



PARKS & RECREATION AND HARBOR COMMISSION
December 3, 2019
216 LEDDY ROAD, LEDDY PARK ARENA, FAMILY ROOM
5:30PM

- I. Approval of Agenda
- II. Consent Agenda
 - A. Action Item: Approval of Minutes of November 5, 2019 Meeting (attachment)
*waive the reading, approve the minutes and place them on file
- III. Discussion Item: (20 min.) Penny for Parks Project Scoring and Requests, Cindi Wight, Director, BPRW (attachment)
- IV. Public Forum: (Time Certain 6:00PM)
- V. Information Item: (30 min.) BTV Stat Recreation, Gary Rogers, Recreation Superintendent, BPRW (attachment)
- VI. STANDING ITEMS:
 - A. Report from Commission on Volunteer Hours (verbal)
- VII. Director's Items
- VIII. Commissioner's Items
- IX. Adjournment

Agenda available in alternative media forms for people with disabilities. For disability access information, call (802) 864-0123.



Penny for Parks Annual Capital Plan Development Process

2019-20 Update

2019 marks the 10th years since the first Penny for Parks project was implemented. This year we are revisiting the Penny for Parks review and ranking process and hope to embark on a larger project outreach effort to solicit community requests later in the year.

Capital Funding

Parks capital improvement projects have a variety of funding mechanisms, including but not limited to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), Penny for Parks (PFP), Park Impact Fees (PIF), the Sustainable Bond, Bike Path Improvement Maintenance Fund (BPIMF), Conservation Legacy Program Fund (CLPF), the Perpetual Care Fund (PCF), Trees and Greenways (T&G), General Fund (GF), private donation, and state and federal resources. All of these funding sources have restrictions as to the types of projects they may support. Flexibility is required to ensure that amenities in need of support are aligned with appropriate resources. This document focuses on the department process specifically in relation to the Penny for Parks (PFP) program.

PFP Management & Staffing

The Parks Planning Division works under the direction of the Parks, Recreation and Waterfront (PRW) Director, and provides three distinct functions to support the implementation and successful completion of parks improvements projects. The first function is the planning and prioritization of all parks capital improvement projects. The second is the management and oversight of these projects during design and construction. The final function is communication and outreach. The team is led by the Parks Comprehensive Planner, who oversees two Project Coordinators and a Marketing and Outreach Manager.

Parks Planning works in close coordination with the Parks Division which is led by the Superintendent of Parks Operations & Maintenance. The Parks Division is comprised of technically based professionals that include the crews of the City Arborist, Grounds Manager, Land Steward, Facilities Manager and Cemetery Assistant Superintendent.

The Parks Comprehensive Planner oversees the overall management of Penny for Parks and other parks capital improvement projects with the support of the outlined staff and with direct support from the designated Penny for Parks Project Coordinator. The other Project coordinator is largely dedicated to the Bike Path Improvement Project.

An internal review team has been identified annually to review potential PFP and parks capital improvement projects. This team consists of the PRW Director, Parks Comprehensive Planner, Parks Superintendent, Parks Project Coordinators, along with support/input from other relevant divisions and City departments.



I. Penny for Parks

PFP is an annual funding plan for parks capital improvement projects. In 2008, PFP was approved by voters as a parks improvement fund and is supported by a dedicated tax. By resolution, PFP is to be used exclusively for parks capital improvement needs. Eligible projects include the repair, renovation, replacement, or expansion of existing park and community garden facilities as well as the construction of new facilities in existing parks and community gardens. Funds not spent in one year carry over to the following fiscal year and remain in the PFP fund for this purpose until spent.

PFP is also a short and long-range financial planning and project implementation tool developed to address community needs for the ongoing improvement of parks facilities. Through this process, BPRW is able to schedule the phased implementation of improvements over time and better identify funding strategies.

