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Recommendations & Action Plans
5.1 Overview of Recommendations

Recommendations were derived from community input including stakeholder interviews, community workshops, intercept surveys, statistically valid surveys, pop-up outreach, and staff interviews. The recommendations were also informed by the Level of Service (LOS) analysis, geographic gap analysis, and funding considerations.

The following discussion describes ways to increase LOS, equitable distribution, and the quality of the parks and recreation system. This is accomplished through adding and enhancing amenities, as well as a commitment to partner with private development and schools to lower the deficiencies and geographic distribution of neighborhood and community parks. Expanding recreational programs or partnerships with those that could deliver programs, is also important in order to provide access to services. It is equally important to look at improving organizational efficiencies, and augmenting financial opportunities and staffing for the division under Public Works.

The following recommendations for providing park and recreation experiences are listed in order of priority for helping to meet future demand for park facilities, as well as equitable distribution of amenities and access to these facilities and potential programs that may or may not be offered in current situations:

5.2 Recommendations for Meeting Population Based Standards for Park, Amenities and Programs

The first five goals (and their supporting objectives) are focused on meeting the quantity of parks available to the public based on current and future populations. Parks standards are not only about the quantity of parks, but also about the equitable distribution of these facilities and the ability of the public to access these facilities. As stated in the General Plan Open Space Policy 6.2—“To the extent feasible, park and recreation facilities shall be equitably distributed throughout the city to serve the various neighborhoods and all socioeconomic segments of the city’s population. Particular emphasis shall be placed on provision of new park and recreation facilities in areas that are under-served”.

5.2.1 Recommendation Goal 1: Maximize active park acreage on public land without disturbing passive natural area.

The city has major surplus of open space, but also some deficiency in active parks. This is partially due to inaccurate park categorization. Some neighborhood parks only have a small portion of active functions and the rest remain passive natural area, while some neighborhood open spaces do have a some flat lawn space with high infill potential for new parks. This two-way transformation between parks and open space is more like a specification of open land form. Goleta’s park system can benefit in the long run in that more potential parkland is identified without changing the form and nature of existing passive open space.

Objective 1.1 Re-categorize active parks and passive open spaces.

Detailed desktop inventory and measurements were done to specify and separate areas with playground and other existing park facilities versus passive unimproved natural areas. Three parks are suggested to be split or re-designated as parks. Number 1 through 3 in Figure 5-1 point out these areas.

Objective 1.2 Identify infill opportunities in open spaces for future population.

Goleta’s residents take pride in the rich open space provision within the city, and want the existing open space to remain mostly undeveloped. However, under the current categorization, not all the open spaces are entirely natural undeveloped areas. Some have flat space which presents infill opportunities and may already been used as multi-purpose fields. Three open space areas have been suggested to be made in neighborhood parks with the potential for infill of passive or active amenities. Number 4 through 6 in Figure 5-1 point out these areas.
Figure 5-1: Reorganize active parks and passive open spaces; Infill opportunities within existing parks and open spaces
San Miguel Park is currently categorized as a neighborhood park, while it is mostly unimproved natural land. Its available active space has a playground, a swing set and a multi-purpose field. It should be divided into 0.75-acre mini park and a linear open space along the creek.

Winchester Park is currently categorized as a neighborhood park, but it is mostly passive open space. Its available active space has a playground and a multi-purpose field. It should be divided into 0.32-acre mini park with the rest of the park remaining as open space.

Santa Barbara Shores Open Space is currently categorized as a neighborhood open space. Although it is mostly vegetated natural land, it has a small active area with a playground, a swing set and a multi-purpose field. It should be divided into 0.83-acre mini park and a linear open space with a dirt trail.

Brandon Park is a neighborhood open space under current categorization. Although it is mostly vegetated natural land, it has a small and relatively flat space. It should be divided into 0.4-acre mini park and an open space with a dirt trail. This mini park can also serve as a great connection between Brandon Drive and the two cul-de-sacs.

Stonebridge Open Space is currently categorized as a neighborhood open space. Although it is mostly vegetated natural land, it has a relatively flat area. It can be divided into 1.6-acre neighborhood park with some mature trees and a linear open space along San Pedro Creek.

Oro Verde Park is currently categorized as a neighborhood open space. The portion framed by Cambridge Drive and Via Salerno is a relatively flat and square space with sparsely distributed trees which is perfect for a 2.1-acre neighborhood park that alleviates local active park gaps.
5.2.2 Recommendation Goal 2: Consider publicly funded parklands to meet deficiencies.

The city should consider the addition of publicly funded parkland to meet park acreage deficiencies. Figure 5-2 indicates a number of city or county lands that do not have major investments on them and that could be considered for future park development. This figure also shows privately held lands that have been designated for open space. If these are not resource based sensitive lands, then these areas could be considered for park development, including publicly accessible open space, dog parks, mini-parks or a natural resource based park with trails and educational/interpretive amenities associated with them.

Objective 2.1 Focus on identifying a potential park site in areas where a park equity gap currently exists. First focus on under-served areas.

The first metric or approach for new park development is to place park facilities in the part of town where existing geographic gaps exist in terms of proximity of parks to existing populations. This is particularly important for neighborhood parks in areas where the demographics indicate higher densities, families and overall shortages of services for under-served populations and disadvantaged communities.

Objective 2.2 Focus on identifying potential park sites in areas where major growth is likely to occur and where undeveloped land could be dedicated for public use as required as a condition of project approvals.

The second metric or approach should be used to identify where major increases in future populations are planning to be allowed. Future populations may result in an overall deficiency in future park standards, so it would be logical to place new parks in these areas. This should be the first metric to be used for new parklands. Where possible, future development should be used to fund and construct facilities directly. But if the development occurs in a park poor area, then it is logical to combine the resources provided by the new development with those of the city to identify new parkland. Often, developers are willing to provide parklands that they dedicate to the city. Having parks very near their new development is often a selling feature for housing buyers. In some cases, the park demand from the new population may warrant the project to fully develop the park using their own financial resources. However, state law only allows the city to insist on park investments commensurate to the development’s fair share of any existing deficiency.

Objective 2.3 Focus on identifying park sites in areas where the City of Goleta currently owns undeveloped or under-developed lands.

This third metric or approach should be used to identify potential parklands when the first two methods have not identified enough lands to meet deficiencies. A review of all undeveloped or underdeveloped lands owned by the City of Goleta should be identified and determined if they are in the right location for parklands and if this use is compatible with other departmental needs. Having the ownership of the land can dramatically decrease park development costs.

Objective 2.4 Focus on identifying a potential park site in areas where lands are undeveloped and where the current land use or zoning designation is in a category that is fully served and where future demand is not likely to need these lands for future projects.

This fourth approach can be used to find parklands using or purchasing privately owned lands that may not be as expensive as other undeveloped lands in the city. A review of all undeveloped lands, especially in those areas where the current demand of land uses is being fully met should be identified. A review of future development trends may indicate the amount of available land for specific land uses is in excess of projected demand existing in some areas where a park deficiency is most acute.
Figure 5-2: Potential Public Land Opportunities for New Parks
1. This city-owned parcel is adjacent to the existing Deckers Park, a privately owned park located near the airport. The parcel is 2.3 acres in size and currently occupied by a corporation yard, but almost half of the space remains undeveloped. This land opportunity makes potential expansion of Deckers Park possible, although it depends on further study and cooperation with the developer of Deckers Park.

2. With the new residential development near Los Carneros Road, an increased demand for parks and recreational facilities in this “park-poor” area will occur. The 1.1-acre city-owned vacant land at the corner is perfect for a new neighborhood park to serve this area.

3. This county-owned parcel is currently a linear natural area along the San Pedro Creek that is unimproved. It is adjacent to the existing Stow Tennis Courts, which is a community park. This is a good opportunity for a dirt trail along the creek bank to connect Stow Canyon Rd and Covington Way, although further study and coordination with the county would be needed to test feasibility.

4. This county-owned parcel is adjacent to Calle Real and a retail complex. The 1.1-acre vacant land at the corner is perfect for siting a neighborhood park to serve this “park-poor” area.
5.2.3 Recommendation Goal 3: Develop and implement Joint Use Agreements (JUA)/Memorandum of Understandings (MOU) with schools districts for use of amenities on school sites.

Schools are well distributed around the city and contain open space and amenities that work well for park and recreation requirements. Although the funds for schools and parks are distinctively different, they are all based on tax payer or user fees from the public. Potential joint use of facilities is the first area that should be explored for helping to fill in park gaps or amenity deficiencies.

**Objective 3.1 Look for opportunities to create partnerships with schools.**

The City should partner with the Goleta Union School District and the Santa Barbara Unified School District through MOUs or JUAs to provide open space and use of school facilities for the community during after-school hours. The City should ensure that all future partnerships are accurately documented in a signed partnership agreement.

**Objective 3.2 Work with school districts to develop neighborhood parks at local schools.**

Provide additional leisure opportunities for residents through the development of school sites for community use during after-school hours. The use of school property as neighborhood parks would reduce the need to purchase and build new recreation facilities. Figure 5-3 indicates schools that are in or near the areas where geographic gaps for parks exist.

These include:

- 1. Brandon Elementary (Goleta Union)
- 2. Ellwood Elementary (Goleta Union)
- 3. Kellogg Elementary (Goleta Union)
- 4. La Patera Elementary (Goleta Union)
- 5. Goleta Valley Junior High and SB Charter School (S.B. Unified)
- 6. Dos Pueblos High (S.B. Unified)

**Objective 3.3 Foster discussions and agreements that are mutually beneficial for both sides and that roles and responsibilities are defined for each organization.**

Partnerships benefit both sides of the providers and users. For an agreement to be sustainable or even agreed upon, both sides need to be willing to give in order to get the benefits. The public will benefit from neighborhood-close facilities that were paid for by taxpayers, the school can obtain benefit from assistance in capital costs and or maintenance costs, and the City can benefit from meeting their obligations on providing recreational experiences for their citizens. The best items to focus on may be either assistance for adding capital investments or assistance for their maintenance requirements, depending on the school’s priorities. Increased maintenance may result from increased use of their lands, so maintenance responsibilities to assist or take over on all maintenance of the shared facilities is a common approach.

Investments in facilities that a have a dual use for students during school hours and the general public in after school hours are better items to focus on for the City of Goleta to try and fund. Playgrounds make sense for elementary schools, while sports fields and court sports make the most sense for middle schools and high schools.

