft #2 appendices**

- As of 2019 a listing of waterways gulches parkways and park land not yet designated and an addressed timeline for designation of these park lands

Definition of

- Green Belts
- Open Space
- Green Space
- Parks

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cindy Johnstone". The signature is written in a cursive style and is placed on a light-colored rectangular background.

Cindy Johnstone

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Maggie Price". The signature is written in a cursive style and is placed on a light-colored rectangular background.

Maggie Price Co Chairs, INC PARC

cc. Happy Haynes, INC Executive Committee

Attachments: Denveright Game Plan, Game Plan Golf Course to Mark Tabor