General management practices for the fund inherently require appropriations to be responsive to: emerging projects, neighborhood interests and community values, trends in park development, capital initiatives, public and private partnerships, available grants and emergency repairs. It is in this spirit that BPRW has managed these funds since the program's inception. Derived from the Grand List, the average PFP allocation is \$370,000 annually. Targeted improvement categories include: playgrounds, courts, athletic fields, seasonal park facilities, standard equipment replacement, general park repairs, emergent and urgent projects, and staffing support.

Since 2012, a portion of the annual PFP allocation has been used to support the Parks Project Coordinator regular, full-time position. Each year, approximately \$48,500 was reserved for this role which is essential to project implementation. In 2018, the allocated funding was shifted to another funding source, but this may be switched back in the future.

PFP projects vary in dollar value, may be recurring, generally have a multi-year useful life, and typically result in fixed assets. Reserve funds are to be used across various projects and are not necessarily appropriated to a specific project, allowing the city to be responsive to critical, emergent needs and to maximize opportunities.

The 2008 PFP Resolution specifies that the annual budgeting process shall be authorized by the City Council. The PFP program is designed to be updated on an annual basis through the operating budget adoption process and through direct amendment. In this manner, it becomes an ongoing fiscal planning tool that continually anticipates future costs and funding sources.

PFP is fluid in nature, with projects added and deleted from the approved list as a result of adjusted funding, project completion, or urgency with respect to safety. The PFP annual project list names each improvement and attempts to identify sources to fund all components. It indicates what will be constructed where, and estimates when and at what cost.

PFP represents the best efforts to allocate available resources toward parks projects that provide the most benefit for the residents of Burlington. The program is reviewed each year to reflect



changing community priorities within the larger framework of parks capital need and their impacts on use, operations, scheduling, and coordination with related projects.

A project's inclusion in the PFP annual plan does not commit BPRW to funding and completion. Available funds, taxing capacity, and debt capacity may require that some projects be deferred beyond the years in which they are initially programmed for completion, or removed from the annual capital plan if staff review processes confirm an alternate priority.

II. Parks Annual Capital Plan Development: Public Requests, Screening, and Communication

The Parks Annual Capital Plan Development Schedule (see attachment) has been updated to ensure participation, consistency, transparency, completion of improvement projects, and alignment to community values. The program process is as follows:

1. Public Project Requests Accepted Year-round

At any point during a given fiscal year, Burlington residents have the opportunity to inform BPRW of potential PFP or parks project suggestions by submitting a Project Request Form. This form is available online at www.enjoyburlington.com.

2. Project Screening

On an annual basis the internal review team will screen public project requests using standard evaluation criteria to rank and prioritize each improvement project. Each project will be scored using the following criteria to reflect the immediacy of the need.

Health, Safety & Accessibility	<i>Project will improve the facility with regards to public health, welfare and safety.</i>
Serviceability & Lifespan	<i>Project currently exceeds its service life.</i>
Parks & Rec Master Plan Alignment	<i>Project supports efforts towards Burlington parks system master planning.</i>
Capital Plan Alignment	<i>Project supports efforts towards 10-year Capital Improvement Plan implementation.</i>
Federal/State/Local Mandate	<i>Project is required by Federal or State regulation, or by City Council ordinance.</i>
Alternative Funding Sources	<i>Project leverages local, Federal, State, grant, or private funding.</i>
Design & Aesthetics	<i>Project will visually, culturally and/or historically improve the image & quality of the parks system.</i>
Best Management Practices	<i>Project supports and/or improves best management & maintenance practices.</i>
Operations & Efficiencies	<i>Project will improve efficiencies in staffing, maintenance, or utilities or reduces future capital burden.</i>
Environmental Impacts	<i>Project will lessen impact on the natural environment and/or supports resource conservation.</i>
Programming	<i>Project will improve the operational aspects of recreational programming.</i>
User Base	<i>Project has a significant user base.</i>
Revenue Opportunities	<i>Project will directly or indirectly increase BPRW revenue generation.</i>

A project will receive 1-2 or 3 points per criteria. If specific criteria do not apply to a project, no points will be assigned. The project's criteria points will be summed to generate a maximum project point value of 39. The review team will consider project point total in terms of



prioritization, along with other impacting factors such as funding sources, distribution of resources, project bundling, staff work plans, and schedule to develop the Parks Annual Capital Plan, which will correlate to BPRW's Strategic & Master Plans and the City's 10-Year Capital Plan.