Security and liability are two important aspects to address in all joint use agreements. All schools could benefit from increased security. If the district is already trying to improve controlled access to their school grounds, then perhaps the city’s investment in gate requirements and automatic locking technologies could help them along in the process. Or the commitment for City staff to help monitor and secure the facilities during after school hours may also be part of an agreement. Generally, the more eyes on the park resulting from afternoon and weekend uses, the less likely that damaging or unsafe activities will occur. Finally, improved access through gates, trails and walkways benefit school users for improved walking and biking access to the schools, as well as the general public’s access to these facilities. Creative thinking and communications are important for reaching agreements. A win-win with a give and take will be the only way an agreement can be reached and sustained into the future.
Figure 5-3: Expanding Park Distribution and Acres through Joint Use with Local Schools
Two areas exist at Brandon Elementary for joint use; area 1 = 2.24 acres & area 2 = 1.93 acres

One area exists at Ellwood Elementary School for joint use; area 3 = 2.50 acres

One area exists at Kellogg Elementary School for joint use; area 4 = 4.88 acres

One area exists at La Patera Elementary School for joint use; area 5 = 4.62 acres

One area exists at Goleta Valley Junior High School for joint use; area 6 = 6.51 acres

One area exists at Dos Pueblos High School for joint use; area 7 = 26 acres
Objective 3.4 Find an amenity that both the school district and the city have a need for and use that as the basis for an agreement.

The elementary schools of the Goleta Union and Santa Barbara School District could be sources of needed park amenities for the community. Table 5-1 summarizes numbers of different types of facilities by each public school within the city. The school district may be in need of funding for weekend security and ongoing maintenance. These two factors could be a source of common ground upon which a MOU could be based. The Santa Barbara Unified School District provides needed community athletic amenities to its students, but may need help in maintenance or additional supporting infrastructure. Perhaps they may be short in specific amenities that would be of benefit to the public as well. As part of any JUA/MOU, capital investment and maintenance would be the location to look for common ground and needs.
5.2.4 Recommendation Goal 4: Continue to work with developers on providing infill parks for future populations.

Based on Guiding Principles and Goals in the Open Space Element of the General Plan, Principle 2. Ensure that new parks and recreational services for the public are provided concurrent with new development. Figure 5-4 shows vacant land that is privately owned and appropriately zoned for new development. It should be noted that park deficiencies cannot be fully passed onto private developments other than their fair share that the development would add to the population, thereby making deficiencies that much more of a problem.

**Objective 4.1** Be equitable in terms of financial responsibility when it comes to paying for future parks.

All levels of development create a demand on park facilities. Often, only large developments are required to dedicate, build or pay into park in-lieu funds. In some cases, park acreage may be adequate in an area of new growth, but special facilities or amenities are missing in the geographic areas. Citywide deficiencies of major facilities that are difficult to distribute around the city for closer access should also be considered if the amenity is in short supply based on current or future populations. In general, a distributed park system that is close into neighborhoods is always desired since users will drive less miles, and potentially walk or ride a bike to the park. Also, they are more apt to watch over a local park, be more involved in the sustainment of that park, and more likely to use a facility than one on the other side of town.

**Objective 4.2** Recognize the role of future development.

When park acreages are short in a specific geographic area or when a significant development of employment or residences is proposed, consider having the developer provide dedicated space for a park, build the park, or fund amenities in the park commensurate with their fair share of payments or investment based on the size of their development. Parks in employment areas, though an important element to encourage day time exercise and stress release, should always function as true parks with visibility and access assured.

**Objective 4.3** Be strategic about new park development.

If a development is to be built over multiple phases, and the initial number of units in the project is substantial or it is in an area with major park deficiencies, then it may be best to have the development build the park, pay for its fair share of the park up front, match with other available park funds for existing deficiencies in the area, or negotiate a credit account for future developer impact fees that would be released to the developer once the subsequent phases are implemented.

The new residential development, “Arrive Los Carneros”, has recently been completed. It provides one neighborhood park with a playground, and a linear trail. Although the development is still in progress, this case exemplifies how private infill development can help improve local park and recreation access. Another park or linear park connection is likely to be located on the west end of the development.

Future development may include a park or open space around 2 acres in size.

Although west Goleta south of HWY 101 is rich in large unimproved open spaces, there are few active parks with amenities available. A mini park with some play or sports amenities will greatly benefit the surrounding communities.

With proximity to a variety of businesses, community attractions and housing, a new mini park will be a valuable asset especially when new development occurs.

Similar to number 2, a new mini park will be a valuable asset especially when new development occurs.
With the new residential development near Los Carneros Road, an increased demand for parks and recreational facilities in this “park-poor” area will occur. The private development opportunities across the street may accommodate another mini or neighborhood park.

Due to the proximity to the airport, a park site here may be appropriate to support existing and new development in the area. The park should be placed to connect with proposed bike lanes along South Fairview and South Kellogg by way of School Bus Lane.
5.2.5 **Recommendation Goal 5:** Consider other parks and alternative recreation facilities when determining park deficiencies in certain areas.

Linear parks, pocket parks, public plazas and other open spaces should count for some of the neighborhood’s requirements if they provide facilities for walking, running, biking, skating, exercise equipment, or peaceful contemplation and relaxation.

**Objective 5.1** Think outside of the park.
Extend the park and activity experience into the community by providing connections to the park. These connections may include promenades, multi-use paths, tree corridors and other major plantings and space that make for comfortable and safe exercise and access to parks.

**Objective 5.2** Strive to connect open space to existing and planned parks.
Consider connecting parks through open space systems that may be along roadways or reclaimed space from roadways that can also be used for drainage courses, urban forestry opportunities and traffic calming.

**Objective 5.3** Identify opportunities to turn open space into linear connections that can provide nature appreciation and science and education.
Linear facilities can often tell stories about the community with an interpretive signage program that also marks wayfinding along with education and art.

**Objective 5.4** Consider private development of parklike spaces in the overall plan.
Public urban spaces that are built on private property should receive some form of credit for providing park and recreation space, but only if this space is highly visible, accessible, and contains design elements that focus on improving the built nature of the site, provides for walking and reflective contemplation, or that observes natural beauty on or near the site.

**Objective 5.5** Allow other forms of open space areas that are mostly natural areas to count towards park requirements.
Look for opportunities with private development that attempts to set aside natural open spaces by allowing some form of credit towards park requirements as long as the space is natural and not derelict and that this space is physically accessible through trails and also visually accessible to the public. Mitigation areas that do not allow human access should not be counted unless a small periphery of the natural space does accommodate trails and visual access to the open space.
5.2.6 Recommendation Goal 6: Consider non-Goleta parks and programs in determining population-based demand and requirements.

Not all park and recreation activities are done under the direction and on lands owned by the City of Goleta. Private for profit and non-profit organizations often provide physical activity options for its citizens. Likewise, the adjacent County and City of Santa Barbara and University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) all provide recreational opportunities. Develop partnerships that recognize the fact that citizens do not see on-the-ground political boundary lines when they decide to use a park or recreate in a certain manner.

Objective 6.1 Integrate parks on state or federal lands that do provide recreational opportunities for citizens of Goleta.

Where these areas are adjacent to city boundaries, work with the managing agencies of these lands to provide bike lanes, multi-use paths, walkways and trails that may allow the public to have recreational experiences getting to the park as well as at the park.

Objective 6.2 Continue to work with private organizations and other service providers that are engaged in recreation programming and potentially offer City of Goleta park lands to deliver these programs.

Some form of revenue should be expected from the use of park lands. Recreational programming is often funded by local city organizations. Since Goleta does not have a formal recreational program, having others provide these services has become the standard way of recreation program delivery for Goleta. Public facilities can and should be used to help deliver a broader recreational program. These partnerships provide savings to the city when a program is desired by the public. It is also easier to administer these programs than to actually run and staff them. There is a point, however, that exclusive and specialized recreational activities that are only benefiting a few citizens which use these public lands should be made to offset all costs through leasing, use permits or other shared revenue programs.

Objective 6.3 Coordinate Recreational requirements with adjacent agencies.

Many of the students and faculty at UCSB utilize the extensive set of recreational programs and facilities on the campus. Those students that live on or near campus are not likely to create user demand on many of the City of Goleta's park systems. However, faculty and students that live in the community probably do visit and utilize Goleta's recreational amenities. But these same individuals are likely to use those at UCSB. So, for those students and faculty that live in the community, some credit for other available recreational facilities at UCSB should be factored into the population per acre methodology.
5.3 Recommendations that Help Provide Better Access to Parks and Open Spaces.

This section looks at ways to improve both non-vehicular access to parks, and also considers ADA Universal Access issues as well. See Appendix ‘A’ for more detailed descriptions of deficiencies as seen from an ADA perspective.

5.3.1 Recommendation Goal 7: Implement the Active Transportation Plan, with an emphasis on Park Connections

The recommendations from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Project that was adopted in December 2018 should be used as a basis for improving bike and pedestrian access to parks and open spaces. This goals seeks to support the expansion of multi-use trail systems for walking, biking, jogging, and hiking both in and around public parks.

Since 65% of all physical and recreational activity is related to linear activity (cycling, running, walking and hiking), this recreational use should be encouraged to start from a person’s home leading to a park and not just at the park itself. The recreational experience should start at a person’s front door, not their car door in a parking lot at the park.

Based on the General Plan’s Open Space Element, Policy OS 6.4- “Neighborhood parks should be easily accessible to the surrounding neighborhood population through safe pedestrian and bicycle access. Neighborhood parks do not generally require on-site parking, although a limited amount of parking may be provided”.

Objective 7.1 Identify open space areas that could benefit from new trails.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for the City of Goleta has identified possible locations for paved bike paths and lanes as well as walkways. However, specific connections throughout the city where unpaved trails can be provided that connect the system of parks and open space needs to be investigated further.

Objective 7.2 Develop plans to build new trails through open space (including mountain biking trails).

It is recommended that the City develop plans for the design and construction of new trails and include the cost of developing the plans and construction of the trails in the CIP.

Objective 7.3 Locate new trails within new development where appropriate.

The City should work with applicants of discretionary projects to coordinate the inclusion of trails within new development where appropriate.

Objective 7.4 Locate missing gaps in pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to parks, recreational facilities and open space.

Some gaps in pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to the existing parks and community centers were identified. Provide a more detailed analysis of missing gaps to further improve connectivity throughout the park system.