Project screening may involve additional staff visits to the proposed facility or project site and include the acquisition of estimates. Other City departments and consultants may provide technical support in determining possible solutions and cost estimates. Parks screening criteria is aligned with CIP screening criteria so that projects may be weighed within the framework of city-wide capital need.

Staff will then compile a draft of the Parks Annual Capital Plan Staff that includes prioritized, publically requested projects in addition to staff-recommended projects derived from BPRW's Strategic & Master Plans and the City's 10-Year Capital Plan.

3. Discussion of Penny for Parks community applications
Staff will provide the list of Penny for Park applications with suggested ranking to the Commission in late fall. These will be projects that are anticipated to be completed in the same fiscal year or the summer of the following fiscal year and are under \$40,000. At this public meeting, those that submitted projects have the opportunity to share their project and staff will explain the ranking. The goal will be to approve the community requests at the late fall meeting.
4. Discussion of Parks Annual Capital Plan Draft with Parks Commission
Staff will introduce the Parks Annual Capital Plan Draft to the BPRW Commission in mid-winter. At this public meeting residents and Commission members may provide input on the development of the Parks Annual Capital Plan.
5. Approval of Parks Annual Capital Plan by the Parks Commission
Annually, the BPRW Commission will formally approve the Parks Annual Capital Plan – prior to staff's annual communication to the Board of Finance and City Council. This meeting, anticipated to take place each April, is also a public meeting where residents may provide input on the development of the Parks Annual Capital Plan.
6. Communication of Parks Annual Capital Plan to the CAO, Board of Finance & City Council
The feedback generated from the BPRW Commission meetings and public input will be incorporated to the Parks Annual Capital Plan. BPRW staff will prepare a recommendation to the CAO, Board of Finance, and City Council for their review and comment.
7. Approval of Parks Annual Capital Plan by the City Council
Feedback from the Mayor's Administration and City Council will be incorporated to the Parks Annual Capital Plan and submitted for final approval by the City Council.

BPRW FY20 Penny for Parks Project Request Ranking

				Health, Safety & Accessibility Serviceability & Lifespan Parks & Rec Master Plan Alignment Capital Plan Alignment Federal/State/Local Mandate Alternative Funding Sources Design & Aesthetics Best Management Practices Operations & Efficiencies Environmental Impacts Programming User Base Revenue Opportunities															
NO.	LOCATION	PROJECT REQUEST	ESTIMATE															Max 39	REQUEST DATE
1	Calahan Park	Tennis Court rehab	\$25,000	3	3	3	1	0	0	2	3	2	0	3	3	0		23	May-19
2	Battery Park	Chief Grey Lock Repair	???	2	3	2	1	0	1	3	2	1	0	1	2	0		18	Jan-19
3	Calahan Park	SD Ireland Field Lighting	\$100,000	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	3	3	2		16	Apr-19
4	Waterfront Dog Park	Water fountain	\$13,500	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	2	3	0		14	Jun-19
5	Calahan Park	Pollinator Meadow	\$2,700	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	2	0	0		13	May-19

Additional Requests that were not ranked:

Permanent Fence for Rock Point North Community Gardens COMPLETED – This request was completed by our conservation/gardens division without the use of PFP funding.

Appletree Park Pickleball Lines COMPLETED – This request was completed as part of the Appletree Courts Reconstruction project

Leddy Park Pickleball Lines COMPLETED – This request was completed as it was very low cost and easily achievable.