Objective 7.5 Develop plans to fill in missing gaps in pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

It is recommended that where feasible, these gaps should be addressed, and capital projects should be placed in the City’s budget to construct improvements. This may take the shape of new sidewalks, improved sidewalks, new trails, bike lanes, safety improvements at intersections, and streetscape enhancements.

Objective 7.6 Work with other departments to implement plans to construct public improvements to increase the connectivity to and use of parks.

A significant amount of usable linear space that could be used to connect people to parks without the use of motorized vehicles exists in public rights-of-way. Any unused street or under-used street should be considered for re-purposing for walking, biking, running, skating, scootering or hiking.

Connections that go beyond immediate park entrance improvements or near park adjustments, should be consistent with the recently adopted City of Goleta Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Figures 5-5 has been taken from the adopted Master Plan to show the proposed bike and pedestrian improvements that could help to improve access to parks and open spaces. Further discussion on park improvements that are directly adjacent to the park, are discussed in later sections of this Chapter. Some potential connections that are near park edges that would improve access by bike or by walking, have been shown on Figure 5-6.
Figure 5-5: Proposed Park Access Projects from the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan 2018
Figure 5-6: Potential other Park Connection Enhancements

1. Available excess public ROW along Phelps Rd. could be used to create a linear park and mini park that would connect Girsh Park and University Village Linear Park to Sperling Preserve trailhead. The unused ROW west of Canon Green Drive could become a mini-park.

2. A prefab pedestrian bridge should be considered over San Jose Creek to provide convenient pedestrian and bicycle access to Armitos Park as well as to a bike path in Jonny D. Wallis Park. Both sides of the neighborhood would be connected and could walk to these parks.

3. Some form of access or pedestrian bridge would be useful to connect residents on the east side of 217 to the proposed park and bike lanes and paths on the west side of 217. Costs may be prohibitive but the connectivity would provide improved access to a new park in this area.
5.3.2 Recommendation Goal 8: Improve direct access to and around parks for those that have mobility challenges.

Many in our society have extremely challenging physical limitations affecting mobility, but many more have varying degrees of physical capabilities and issues that may negatively affect their use of parks and recreation facilities. This plan included a Park Accessibility Compliance Assessment (see Appendix A) that was derived from site inspections performed at each of the City parks. Inspections were performed to verify compliance with both state code requirements as well as federal ADA Standards. Site verification included accessible parking, amenities such as picnic tables, playground and tot lots, drinking fountains, bench seating, tennis courts, and sport fields.

Objective 8.1 Provide a more detailed review of the ADA issues and potential approaches to removal of these barriers.

A detailed review is needed to help determine the best way to remove barriers. These barriers should be tracked with each park renovation or addition of new park amenities. The resolution of ADA issues does not have to be immediate or extensive. However, the process of capital improvements, life cycle replacements, renovations and upgrades must take into account the need to remove existing barriers. Integrate known ADA issues into park planning, design, programming and budgeting. Compliance with ADA is best documented by integrating barrier removal into all facets of government review and capital investments.

Objective 8.2 Plan for consistent investments in ADA issues and barrier removals in all park and recreation planning, design and maintenance.

There is no “grandfather clause” in the ADA that exempts older facilities. However, the law strikes a careful balance between increasing access for people with disabilities and recognizing the constraints many public entities face. It allows entities confronted with limited financial resources to improve accessibility without excessive expense.

A logical strategy is to identify facilities and amenities that are nearing the end of their life cycle or are in need of a great deal of repair. These project types clearly require the removal of the barrier and the adherence to local, state and federal ADA mandates. It is important to not concentrate on the specific facility without looking at the parking, path of travel, and use of the facility by those with physical challenges. A facility replacement requires that it is not only usable by those with disabilities, but it is also accessible.

Objective 8.3 Prioritize barrier removal amongst all other ADA requirements and commit to a dedicated percent of the City of Goleta’s financial resources to fix or remove these barriers on an annual basis.

Prioritization should take into account these four factors:

1) Is the barrier preventing an individual with a physical challenge from obtaining access to all of the recreational experiences? A key concept is that public programs and services, when viewed in their entirety, must be accessible to people with disabilities, but not all facilities must necessarily be made accessible.

2) Is there a potential safety hazard associated with the barrier that puts an individual at risk to harm, especially when fully-abled persons are not exposed to this same risk?
3) Although cost limitations are not considered a reason to not remove a barrier, if the solution requires damage to natural areas or cultural areas, then some exceptions can be made, or standards slightly decreased. When multiple experiences in one park setting are available, select the one solution that would be least damaging to natural and cultural resources and the least expensive to resolve as well. Focus on providing one equal experience at each park and not on all possible experiences.

4) Prioritize facilities that are heavily used or those that are likely to have the greatest number of persons with disabilities potentially using them.

**Objective 8.4** Continually assess the current condition and determine if financial situations for the city has changed, and if the city has above average financial resources in any given year, make sure that barrier removals are given their fair share or more of these resources.

A key ADA concept is that public entities have an ongoing obligation to make programs and services accessible to people with disabilities. This means that if many access improvements are needed, and there are insufficient resources to accomplish them in a single year, they can be spread out over time. It also means that rising or falling revenues can affect whether or not an access improvement can be completed in a given year. What might have been seen as an undue burden during an economic downturn could become possible when the economy improves and revenues increase. Thus, public entities should periodically reassess what steps they can take to make their programs and services accessible. Public entities should also consult with people with disabilities in setting priorities for achieving program access.

**5.4 Recommendations that Help to Reduce Deficiencies in Specific Needed Park Facilities and Amenities**

This section indicates the types of facilities that are in the shortest supply and a strategy on how to implement or resolve the deficiencies.

**5.4.1 Recommendation Goal 9: Provide new or upgraded baseball fields (youth), softball fields (youth), and soccer fields (youth).**

After reviewing the entire parks systems for available undeveloped space or underdeveloped space, consider adding infill sports fields to lands adjacent to existing parks that may be available for purchase:

- Develop a multi-purpose field at the existing Evergreen Park
- Renovate the athletic field at the Goleta Community Center
- Develop a multi-purpose field at Stow Grove Park

**Objective 9.1 Incorporate permanent youth baseball, softball, and soccer fields into the inventory.**

Based on the existing facilities analysis, youth baseball, softball, and soccer fields within public parks are in short supply. The Park’s Division should develop additional fields to relieve pressure from over use of existing ones, as well as park areas that are not conducive to these sport activities but are currently being used for these purposes.
Objective 9.2  As a result of reviewing the entire parks systems for available undeveloped space or underdeveloped space, consider adding infill sports fields to the following existing parks:

- Evergreen Park
- Goleta Community Center
- Stow Grove Park
- Jonny D. Wallis Park

Objective 9.3  As a result of reviewing the entire parks systems for available undeveloped space or underdeveloped space, consider adding infill sports fields to lands adjacent to existing parks that may be available for purchase.

At this point in time, there do not appear to be too many opportunities for adjacent to park land acquisition. Further research will be required.

Objective 9.4  After reviewing the entire parks systems for available undeveloped space or underdeveloped space as well as adjacent undeveloped lands, consider adding infill sports fields to new parks resulting from new development.

The shortage of citywide sports facilities cannot be put on the development in its entirety, but potentially available lands can be dedicated to the city in exchange for the developments fair share of park requirements.

Objective 9.5  Update sports facility needs based on the recommended standards from the Needs Assessment as well as national standards on an annual basis.

It is recommended that the City should carry out small additions of new sports facilities on an annual basis to reduce the current deficit. Annual investments should be applied to item 9.2 to 9.3 first.

5.4.2  Recommendation Goal 10: Provide new or upgraded aquatic centers, recreation centers, and skate parks.

Objective 10.1  Upgrade convenience and customer service amenities to existing facilities to increase usability and access to more.

The Division should investigate opportunities to add shade, storage buildings, security enhancements, lighting, benches, and other amenities appropriately at existing facilities as it is making improvements and augmenting existing facilities. These improvements may increase capacity or use levels if they are offered. Note the carrying capacity of each park amenity and determine if the capacity could be increased by adding more parking, staging areas, viewing areas or functional changes to the facility that could make it handle more people, or accommodate dividing facilities to allow two or more groups to use it at the same time.

Objective 10.2  Create additional recreational facilities and amenities at existing parks.

The prioritized list should be based on needs assessment and a higher priority put on those amenities that have the greatest citywide deficiency. As part of the Civic Center Feasibility Study, consider a swimming pool that includes leisure, competitive, fitness and recreation in the programming for the facility. Additionally, consider collocating a recreation center/gymnasium with a swimming pool. It may also be a potential to consider an aquatics center at the existing Goleta Valley Community Center, given its central location, existing infrastructure and the under-served community that this area represents.

Based on the existing facilities analysis and the LOS analysis, recommendations have been made for what types of facilities are needed. The park infill maps shown later in this chapter also list what types of facilities can be added to the existing park space. It is recommended that the City include the addition of these facilities and any ancillary improvements that will need to be done in order to accommodate these facilities in the Capital Improvement Program for design and implementation.

Objective 10.3  Identify where existing missing amenities can go as part of new park development.

Once it has been decided that a new park is needed or that a park is to be partially built / funded by a development, then consider having the Master Plan work into the overall design the missing facilities that are deficient either in the immediate area or citywide.

Objective 10.4  Maintain and improve existing facilities, parks, trails, and open spaces.

The Division should evaluate the condition of existing parks and trails on a routine basis. Evaluation methods should be developed to measure the quality of maintenance. Training of staff to guarantee maintenance up to City standards should happen on a continuous basis. Maintenance staffing should be observed and corrected as needed to meet present need for services, and an employment strategy for upcoming growth should be established. Once-a-month examinations of all facilities, parks, trails, and open spaces should be executed. Maintenance projects and annual maintenance demands should be undertaken on a consistent basis to decrease an accumulation of maintenance. Maintenance tasks should be prioritized and should be reviewed routinely. This should include developing costs, plans, and phasing recommendations.
5.5 Recommendations to Increase Access to Nature and Open Space.

This section suggests that part of the desire for recreation is formed around the desire to see and be part of nature. Open space and access to natural areas is an important aspect of any recreation plan, especially in areas with beaches, bluffs, creeks and mountains are prevalent like in Goleta.

5.5.1 Recommendation Goal 11: Preserve and make open space more accessible for the general public.

Although not under the control of the City of Goleta, it may be possible to improve access trails and bike facilities to existing county, regional, state and federal lands.

Objective 11.1 Work with other departments and landowners to preserve existing open space.

Preserving open space ranked the third highest priority in the statistically valid survey and scored highly in all the other public outreach. The City should work with the owners of open space, especially those that are public sector or land preservation organizations, to assist in protecting open space in areas where it is appropriate. These areas would include sensitive habitat, steep slopes, buffers to sensitive areas/uses, areas along streams, and areas recommended for trails.

Objective 11.2 For new development seeking a discretionary permit, work with the applicant to preserve open space where appropriate.

It is recommended that City staff work with applicants of discretionary projects to preserve open space in beneficial areas. Preserving open space can be deemed as a community benefit to the project. Try to direct the project applicant’s site planning in a manner that allows for the preservation of open space and the presence of natural features. Discretionary approvals can be based on the preservation of natural features, and impacts or mitigations under CEQA can be minimized. Provide partial park credits for this space or provide density transfers or bonuses to accomplish the preservation of open space.

5.5.2 Recommendation Goal 12: Restore open space and enhance its use by the public.

In areas where open space exists but where this open space is disturbed, derelict or inaccessible, work with the agency or property owner to provide access if the City provides funds to enhance the overall space. A dedication of parkland or access easement would be required back from the private property owner, or an MOU from a related agency.

Objective 12.1 Where open space is already preserved or dedicated, look at ways of enhancing the habitat quality, the extent of habitat and the diversity of the habitat as well.

This can be done through access trails, interpretive facilities, revegetation, trash removal, and control fencing to keep people out of sensitive areas or private areas that need a buffer.

Objective 12.2 Where open space is already preserved or dedicated, look at ways of enhancing the public's use of the open space through the development of appropriately designed and controlled trails systems and overlooks.

On street parking may be required. Trails may be needed, or simply permission to access or the granting of easements.

Objective 12.3 Where open space is already preserved or dedicated, look at ways of enhancing the public's understanding of the natural environment.

This can be done by adding kiosks, signage and other interpretive facilities pointing out the sensitivity of these resources and the natural processes and values that many of the public are not aware of.
5.6 Recommendations that Help to Increase Funding of Parklands, Amenities and Programs.

Knowing what is needed is the first step in resolving park deficiencies. However, the most critical step is in identifying possible methods for paying for these facilities.

5.6.1 Recommendation Goal 13: Expand Financial Opportunities for Park Expansion, Amenity Infills or Improved and Accessible Facilities.

The best technique for implementing public park and recreation facilities is the leveraging of available funds against grants and other sources that require matching or in-kind services.

Objective 13.1 Create a best practice pricing model.

It is important for the City to develop a resource allocation and pricing philosophy that reflects the values of the community and the responsibility it has to the community. This philosophy will be especially important if the City moves forward in the development of new programs and additional and/or expanded facilities, and as it strives for sustainability and determines how much it is willing to subsidize operations with tax dollars.

One means of accomplishing this goal is applying a process using an industry tool called the “Pyramid Methodology.” This methodology develops and implements a refined cost recovery philosophy and pricing policy based on current “best practices” as determined by the mission of the agency and the program’s benefit to the community and/or individual.

Critical to this philosophical undertaking is the support and understanding of elected officials, and ultimately, citizens. Whether or not significant changes are called for, the agency wants to be certain that it is philosophically aligned with its residents. The development of the core services and cost recovery philosophy and policy is built on a very logical foundation, using the understanding of who is benefiting from recreation services to determine how the costs for that service should be offset.

Objective 13.2 Investigate supplementary funding sources.

The Division should continue to pursue funding strategies that provide alternative funds from the City’s General Fund:

- Explore funding sources that strategically align with targeted services.
- Expand alternative funding for strategic initiatives through grants.
- Explore additional Community Partnerships.
- Explore the opportunities for (and use of) sponsorships.
- Continue to apply for and use CDBG funding.
- Submit on the State of California’s Proposition 68 Parks, Environment and Water Bond for grant funding. Projects that
- Consider a bond referendum for expanded and new facilities if Park Development Fees are not available.
- Establish a state of the industry Cost Recovery and Financial Sustainability Program.

Objective 13.3 Study prospects to grow private sponsorships.

The Division currently has sponsorship arrangements for special events, programs, and activities, and it should continue to explore additional sponsorship opportunities and build on existing sponsorships. All existing and future sponsorships should be evaluated to ensure that they are accurately portrayed in a signed sponsorship agreement. The Division should continue to grow sponsorship partnerships for special events, activities, and programs. Present and future sponsorships should be assessed to confirm that they are conforming to existing sponsorship policies and procedures.

Objective 13.4 Track grant and charitable opportunities.

New grant opportunities for programming, facility improvements, and connectivity enhancements should be pursued at the federal, state, regional, and local levels. The Division may want to contemplate hiring a new position or contracting with a consultant capable of writing grants to explore, propose, and follow grants. The Proposition 68 grants are significant sources of possible funding if the projects can be planned and designed to address the grant evaluation criteria for either recreation, water quality or environmental enhancements in park systems. Ideally, a project that addresses all three areas is more likely to obtain grants than those that only address one of these three factors.
5.7 Recommendations that Help to Increase Programmed Recreational Services

Programs are a way of extending the use levels of park and recreation capital investments in facilities and amenities. It is also a good way to provide good will between the City of Goleta and its residents. Finally, active involvement in programs and special events also results in an engaged, healthy and active community.

5.7.1 Recommendation Goal 14: Either increase partnerships for program delivery or look at shifting recreational programming back to the City.

Understanding core services in the delivery of parks and recreation services will allow the City to improve upon those areas while developing strategies to assist in the delivery of other services. The basis of determining core services should come from the vision and mission developed by the city and what brings the greatest community benefit in balance with the competencies of the division, current trends and the market.

The City should pursue program development around the priorities identified by customer feedback, program evaluation process, and research. Those following criteria should be examined when developing new programs:

- Need: outgrowth of a current popular program, or enough demonstrated demand to successfully support a minimal start (one class for instance);
- Budget: accounting for all costs and anticipated (conservative) revenues should meet cost recovery target established by the Department;
- Location: appropriate, available and within budget;
- Instructor: qualified, available and within budget;
- Materials and supplies: available and within budget; and
- Marketing effort: adequate and timely opportunity to reach intended market, within budget (either existing marketing budget or as part of new program budget).

Further research into what types of programming would be successful needs to be done. Successful programs utilize continuous creative assessments, research, and planning. The City should establish a process that evaluates the success of current program offerings and criteria to determine if new program ideas should be instituted or if changes should be made to current programs.

Maintaining the current registration data and evaluation process will help to assure success.

Decide if increased reliance on partnerships with non-profit organizations to deliver recreation programs is preferable to having the Department of Neighborhood Services and Public Safety create an expanded Parks and Recreation Division that can provide recreational programs, assuming additional funding sources are identified.

Objective 14.1 Improve special event offerings.

Using trends and demand data, the Division should add new special events that there is demand for and/or is trending in the parks and recreation field.

Objective 14.2 Routinely analyze the usage of the programs, facilities, and services and make appropriate adjustments based on collected data.

The Division should routinely measure the amount of participation in its facilities and services to determine the levels of usage and identify any trends in this usage. With this data, the Division can make appropriate changes to its supporting facilities or agreements with program providers to reflect this demand.

Objective 14.3 Work with other service providers to enhance/develop programs to address changing needs and trends.

As needs and trends change, work with other recreation providers to supplement the needs of changing interests. Create agreements in writing with the service providers. Develop a web site where a member of the community can find out about all the other service providers’ recreational opportunities.

Objective 14.4 Monitor the costs of programs and services.

The Division should augment partner provided programs and services as their demand increases. Staff should monitor resource allocation, spending, and
cost recovery. Proper education of staff will help keep costs in-line. Program and services employees of partners should be routinely observed, and changes should be made to meet present needs. Future programs and services’ costs should be identified and analyzed.

The City of Goleta awards grants through the Goleta City Grant Program of up to $5,000, for civic services, community projects, and public services that are of benefit to the residents of the City of Goleta.

Eligible services and activities must be sponsored by non-profit organizations or governmental agencies. Categories of services and activities eligible for grants include:

- Civic projects or services sponsored by Goleta community organizations
- Cultural activities (e.g. music, art, dance, recreation, etc.)
- Educational programs
- Special events
- Regional projects of benefit to Goleta residents
- Public services (e.g. senior services, youth programs, health services, etc.)

5.7.2 Recommendation Goal 15: Enhance Division efficiencies.

Efficiencies could potentially free up funds for other recreational uses or they could be used to offer programs or improve existing facilities.

**Objective 15.1 Improve internal and external communication about division activities, special events, and services.**

The Division utilizes a number of effective marketing tools and strategies actively promoting parks and recreation services in the community. These tools include, but are not limited to email, social media, the Internet, and street banners.

To continue to be successful, the Division should develop a marketing plan that will guide communication and promotion of its activities and facilities. Such a marketing effort will create greater awareness of city recreation offerings, and should include branding for the Division, use of social media, and development of the Division website and partnership opportunities. If developed, the Marketing Plan should be updated every five years or as needed and include marketing strategies that incorporate the efforts of partner departments, other local parks and recreation departments, and projects.

As part of the Marketing Plan, the Division should evaluate wayfinding signage to facilities on roadway, pathways, and within parks. The Division should develop signage standards for parks, trails and providing measured distances and loops. Improved wayfinding signage will contribute to a greater sense of connectivity to parks, facilities, and pathways.

**Objective 15.2 Keep up with current demand by staffing properly.**

As facilities, programs, and services are enhanced, it is necessary to have appropriate staffing levels. This may necessitate new positions.

As recommendations in the Master Plan for expanded services, new facilities, bike paths and trails, parks, programs, and facility upgrades are implemented, it will be vital for the City to increase staffing levels as the Division’s responsibilities grow. This will require new positions in both recreation and maintenance. Additionally, the use of contractual part time and seasonal employees should be considered to ensure that the practice is meeting the needs of the Division and the customers being served.
5.8 Summary of Recommendations to Reduce Deficiencies and Equitable Distribution of Parklands and Amenities

Based on the previously discussed options for improving the level of service, the geographic distribution and the addition of amenities, this section summarizes the improved scenario and Levels of Service that would exist if all of the proposed recommendations were put into place. Figure 5-11 displays the various types of opportunities that could occur throughout the City of Goleta. Color dots on previous maps and on Figure 11 include: existing parks, recategorized parks, potential new parks on public lands, potential new parks on private lands that are likely to be heavily developed, and potential public access to existing facilities at schools in areas where current geographic distribution is not ideal. Table 5-2 shows a summary of these acres. Table 5-3 includes a comparison of the maximum park acreage increases that can be expected from these additional recommendations. The table lists recreation facilities by park and park type as well as indicated the maximum number of acres that is reasonable to expect under this plan.