UVMCM Community Gardens Irrigation COMPLETED – This project was completed quickly due to its time sensitive nature (the goal was to provide irrigation before this past growing season), high priority (this was the only community garden remaining that did not have irrigation), and the offer of project management from the City's water department.

Comprehensive High Quality Bike Parking – This project is already on our Capital list and so does not need additional ranking. Our Bike Rack Inventory was completed this past summer and we have piggybacked a \$12,000 order for bike racks onto DPW's bulk purchasing agreement. Our priorities are to start by placing racks in parks without any, followed by those in poorest condition, followed by replacement of "wheel bender"/ladder-style racks.

Waterfront/Urban Reserve/Battery Park Basketball Court – This request didn't screen to be on our capital list. Because of legal restrictions on Waterfront Park and the Urban Reserve it is not possible or within Parks' authority to construct a court in either of these areas. It is possible that a basketball court could be built in Battery Park, but because this would be a significant change to the character of the park, this would need to be first vetted through a Master Planning process for Battery Park.



PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
Minutes
December 3, 2019

Commission Present: Farrell, Barlow, Hurley, Traverse, Healy, Harris, Todd

Staff Present: Wight and O'Daniel

The meeting was convened at 5:41p.m. by Traverse

Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda by Todd, second by Barlow, motion carried.

Approval of Consent Agenda

Waived the reading aloud of the consent agenda, motion was made to approve the consent agenda without reading aloud with the included motions by Healy, second by Todd, motion carried.

Penny for Parks Project Scoring and Requests

Wight: Asked if any questions about the handout. No questions.

Our ranking along the top are all of the scoring criteria, talks about which each area means. Went through (planning team, parks team and Cindi) went through projects and ranked them. Some were small requests that they were able to just turn around – example Pickle Ball court lines at Appletree. Waterline at the Medical Center Garden. Bike parking expansion.

Calahan Park – Tennis Courts: fixing all of the cracks and re-sealing the tennis courts. This ranked high because of Health/Safety/Accessibility etc. Fits in our Master Plan for keeping up with court maintenance.

Battery Park – Chief Grey Lock repair: ranked high because there are unsafe aspects to it. The repair is not likely, the replacement could be a different art installment. There is a group interested in working on this. Potential fundraising and ideas from them.

Calahan Park – SD Ireland Lighting: Being ranked even though it is an expensive project. Could be a long term project, breaking it up into smaller projects year to year.

Waterfront Dog Park – Water Fountain: Getting water to the site is the most expensive piece.

Calahan Park – Pollinator Meadow: Scored lower because of the level of commitment from the public.

Questions:

Hurley asked how we get the word out. Seems like there are a lot of South End projects – what about the Old and New North Ends?



Wight responded that there isn't much pointed outreach at this time. Could be increased. Todd suggested the schools would be a good place to do outreach for more engagement into the PFP process.

Barlow asked how the ranking system is determined. Wight responded that it is a choice by the individuals on the committee. Could be tightened up with a rubric of sorts potentially.

Todd asked if there was a timeline for submitting. Wight responded no, but they are reviewed in October/November. Some smaller ones that come in earlier with a time limit can be approved ahead of time.

Traverse asked if all of the money needed to be spend annually or if some could be rolled over and put towards more expensive projects.

Traverse what Wight would recommend the Commission do in regards to her presentation. What is the role of the Commission in this? To support your recommendation?

First time Commission has been asked for their vote of approval for Penny for Parks. Wight would recommend that for FY2020 we rehab the Calahan Tennis Courts and set aside the remainder towards the Chief Grey Lock repair/replacement project – potentially assessments.

Todd stated she feels that the Commission shouldn't micromanage the choices, but show support for the recommendations that the Staff brings.