### Table 5-2: Future Park Type and Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goleta Park Type</th>
<th>Exist Acres</th>
<th>Future Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini Parks</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>35.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>70.57</td>
<td>70.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Open Space</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>44.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Open Space</td>
<td>404.04</td>
<td>404.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>553.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>569.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Park Acreage per 1,000 Residents (2035)

- National Average: 10.1
- Ave. for cities with similar size (20k-50k): 9.6
- Goleta Park Goal per 1,000 Residents: 10
### Table 5-3: Future Recreation Facilities per Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citywide Inventory of Parks and Recreation Assets</th>
<th>Comm. Center</th>
<th>Mini-Park</th>
<th>Neighborhood Parks</th>
<th>Community Parks</th>
<th>Neighborhood Open Space</th>
<th>Regional Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Acreage</td>
<td>553.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbeque</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Can</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Bag</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Parking</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Field</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocce ball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Park Facility                                   |              |           |                    |                |                        |                    |

Note: The table continues with more details for each park.
5.8.1 Future Recreation Facilities

For future recreation facilities, Deckers Park and the Arrive Los Carneros Park have been included in the LOS analysis since they have not been included in previous park inventory efforts. Deckers Park is a privately owned but publicly accessible neighborhood park located in the Cabrillo Business Park. It functions as a public park and should therefore be counted as a public park. Although the park is not close to any residential land uses, daytime park uses from the nearby commercial and employment centers have easy access to this asset. As mixed use development is being completed in this area and populations come in to the area between Hollister Avenue and U.S. Route 101, the park will help to provide daytime park and recreation needs for users working in this area or from new nearby neighborhoods. Thus, Deckers Park should be counted towards analysis standards in future conditions. Arrive Los Carneros Park is a mini park recently finished within the new residential development. It is also privately owned but publicly accessible.

Table 5-3 provides a summary of all existing and future parks and adds the proposed joint use facilities as well. Anticipated amenities in these new park areas have also been analyzed and some suggested amenities based on geographic distribution and prioritized deficient amenities have also been suggested. Table 5-4 provides a summary of the amenities and determine future deficiencies or surpluses.

### Table 5-4: Future Recreation Facilities Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service for 2035 Population</th>
<th>City Facilities</th>
<th>Private Facilities</th>
<th>School Facilities under Memo of Understanding</th>
<th>Max Facility Total</th>
<th>National Guideline Service Level (#/# pop)</th>
<th>Recommended City of Goleta Standard (#/# pop)</th>
<th>Total Facilities Needed</th>
<th>Total Surplus/Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Areas (12+ people)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbecue</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds (age2-5, 6-12)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Field</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball (Youth)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5,572</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball (Adult)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Youth)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Adult)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Youth)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>(4.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Adult)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,493</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocceball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Track</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Swimming Pools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Rink</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Trails - mi</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-5: Future LOS Summary after Recommendations have been Implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Level of Service Summary Using Future Conditions &amp; All Recommendations</th>
<th>Actual Park Acreage</th>
<th>Adjusted Park Acreage*</th>
<th>Max. with Recommended New Park Acreage Added***</th>
<th>Goleta Standard per 1,000 Population (Suggested Adjustments)</th>
<th>Existing Acres per 1,000 Population (2017) based on Adj. Acres</th>
<th>Future Acres per 1,000 Population (2026) based on Adj. Acres</th>
<th>Future Acres per 1,000 Population (2035) based on Max. Acres</th>
<th>Acres Needed to Meet Standard for Future Population</th>
<th>Acres Surplus (or Deficit) Using Actual Acres</th>
<th>Total Acres Surplus (or Deficit) Using Adj. Acres</th>
<th>Total Acres Surplus (or Deficit) Using Max. Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Parks- Neighborhood</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>40.60</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>(23.85)</td>
<td>(26.37)</td>
<td>(9.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage of Potential Shared Use Areas</td>
<td>48.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount to Count for Credit of Assets= 25%</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Deficiency with Joint Use of Schools**</td>
<td>52.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Parks- Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks and Center</td>
<td>80.33</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td>80.33</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>84.25</td>
<td>(3.92)</td>
<td>(22.65)</td>
<td>(3.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Parks- Community + Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Active Parks</td>
<td>107.03</td>
<td>85.78</td>
<td>133.10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>134.80</td>
<td>(27.77)</td>
<td>(49.02)</td>
<td>(1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood &amp; Regional Open Space</td>
<td>446.89</td>
<td>431.62</td>
<td>448.63</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>202.20</td>
<td>244.69</td>
<td>229.42</td>
<td>246.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Parks</td>
<td>553.92</td>
<td>603.18</td>
<td>615.35</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>337.00</td>
<td>216.92</td>
<td>246.18</td>
<td>278.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only 25% of Private Parks that are Publicly Accessible are Counted Toward the Park Standard
** Only 25% of School Recreational Areas are Counted. Would require MOU’s and shared costs.
*** Max Recommendations include School Joint Use, New Parks on Public Lands and New Parks on Private Lands

Table 5-6: Future Park Geographic Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Service Area</th>
<th># Population Served 2017</th>
<th>% Population Served 2017</th>
<th># Population Served 2035</th>
<th>% Population Served 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-Minute Walking Distance (Neighborhood Parks)</td>
<td>22,858</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>27,683</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Minute Walking Distance (All Active Parks)</td>
<td>23,455</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>28,063</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Minute Walking Distance (All Parks)</td>
<td>25,654</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>28,686</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Minute Driving Distance (Community Parks)</td>
<td>27,086</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>30,046</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Minute Driving Distance (All Parks)</td>
<td>28,481</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>32,381</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-5 calculates the future population based standards, with the intent of reducing deficiencies as much as possible. Note slight adjustments in the park standard per 1,000 population has been made per park category, but the overall standard remains at 10 acres per 1,000 population.

Table 5-6 shows how access to the future parks has been increased for 2035 Goleta populations, given the goals of a 15-minute walk and a 5-minute drive. Where access has been improved based on the recommendations in this Chapter and based on the implementation of the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan, the access analysis has calculated the increase in populations that will benefit from these improvements.
Although the population forecast shows a 9% increase in population from 2017 to 2035, Goleta’s park service coverage can achieve great improvements if all of the recommendations are implemented. The most prominent increases are percentage of population served within 15-minute walkshed of neighborhood parks and active parks.

As is shown in Figure 5-8, the majority of parkshed gaps where there is no active park within a 15-minute walk or 5-minute drive, are eliminated by implementing recommendations proposed in this chapter.

The remaining parkshed gaps are mostly commercial land use areas. Our study does not show any feasible opportunities or solutions under current circumstances in several areas that remain as gaps. In the future, if any developable land occurs in these area, especially those with residential uses, the city should consider requiring park fees or constructed parks as a condition of approval for these developments.
5.9 Maintenance and Operational Guidelines

A park system benefits from park maintenance standards and practices that provide clear guidance for the maintenance of park sites. Properly developed standards can form the foundation for enhanced operations and quality maintenance practices.

Park and recreation facilities within the City of Goleta are found to be maintained in a variety of conditions from poor to very good, with an overall rating of “weak but acceptable operating standard” by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA).

Generally speaking, deferred maintenance needs are commonly found within park structures, facilities, and buildings. Specific needs include graffiti removal that is found regularly on structures in several parks, the need for better maintenance of bathroom structures, and trip-hazards resulting from large cracks and lifts in concrete pavement.

The Open Space Element of the General Plan, under Section OS 6.10 states: Design and Management of Public Parks and Open Space. The City should ensure that park, recreation, and open space facilities are designed and managed in a manner that is consistent with protection of the ecology of the natural systems at each park site and that will serve the needs of the intended user groups. The following criteria shall apply to the design and management of public parks and open space areas:

a. Wherever feasible and appropriate, landscaping should emphasize native and drought-tolerant, noninvasive species that will reduce maintenance costs and water use and be supportive of wildlife habitats.

b. To the extent feasible, the City shall maintain parks and open space areas without the use of herbicides, pesticides, chemical fertilizers, and other toxic substances. Herbicide use is restricted within 100 feet of the top-of-bank of any watercourse in parks and open space to those herbicides approved by the U.S. EPA for use in aquatic environments.

c. The types of improvements and facilities at each site should be based on the recreation and leisure needs of the targeted user groups and the physical opportunities and constraints of the site.

d. Improvements should provide for convenient access by pedestrians from the adjacent neighborhood areas.

e. The design of improvements shall provide for maximum visibility of the park from public streets and incorporate measures to assure adequate security and safety for users.

f. Provision of lighting shall be limited to the minimum needed for the types of uses planned in order to reduce light pollution and glare. Lights shall not be directed upward or into adjacent habitat.

g. Adequate off-street parking to serve the intended uses shall be provided in order to minimize the burden placed on on-street parking in the neighborhood.

High priority landscape maintenance procedures need to include:

- Turf areas that are in non-useable conditions;
- The need to address improper mowing of turf areas and maintenance strips along trails;
- Brush clearing in and around shrubs; and
- The controlling of weeds in open spaces.

Based on interviews with park maintenance staff, overgrown areas do seem to contribute to homeless issues. This issue is particularly relevant to several parks that contain trees and shrubs along the border fences, and where natural tree growth is found throughout Environmentally-Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA).

5.9.1 Maintenance and Operational Guideline 1: Maintenance Level of Service

In an effort to increase the public’s use of the park system, it is worthwhile to consider how to improve the perception and reality of park maintenance levels. There are many potential reasons for the public’s weak impression of the park system. There are some valid reasons why the level of maintenance may be below expectations. These reasons include lack of funding, unrealistic expectations on behalf of the public, City-wide priorities that compete for funding, maintenance operations suffering because staff is utilized for events/programs, contracted maintenance firms under-performing, or perhaps a combination of many of the above. Below are some suggestions for potential methods of improving maintenance.
Efficiencies in maintenance can be improved if the existing parks are grouped into tiers for parks with similar levels of maintenance requirements. A tiered approach that classifies parks into groups based upon maintenance needs could improve consistency in the level of maintenance service throughout the park system because it would help maintenance companies understand which types of parks require more (or less) maintenance. Providing specific, tier-based level of maintenance service requirements which include frequencies of trash pickup, and bathroom cleanings to contracted companies could also help highlight that level of service expectations differ from park to park.

For the purposes of the Goleta parks system, these maintenance tiers could correspond to the Goleta Park Types as outlined in the Goleta Parks and Playgrounds Master Plan (Section 3.2, Figure 3-5) based on park size, function, and character. In this scheme, community parks, such as Evergreen Acres Park, require a higher level of maintenance effort, maintenance frequency, or maintenance expertise, and therefore could be placed in the highest “tier” of parks, whereas mini and neighborhood parks that require less maintenance would comprise the lowest tier.

However, maintenance needs may be different than those categories based on park size, function, and character. It may be helpful to include middle tiers that encompass special needs, such as Nectarine or Armitos Parks, which are small neighborhood parks, yet have specific issues related to graffiti, used needles and bottles, and the homeless populations that occupy those spaces. Also, more passive use parks such as the neighborhood and regional open spaces may require more maintenance such as intensive brush clearing depending upon the type of land management desired. Whichever tier system chosen, the tier systems should ultimately be decided by the parks maintenance leadership based on similar levels of maintenance.

Because written maintenance standards appear to only exist within maintenance contracts, taking verbiage from these contracts to craft a written set of maintenance guidelines available for the parks system to reference may be beneficial. Maintenance standards that may exist in contracts may unintentionally lead to a select few fully understanding the maintenance goals and expectations for each park. Creating a set of written maintenance standards that Parks and Open Space staff have access to could allow for a greater percentage of City staff that may review and understand the maintenance expectations of each park (or tier of parks), thus creating a shared vision for the level of maintenance the parks should have while simultaneously enlisting a larger number of staff to help identify any potential maintenance deficiencies.

When maintenance operations are contracted to outside companies, often the level of quality control is lost as compared to in-house staff that reports directly to City staff. As such, it is recommended that as specific areas are targeted for improved maintenance operations, it may be advisable to bring these operations in-house under the direct supervision of Public Works Department. Additionally, for special events and programs, many municipalities utilize in-house staff to supplement the level of cleaning/trash removal that contracted maintenance companies provide. While this improves the experience of the special event/program at one park site, pulling staff away from their typical duties may lead to maintenance neglect at other park sites.
It is recommended that staff continue investing in their professional development through CPRS Maintenance Management School or other similar courses, or by prioritizing networking with park maintenance staff from nearby municipalities. Opportunities to share the successes maintenance staff are experiencing while simultaneously learning new ideas about how other municipalities are addressing similar challenges may refine the maintenance processes of park maintenance.

5.9.2 Maintenance and Operational Guideline 2: Quality Assurance

It is understood that park supervisors review the maintenance of the parks they oversee. “Secret shopper” tools, which are strategies to measure quality of service in a variety of industries, can be used to evaluate the Public Works Department internally. Additionally, it would be prudent for the public to have access to a customer care platform where park issues can be reported to park maintenance staff.

One additional measure that is recommended is to provide dedicated staff to perform quality assurance reviews of each park site periodically. Higher maintenance-tier parks that experience frequent use may need to be reviewed six times a year, whereas parks that experience less use may only need to be reviewed three times a year. The frequency of park quality assurance reviews should align with the tiered category, for example, six reviews for top tier parks, four reviews for middle tier parks, and three reviews for the lowest tier of parks.

The review checklist should be thorough and should include categories such as, but not limited to, landscape and irrigation, sports field wear-and-tear, building interior and exterior cleanliness, playground/site furnishings conditions, trash removal status, park staff/maintenance staff friendliness, and general park aesthetics. Having dedicated staff responsible for quality assurance helps protect against the potential for subjectivity during the review process and developing objective, quantifiable review sheets will increase quality. Having the same staff member review all park sites, helps standardize the results. Reviewing sites using multiple different staff members that use subjective evaluation methods should be avoided as it leads to distorted findings.

Increased quality assurance measures help objectively identify what is working well and also identify areas for improvement. The end goal should be the further refinement of maintenance operations that ensure that the public’s experience of a park consistently meets or exceeds their expectations.

5.9.3 Maintenance and Operational Guideline 3: Technology

Technology continues to change how we communicate as a culture, so it is important to regularly evaluate how well the current methods of communicating to, and receiving feedback from, the public are working.

Online public input systems that integrate numerous different aspects of parks and recreation work including, but not limited to, league scheduling, reservations, rentals, passes, and registrations are becoming more robust each year.

As new sports lighting projects are designed, it is important to specify a lighting control system that integrates well with Goleta’s existing software system that can be controlled remotely. Additionally, similar on-line technologies exist which can monitor and manage irrigation functions remotely.

5.9.4 Maintenance and Operational Guideline 4: Safety

A formal written process is recommended to be developed for how to evaluate and make important decisions which directly relate to the public’s health, safety, and welfare regarding when park infrastructure is damaged. If a portion of a park site does need to be shut down due to safety concerns, dated photographic documentation showing installed warning flagging, barricades, or signage should be obtained.

It is important to review the processes and After-Action Reports with management staff to consider if opportunities for improvement exists. Such reports provide a glimpse into how well staff is trained to respond to situations using sound judgment.

From a public relations standpoint, when a portion of a park site needs to be shut down for maintenance, it is beneficial to provide signage that includes Goleta Parks and Open Space branding and a number that can be called and a website address, if the public has questions regarding the closure. The number called will connect to a voice message that provides information regarding the start date of the closure, the reason for the closure and the work being performed, the anticipated opening of the site, and a “thank you” from the Parks and Open Space department for the public’s patience. This “Frequently Asked Questions” voice message provides transparency for the public and frees up staff to perform their typical job responsibilities and spend less time answering the common questions.
5.9.5 Maintenance and Operational Guideline 5:
Accessibility

Park maintenance staff that oversees construction should receive training in U.S. Access Board/State of California accessibility standards. Some municipalities undertake small park infrastructure renovation projects, and these projects typically don’t go through a formal permitting process where accessibility review takes place. As such, the maintenance staff that oversees these projects needs to be able to identify if a proposed solution adheres to accessibility codes. Alternatively, the Public Works Department can have one staff member trained in accessibility review and then set up a process so that these renovation projects are reviewed by the trained staff member prior to ordering materials or commencing with construction activities. A third option is to simply hire a third-party accessibility consultant to review proposed projects prior to construction. While this additional step in the process may require time and money, developing park infrastructure that does not meet current accessibility codes and subsequently being required to replace this infrastructure or dealing with litigation that arises because of non-compliant construction is much costlier.

Some accessibility standards that maintenance staff can have a direct hand in replacing include benches, trash receptacles, picnic tables, grills, camping facilities, picnic facilities, and viewing areas, as described in the U.S. Access Board Standards for Outdoor Developed Areas. Additionally, training key staff in Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles will also benefit Goleta Parks.

5.9.6 Maintenance and Operational Guideline 6:
Sustainability

After protocols have been established to protect the Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas in several of the Goleta parks, maintenance staff should be trained on how to protect the resources and provided maps highlighting these locations. This information will need to be repeated at a regular frequency (i.e. annually) due to staff turnover, and newly hired staff should also be provided with a map/list of the natural resource locations and the appropriate training.

Since Goleta Parks and Open Space maintains landscape areas using contracted maintenance companies, this same natural resources protection information will need to be provided to maintenance contractors at reoccurring intervals. Protecting sensitive natural resources with third party maintenance contractors will require diligence considering new maintenance staff that is unfamiliar with the nuances of site specific natural resource protection will frequently be used to maintain the park. Inconspicuous signage that informs maintenance staff while minimally adversely impacting the natural experience of the park may be warranted in some areas. Once natural resource protection protocols are in place, it is advisable to include them in maintenance contracts so that contractors can be commended for their good performance, or alternatively, held accountable for their negligence.

In general, park projects should utilize landscape plant species adapted to Goleta’s climate; those that require minimal supplemental irrigation, fertilization, or pruning once established. Existing parks which contain irrigated turf areas that experience infrequent use could be converted into native grass areas or low water use planting beds to conserve water. If potable water is currently being used to irrigate landscapes, an analysis of reclaimed water utility infrastructure may reveal opportunities to retrofit existing park irrigation systems and connect to adjacent reclaimed water utilities.

To protect Goleta’s water bodies, staff should be trained in Integrated Pest Management (IPM) principles which effectively control pests while also minimizing the application of toxic chemicals. Staff that oversees construction projects where soil is disturbed should take National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) training courses to gain an understanding of stormwater best management practices and ensure soils from construction related activities are not transported away from the construction site. Where irrigated turf currently exists directly adjacent to water bodies, consider providing a vegetated buffer with plants/grasses that do not require fertilization between the turf and the water body to help protect the water body from eutrophication.

For the older parks within the Goleta Parks and Open Space system, long range budgeting for complete replacement of aging facilities may be warranted. While it can be difficult to secure funding to completely rebuild an existing facility, good record keeping regarding the costs to address outdated facilities in need of replacement using a “band aid” maintenance strategy can be helpful. Simultaneously casting a new, energy efficient, exciting vision for new facilities may prove successful, especially if the vision for the park replacement is master planned utilizing a phased approach. Lastly, an Energy Audit of existing facilities will help identify areas where energy efficiency can be improved and may also provide useful information that helps prioritize the replacement of the least energy efficient parks.
5.9.7 Maintenance and Operational Guideline 7: Develop a Maintenance Manual

Below are specific recommendations for creating a maintenance manual for the City of Goleta, as paraphrased from the 2015 Needs Assessment Study.