Traverse moves to support the department's recommendation of \$25,000 to tennis court rehab at Calahan Park and to also support \$15,000 for the Chief Grey Lock assessments contingent to what information is brought back as more information is learned. Hurley seconds, motion approved.

Public Forum (Time Certain 6:00PM)

Public forum opened at 6:00 p.m. by Traverse.

Dave Hartnett: Wants a pavilion at Leddy Park behind the rink in the Picnic Grove. Weather always seems to be an issue, nice to have a covered space. Also nice to have bathrooms available to the public. Believes it would be rented every weekend and a welcomed addition to the park. It would be well served here in the New North End.

Dave Hartnett: Speaking to Penny for Parks also – used to take trips to all the parks as Commissioners to see the conditions. Helped advocate for all parks in the City and meeting all of their needs.

Pat Kearney: Would also like to see a pavilion at Leddy. Wants to see one similar to the ones at Oakledge Park. Would be a lot of money but would be well used and would pay for itself quickly.

Pat Kearney: Leddy Garage: Was told that the garage was going to be torn down. Told shingles would fall off and doors were too narrow. Will the arborists and the whole crew be able to move there?

Pat Kearney: We need some salt for the Leddy walkway!



Public forum closed at 6:06 p.m.

BTV Stat Recreation Presentation

Wight explained that all City departments have to present – Parks goes 3 times a year: November, February and July. Really starting to narrow in on what they want us to present on. This was the 2nd time we presented on this information so we were able to compare from last year.

Program Offerings and Participants – Increase in programs offered. Used the data to see where there were gaps and offered more where those gaps were.

Program Capacity by Season – Decreased a lot of the summer openings. Fall/winter stayed similar.

Program Cancellation Comparison – Where are there a lot of cancellations? Adults has the highest amount. This is when they tried a program and they were cancelled because of low attendance. Looking for thoughtful ways to create new programs.

Participant Survey Results – Are people happy with what we're doing? Increase with satisfaction overall.

Summer Youth Programs – 4 Year Funding Comparison – State aid decreased from 2018 to 2019, has to do with childcare resources. Financial Assistance awarded – Having more scholarships available. Daily Youth Participants By Race – looking at demographics by perception, a scan of the kids who are there. Daily Youth Participants by Race – Fee Based Programs vs Summer Meals Programs: less diversity in fee based, more diversity in summer meal programs.

P.A.L Camp – partnership with Parks, the Library, and BCA, realized there was a gap in the last 2 weeks of August, committed to doing a licensed camp for those 2 weeks.

Department Events revenue

Report from Commission on Volunteer Hours

Traverse asked the Commission if they had any additional hours for the month of November in addition to the commission meeting.

Todd, Barlow and Traverse attended the Barge Canal revetment tour with Adams-Kollitz and Wight. It was a 1 hour tour.

Pierce met with Wight individually for 1 hour.

Director's Items

Wight explained updates.

Have selected someone to do a Commission retreat. Got 3 proposals from an RFP. Starting to think about dates in January, maybe a Friday. Tentatively 1/24/20. About 4 hours long. Discuss open meeting laws and what the authority of the Commission is. People wanting to know how to serve in this role.



Bike Path Update – assisting with Maple to College St. alignment for Amtrak. The 2nd track has been in discussion since 2016. In order for Amtrak to be accommodated and all other users to be able to access the tracks, there needs to be a 2nd track. We want to be on the other side of the track. CEDO is taking the lead on this project. DPW and Parks are involved. Open to concept.

Had name tags made for all of the commissioners.

Todd inquired about the Farmers' Market. Is it staying in the South End?

Wight responded yes for 2020. Not sure for 2021 yet. They need a certain amount of linear feet, which we are putting together for them now.

Harris asked for an update on the bike park.

Wight responded that it is currently with the City Attorney's office. Working on the MOU for doing the fundraising.

Commissioner's Items

None

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 7:30p.m. by Farrell, second by Todd, motion carried.