- Develop a Maintenance Manual that details park maintenance and operation tasks on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis. The Maintenance Manual should include existing specifications as well as:
  - Clear written maintenance objectives and frequency of care for each amenity is needed based on the desired outcomes for a quality visitor experience in maintaining the parks for safety, aesthetics, recreation and sustainability including:
    - Landscape bed design, planting and maintenance standards
    - Landscape turf and right of way mowing and maintenance standards
    - Tree and shrub planting and maintenance standards
    - Equipment maintenance and replacement standards
  - Integrated Pest Management Plan
- Formalized and scheduled park facility inspections including playgrounds, specialized facilities such as skate parks, high use visitor areas and buildings.
- Design standards for the development of park features such as sports fields, trails and buildings.
- Preventative maintenance plan developed for all park locations.
- Develop a life-cycle maintenance plan for buildings and park amenities. This should be built into daily operations, yearly capital improvement plans, and budgetary requests to maximize the value and useful life of these assets.
- Develop a soil management plan which includes regular soil testing in order to avoid issues with plant die-back and sparse or soggy turf conditions. The plan should include at least:
  - Soil type and texture
  - Infiltration rate
  - pH
  - Soluble salts and sodium
  - Identification of limiting soil characteristics
  - Planned soil management actions to remediation limiting soil characteristic
- Evaluate additional opportunities to “naturalize” many existing facilities, especially those built near and around creeks and other drainages. This could include the elimination of turf in areas of little public use and expansion of riparian and natural areas.
- Install a centrally-controlled irrigation system with soil sensors and an automated evapotranspiration (ET) based irrigation control and scheduling system that allows control of multiple sites to exact specifications and daily changes.
- Establish an Estimated Annual Water Use (EAWU) for various hydro-zones such as turf, sports fields and shrub beds.
* Develop a process of evaluation and refinement to measure park maintenance success through established performance standards and should include:
  - Established park maintenance standards and frequency rates and tracking over several years
  - Establish and track the cost per acre for each park and park type and tracking over several years
  - Establish a minimum of training hours per year per employee with reevaluation of success of training and new requirements due to legislative changes
  - Equipment replacement schedules are met and funded to the replacement outcomes desired
* Develop a Sustainable Performance System with responsibility for the program handled by a dedicated Conservation Coordinator. The performance system should include at a minimum:
  - Native Plant Policy—ecoregion
  - Track Utilities—Partnership with utilities
  - Recycling Program
  - Green Waste Composting
  - Demonstration Gardens
* Use of Alternative Energy Sources
* Integrated Pest Management Program reflective of consistently changing needs of an urban park system
* Habitat Development beyond mitigation sites
* Community Gardens
* Public Education and Outreach
* Stormwater retention
* Human health, well-being and community values
* Consider and establish policies appropriate for the installation and management of synthetic playing fields including:
  - Synthetic fields should be installed only at facilities which also have lights for night-time play.
  - Synthetic fields should be budgeted as a fixed asset and fully depreciated over the life of the “surface.”
  - A policy that states synthetic fields will be open for play except under extreme weather conditions.
5.10 Signage Policy

5.10.1 Existing Conditions of Goleta Parks Signage

Many of the heavily used parks in Goleta have signs of park names and/or rules at the entrances. Some of the larger community parks and open spaces such as Stow Grove Park and Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserve, have signs for specific sections within the parks. Most of these signs are white metal panels often supported by wooden posts. Armitos Park, Evergreen Open Space, and Stow Grove Park have their own unique park name signs while other parks have either smaller name signs or no park signs at all. Some of the existing signs are relatively small and hard to read, and some signs are in poor condition. Not many of the signs have a consistent design, color or logo associated with them. Considering the fact that a relatively large percentage of the public do not know about all of the parks and the unique situation of the UCSB campus and other County of Santa Barbara lands around the City of Goleta, signage of parks is important and essential for improved perception and use of the parks.
Chapter 5 | Recommendations and Action Plans

Graffiti on a regulatory sign in Evergreen Open Space

Damaged signs and signs that are too small for clarity

Older interpretive signs with limited graphics and color

Signs with too small of lettering

This park entrance is not clear that it is a public park

Many parks have entrances with no identification signs
5.10.2 Park Facilities Signage and Interpretive Guidelines

This Master Plan suggests that the City adopt a four-tier general sign system, with adjustments for the different established park types. These guidelines are important for consistency, branding and appropriately sized signs that either identify the park or discuss regulatory or operational information signs.

- **1st Tier Monument Identification Signs**: for the City’s most important Community and Regional Parks located at major entrances only and that should be viewed from major streets allowing for decision making of turns and wayfinding.

- **2nd Tier Entrance Identification Signs**: for the main entrance of smaller Community and Neighborhood parks. These signs still need to be of sufficient size and clarity for wayfinding and turning decisions as seen from a vehicle.

- **3rd Tier Pedestrian Entrance Identification Signs**: for Neighborhood Parks and Open Spaces where the entry is likely by foot or by bike. These signs can be used as the primary entry signs for smaller open spaces and neighborhood parks or as pedestrian level entry signs where vehicles are not the primary access point for the park.

- **4th Tier Informational Signs**: This can include way-finding signs, kiosks and vertically-oriented pole signs to indicate minor entrances, edges of a park, or trails leading to a particular park.

On the following page are some general samples of what the 4 tiers of signs generally look like. Figure 5-12 provides a set of design samples of the suggested signage family. Please note that rather than the absolute design of each sign, these images are intended to represent the hierarchy, function and relative size of the interpretive materials. They do not dictate design details that should be used for each of the signage types.

All four sign types should have a unifying design elements, most notably materials and the Goleta City Logo. Other unifying design elements can include, shape, height, font styles and general form. These are unifying elements. However, some uniqueness should be considered for each signage tier type as well as the park site itself. Generally the name of the park and the specific color of parts of the sign, should be looked at as the differentiating factors of design.

This Master Plan suggests that the signage design incorporate key elements such as Goleta Parks logo, a park specific icon and a unique type-style and color of certain highlights of the overall sign. The materials should include concrete as base elements or pads with wood elements coming out of the concrete. Perhaps metal flat iron or other painted or metal with a patina should be around the base of the sign and at all joinery. Specific signage design styles may reference the example photos below and on the following pages.
**Figure 5-9:** Park Signage Samples

1st through 3rd Tier Identification Signs

- **1st Tier Monument Sign**
- **2nd Tier Entrance Sign**
- **3rd Tier Entrance Signs**

4th Tier Informational Signs

- **Trail/Milestone Identification Wayfinding Sign**
- **Interpretive Kiosk with Handout Pockets**
- **Interpretive Wood Post**
- **Free Standing Interpretive Wood Post**
- **Interpretive Kiosk with Shade**
5.10.3 Example of Implementation

As an example of how the hierarchy of signs should be used, Los Carneros Natural and Historic Preserves Park has been used to show the typical signage treatments envisioned at all parks. Currently, there is no official entrance feature in the Los Carneros. The park is accessible mostly through a vehicle entrance next to a county fire station, where there is only an entrance sign for the fire station and a small sign post for the museum.  

Hikers and bikers can access the park from Covington Way and La Patera Lane. Many on-line reviewers speak highly of the park, calling it a “hidden gem.” A clear signage system can surely make it easier for visitors to find and navigate, making this park more accessible and enjoyable for citizens and visitors.

According to the Lake Los Carneros Trail Management Plan (2009), SBTC recommended the development of small, unobtrusive kiosks at each of the main entrances to provide users with basic information regarding use of the park and interpretive materials about the park relating to the area’s wildlife and natural features.

Figure 5-13 is a map of the park from the SBTC document. The purple circles with letters represent recommended locations for different type of signs from the signage family introduced.
1st Tier Monument Sign
Main entrance with parking and other attractions on N Los Carneros Rd; currently no park name sign exists

2nd Tier Entrance Identification Sign
Another paved entrance with unofficial parking on N La Patera Ln; currently no park name sign exists

3rd Tier Entrance Identification Sign
As an official entry area for pedestrians, a sign is needed to identify the park and the entrance

4th Tier Wayfinding Informational Signs
Various trail markers can help to identify trails and to suggest mileage and destinations

3rd Tier Entrance Identification Sign
Another version of how this 3rd Tier could be made to work along a trail entrance

4th Tier Visitor Kiosk with Handout Pockets
Interpretive signs can exist where a resource is seen or where a walking entrance enters special park areas
5.11 Recommendations for Utilizing Reclaimed Water for Parks

The use of reclaimed water for park irrigation purposes is both a logical and sustainable option that should be considered for all parks. This general goal, however, should be applied in a comprehensive manner. Reclaimed water use can help to save on costs (less per unit cost), although the actual costs may be higher than the costs of using potable water. Factors affecting financial feasibility include capital costs of distribution, retrofitting, active water management practices as well as the cost of water to the City Parks Department. The extension of reclaimed water infrastructure is often not justifiable based only on water costs for a park system. However, if capital funding for reclaimed water infrastructure is going to occur in a particular geographic area, and a park can take advantage of this subsidized, drought-tolerant, alternative source, it should be considered.

5.11.1 Three-Phase Screening Process

There are a number of factors that need to be taken into account to decide if a park should switch its irrigation systems from potable to reclaimed, including:

- Adjacency to existing recycled water distribution lines
- Timing/status of park in planning, design and renovation schedules
- Soil capability in respect to drainage and retention capability of existing soils
- Horticultural capability/salt-tolerance levels of existing or future plantings
- Use capability in respect to proximity to passive, active, or play or picnic areas
- Current or planned irrigation systems and their compatibility with reclaimed water

To determine whether a given park is suitable for implementing a reclaimed water irrigation strategy, a comprehensive, three-phase prioritization screening process is recommended. This is to align with the natural progression of park planning and design, but also so that critical feasibility factors are determined early in the process. Table 5-7 through Table 5-9 show a methodology that should be used, in sequential order from Phase 1 through Phase 3. Scores are achieved at each phase per park if the minimum score is reached for a phase, the park can be moved to the next screening phase for further consideration. If the total for the park reaches at least 3 points for phase three, it is recommended to consider the project for reclaimed water irrigation. If the screening is performed for multiple parks, simply prioritize the highest scoring parks out of the list.
Screening Process 1: Initial System Planning

Reclaimed Water Access: By far, distance from supply factors are the most critical metrics in making these decisions, therefore, it is recommended that access to existing (or planned) distribution of reclaimed water is considered first (see Table 5-8). If reclaimed water already exists in a portion of the park, then it should be used throughout the park. If reclaimed water is available at the edges of a park, then this should be a high priority park to consider for this use. Even if the project is within 200 feet to 1,000 feet, if allowable it may be feasible to extend the distribution lines or provide a connector valve and meter and run a pressurized line to the park site. However, much beyond 1,000 feet the financial feasibility starts to become an infeasible choice. If reclaimed water is proposed in the area around an existing park that will bring reclaimed water to or near the park within a 3-year time-frame, it is probably within the window of the need to plan for it. However, if it is greater than 1,000 feet or beyond 3 years for access to reclaimed water, then other parks should be considered as a higher priority. This phase serves as a first-pass filter, since it involves the highest cost which determines the feasibility of considering irrigation for a park in the first place.

The City and its water provider, though having not implemented, have also considered reclaimed water reuse possibilities with recharging its potable water supplies. Although reclaimed water delivery and use is currently about a third the capacity of available supplies, there may be some potential minor impacts to the available reclaimed water supply. While no expansion is planned of the reclamation distribution system (per Dan Brooks, Chief Engineer, Goleta Water District, 1/8/2019), note that this phase of the screening process can accommodate future planned expansion in 3, 5, or 10 years.

An analysis map showing distances to and from parks to reclamation lines is provided here. This map includes a list of the parks within an acceptable distance to recycled water distribution and their points scored on the first phase of the screening process (see Figure 5-115-14). Note that the parks visible on this map only include public parks owned and managed by the City of Goleta, since these parks will be considered for a reclamation irrigation strategy. If the reclaimed water line runs through the park itself, such as Bella Vista Park, then the score achieves a very high score of 10.

Table 5-7: Screening Process Phase 1: Initial System Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reclaimed Water Access</th>
<th>SCORING POTENTIAL</th>
<th>RECLAIMED WATER ACCESS POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reclaimed Water at Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclaimed Water Adjacent to Park (less than 200’)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclaimed Water Near Park (200’ to 500’)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclaimed Water Near Park (500’ to 1,000)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far from Reclaimed Water (&gt;1,000’)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be Serviced by Reclaimed Water in 3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be Serviced by Reclaimed Water in 5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be Serviced by Reclaimed Water in 10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBTOTAL 0 If above 3 points, move onto Phase 2
Figure 5-11: Distances from Recycled Water to Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK</th>
<th>MINIMUM DISTANCE FROM RECYCLED WATER</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION TO SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bella Vista I, II &amp; III Parks</td>
<td>On Site</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Acres</td>
<td>0.200'</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell’s Beach Easement</td>
<td>0.200'</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Shores County Park</td>
<td>0.200'</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Shores Open Space (Small)</td>
<td>0.200'</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Village</td>
<td>500-1,000'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Screening Process Phase 2: Park Planning

After having succeeded through the first phase, this screening phase will rank the parks based on existing conditions, which includes park planning and soil capability. The factors involved with Phase 2 are more related to new park sequencing (see Table 5-9).

**Park Status:** A new park can start with properly designed water distribution and irrigation methods from the beginning and the appropriate salt-tolerant types of plant material can be specified up front.

**Soil Capability and Reclaimed Water Relationships:** A major factor in determining the feasibility of reclaimed water use is the type of soil including its chemical characteristics. Soil with high salinity levels would require salt-tolerant plant species which are generally limited in number. In general, reclaimed water must be applied with greater control and management if it is high in Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), a measure of salinity and other solids. High TDS water causes a significant loss in water and nutrient uptake capability in most landscape plants due to salinity ions displacing critical ions and plants become stressed. Soil water near the surface naturally evaporates, and plants will suffer if salts are not pushed away from the plant root zone on a regular basis. Saline water conditions tend to build-up on the soil surface, creating a crust to hinder water infiltration and a toxic evapotranspiration environment for plants. Any salt build-up around the root system can cause stunting in growth, tip burn of vegetation or other damage to the plant.

2018 reclaimed water analysis results of TDS at the Goleta Water District’s treatment facility range from 1,131 and 1,435 ppm, with an average of 1,238 ppm (per Lena Cox, Laboratory and Technical Services Manager, Goleta Sanitary District, 10 Jan. 2019). These numbers are generally high but for plants with various levels of salt tolerance this water is still considered usable. Interventions are recommended with mid-level TDS, such as leaching as the most common method (Irrigation Water Quality Standards and Salinity Management, Texas A&M Agrilife Extension, 2017) and moderate-level restricted use (Water Quality for Agriculture, 29 Rev. 1, FAO, 1994).

### Table 5-8: Screening Process Phase 2: Park Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Status</th>
<th>SCORING POTENTIAL</th>
<th>PARK STATUS POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Park with Some Reclaimed Water Infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Park in Design Phase</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Park in Planning Phase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Park with Expansion Areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Needing Irrigation Replacement Soon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Capability</th>
<th>SCORING POTENTIAL</th>
<th>SOIL CAPABILITY POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Drained Loam / Sandy Soils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-permeable Deep Soils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifiable Soils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Drained Clay Soils</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** 0

If above 4 points, move onto Phase 3
Figure 5-12: Well Drained Soils Throughout Park System
Soils conducive for reclaimed water use are those that are capable of allowing adequately flushing of TDS. Plants root zone depths vary across species and in various soil types but the majority of roots are generally found within the top 18” of the surface. Well drained soils that are deeper than 16” can generally minimize TDS build-up near the root zones. A map of well drained soils found in Goleta’s park system can be found on Figure 5-12. Note that the parks shown on this analysis map only include public parks owned and managed by the City of Goleta, since these will be the parks most eligible for consideration for irrigation. The categories on this map align with the “Well Drained Loam / Sandy Soils” factor in the screening table.

Interventions can be used to mitigate the effects of higher TDS levels in reclaimed water and soils. These can encompass a proper, judicious selection of plant material that can handle higher TDS levels, as well as soil amendments and treatments. For existing sites it is not always easy, nor is it always simple to modify the infiltration rates of low permeability soils necessary for effective leaching. Modifying the soil surface is limited to minimizing disturbance to existing plants and their roots. Some soils can be modified enough to increase drainage capability. Irrigation practices that apply excess water on a managed, regular basis, and applying supplemental irrigation during rain events (where allowed) can help to drive salts down below and out of the active plant root zone. But these methods are more expensive than having the favorable soils to start with.

**Screening Process Phase 3: Park Design**

This phase is where the park planner can have the most control (see Table 5-10). The factors involved with Phase 3 are more about how and where in the park should one consider implementing reclaimed water use.

---

**Table 5-9: Screening Process Phase 3: Park Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horticultural Capability</th>
<th>SCORING POTENTIAL</th>
<th>HORTICULTURAL CAPABILITY POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wide Open Turf Fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally Mixed Non-native Plantings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought Tolerant Natives</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Compatibility</th>
<th>SCORING POTENTIAL</th>
<th>IRRIGATION CAPABILITY POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Passive or Trail / Walkway Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Playgrounds or Picnic Areas</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Irrigation Compatibility</th>
<th>SCORING POTENTIAL</th>
<th>USE COMPATIBILITY POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotary or Flood / Stream Based System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Mixed System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Irrigation / Large Coverage</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drip or Emitter Based System</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL FOR ALL PHASES**

*(if above 10 points consider programming / implementing project)*
Horticultural Capability: Plants that are subjected to reclaimed water irrigation must be able to survive under sustained applications of water and live in soils that may be with higher salts levels. Each site evaluated should be considered for their ability to support plants conducive to living with these conditions. Existing ornamental plants must be identified as to their salt sensitivity level. Many ornamental plants are salt-sensitive and may not be able to tolerate reclaimed water with the TDS levels present. Some coastal native plant material can be capable of handling higher salinities in the soil and on their foliage, but most do not do well. Since natives require lower water use to start with, irrigation systems may not often be operated enough, and their inability to tolerate infrequent watering may be to their detriment. Potential possibilities of mitigating the increase in salt levels exposed to plants may include periodic reclaimed/potable water mixing, and potable water syringe cycling.

Park Use Compatibility: When considering applications for reclaimed water, use regulations must be taken into account. Where conflicts are evident, modifications must be reviewed. Potable water use areas must be reviewed along with reclaimed water use areas. Some potable water use areas may need to be expanded due to restrictions of reclaimed water use. Health concerns of using reclaimed water around active sports fields (those sports where a player’s face/mouth may come in contact with the turf) may need to be avoided. However, timing of events and timing of irrigation application can offset some of these concerns. Natural waterways, water features, drinking fountains, exercise facilities, playgrounds and drainage facilities and other areas where potential contact with reclaimed water may occur, are concerns. In areas of a park where food is prepared or eaten, over-spray onto these areas may be a concern. Again, time of application and control of irrigation practices, where allowable, can still allow for reclaimed water use in these areas. However, the costs of water application techniques and monitoring will be higher.

Current Irrigation Compatibility: Finally, if an existing irrigation system is in place and is not in need of whole replacement (operates sufficiently), then the types of irrigation equipment retrofitting should be considered. In general, low flow emitter, micro-spray or drip systems tend to clog up easily when their orifices are exposed to atmosphere, especially those only operated infrequently and in dry seasons. But when this type of irrigation covers extended plant root zones (orifices are not just localized at the plant), are operated regularly and can be cycled longer for leaching purposes, they can be an effective means of driving salts out of the root zone. On the other hand, sprinkler heads that cover large areas can in built environments create over-spray onto non-landscape areas that is of concern. Generally, wide open areas are better for reclaimed water application, especially turf areas since they allow for irrigation systems that are less likely to clog and with less equipment may minimize retrofit costs. Some sprinkler heads may cause soil surface compaction with their large water drops, which can impact water infiltration. The most effective types of irrigation most closely imitate the broad coverage of rainfall. Smaller water drops of sprinkler heads with moderate throw distances allow for less over-spray and water that is better distributed.

Summary

All of these factors should be considered in determining if and where to use reclaimed water in a park, and this screening process is one method to ensure everything is addressed. A master plan for reclaimed use in parks should be further developed to determine specific recommendations by Park maintenance staff, planning staff, as well as staff from the Goleta Sanitary Water Resource Recovery District.
5.12 ADA Recommendations

A key concept that must be kept in mind, is that public programs and services, when viewed in their entirety, must be accessible to people with disabilities, but not all facilities must necessarily be made accessible. For example, if a city has multiple public swimming pools and limited resources, it can decide which pools to make accessible based on factors such as the geographic distribution of the sites, the availability of public transportation, the hours of operation, and the particular programs offered at each site so that the swimming program as a whole is accessible to and usable by people with disabilities.

Another key concept is that public entities have an ongoing obligation to make programs and services accessible to people with disabilities. This means that if many access improvements are needed, and there are insufficient resources to accomplish them in a single year, they can be spread out over time. It also means that rising or falling revenues can affect whether or not an access improvement can be completed in a given year. What might have been seen as an undue burden during an economic downturn could become possible when the economy improves and revenues increase. Thus, public entities should periodically reassess what steps they can take to make their programs and services accessible. Public entities should also consult with people with disabilities in setting priorities for achieving program access. Please refer to Appendix A to see the ADA issues that should be addressed when any of these parks are added to, infilled with new amenities or upgraded in some manner.