

## CHAPTER 6

### FACILITY AND AMENITY STANDARDS, LEVELS OF SERVICE AND RE-EVALUATION

Beginning with *The Cordova Recreation and Park District Park Standards & Guidelines for New Development* prepared by Moore, Iacofano, Goltsman, Inc (MIG), *The Inventory and Assessment Plan* explains the process and rationale for service level adjustments subsequently established by Gates + Associates in 2009 and September of 2012. PRO's Consulting then published, in the *Inventory and Assessment Plan*, Appendix 4 "Service Level Standards". These standards were ultimately refined and incorporated by Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc. in *The Cordova Recreation and Park District Park Impact Fee Nexus Study* to provide specific costs associated with proposed capital improvements.

Recent District policy changes have allowed flexibility in park and open space development with the City of Rancho Cordova. As a result, the District may consider a variety of land use planning options that meet both, the recreational and functional needs of the community when adequate funds are provided for improvement and ongoing maintenance and operations.

Section 3.2 Facility/Amenity Standards, Levels of Service and Service Area Analysis of *The Inventory and Assessment Plan* is inserted below, followed by the Capital Improvement Plan.



## 3.2 FACILITY/AMENITY STANDARDS, LEVELS OF SERVICE AND SERVICE AREA ANALYSIS

### 3.2.1 FACILITY STANDARDS OVERVIEW

Facility Standards are guidelines that support investment decisions related to parks, facilities and amenities. Facility Standards could change over time as the program lifecycles change and demographics of a community change. Park Service Areas determine how much of the population within a certain proximity will be served by a specific type of facility. Park Service Levels indicate how many of the resident population will be served by a specific facility.

### 3.2.2 SERVICE LEVEL ANALYSIS

In 2009, the District utilized a City of Rancho Cordova General Plan Survey conducted in 2004, a CRPD Park Standards and Needs Assessment conducted in 2005 by MIG, Inc., and a comparative analysis performed by Gates & Associates in 2009 to initiate the discussion about the appropriate service levels for the District. The original service levels proposed in 2006 included heavily programmed park sites with limited use facilities and numerous community-wide and District-wide features, such as football fields, rubberized tracks, a campground and an indoor soccer arena. These levels were revised due to the high capital costs that were proposed. In 2009, the Gates study analyzed park amenity service levels of the Roseville, Folsom and Cosumnes areas and developed comparable standards for the District (see **Figure 41**). This methodology and outcome was presented to a Joint Work Session of the City of Rancho Cordova City Council and the CRPD Board of Directors on January 27, 2011. During that same time period, CRPD worked with PROS Consulting to conduct two surveys to determine demographic trends and associated park and recreation needs of the District (see **Chapter 2**). Simultaneously, from 2009 to 2011, CRPD participated with the Northstate Building Industry Association (BIA) and Sacramento County to write a 'Tentative Agreement in Principle' to the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors to produce a park 'Quimby' standard for all of the Park Districts in Sacramento County. Standards for the 'Infill Park Districts' were adopted in 2010. Discussions with the 'New Growth Districts' stalled as the proposal did not address geographic differences, future needs and demographic trends. The CRPD determined to proceed with a policy that would create parity throughout all areas of the District and determined that CRPD would negotiate its own service level program with Sacramento County. In 2010, PROS evaluated Park Service Level standards using a combination of resources. These resources included: National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) guidelines, standards established by the Quimby Act in California, and recreation activity participation rates reported by American Sports Data as it applies to activities that occur in the United States. Pros also preformed a needs-based analysis for the Cordova Recreation and Park District area. A summary findings of this analysis can be found in **Chapter 4**.

### 3.2.3 SERVICE LEVEL AND SERVICE AREA REEVALUATION

After receiving public testimony at the joint CRPD Board/Rancho Cordova City Council/BIA meeting on January 27, 2011, a re-evaluation of the service level program was performed.

CRPD went through an administrative change on February 16, 2012. On April 9 2012, the CRPD Board of Directors, new administrator and the CRPD Management Team held a retreat to determine the future of the District over the next five years. One of the outcomes of this retreat was a determination by the Board of Directors and staff to make the District's future park facilities attractive, reasonable and financially sustainable. Park development standards were subsequently revised to include a philosophy that neighborhood parks would be more passive in nature and community parks would be more active in nature. The park program would also include larger, but limited district-wide attractions and facilities. Based on this new philosophy, the service-level program was once again reevaluated from March 2012 to August 2012 combining the comparative performance standards analysis work performed by Gates & Associates and the hierarchical needs-based analysis performed by PROS Consulting to generate a program that was flexible, operationally feasible, financially sustainable, and addressed community needs.

Several changes were made to make the program more sustainable and include:

- 1) Moving sports facilities and restrooms from the neighborhood parks to the community parks.
- 2) Increasing flexibility in field use by reducing limited-use and enhancing multi-use fields.
- 3) Reducing the total number of sprayground facilities in neighborhood parks and replacing with enhanced facilities in community parks.
- 4) Replacing full-court basketball in neighborhood parks with half-court facilities.
- 5) Eliminating CRPD-built football field and track facilities and entering into agreements with the four school districts within CRPD boundaries to utilize football and track facilities in a joint-use format.

Park Service Areas and Standards are defined as follows:

- 1) Neighborhood Parks shall be located in neighborhoods. They are 2 acres to 15 acres in size with passive programming and a service radius area of  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile. They shall be bordered on three sides with residential street frontage (one side of residential street frontage may be substituted by elementary school frontage). The remaining property line shall be fenced by a 6' CMU split-face wall with a decorative cap when bordered with residential or commercial properties (this may be substituted by creek frontage if applicable). When adjacent to schools, decorative fencing with access gates shall be used on the property line. Neighborhood Parks shall not be located on lands that are unusable or not programmable.
- 2) Community Parks shall be centralized in villages and community areas. They are 15 acres or greater in size with active programming with a service radius of 1 – 1  $\frac{1}{2}$  miles. They shall be bordered on two sides with residential street frontage and one side with connector roads (one side of residential street frontage may be

substituted by high school or middle school frontage). The remaining property line shall be fenced by a 6' CMU split-face wall with a decorative cap when bordered with residential or commercial properties (this may be substituted by creek or lake frontage if applicable). When adjacent to schools, decorative fencing with access gates shall be used on the property line. Community center buildings shall be located on or adjacent to Community Parks. Community Parks shall not be located on lands that are unusable or not programmable.

- 3) District-Wide Facilities are facilities that serve the entire District (Office Complex, Corporation Yard) shall be constructed in centralized locations near to or on Community Park property.
- 4) Urban Plazas are parks that are urban in nature with a plaza-like feel and are acceptable in commercial and densely urbanized areas. They are eligible for Quimby credit and shall be reviewed and credited on a case-by-case basis.
- 5) Lakes and Creeks – CRPD will not accept or maintain lakes or creeks. These are not eligible for Quimby Credit.
- 6) Drainage Basins – CRPD will not accept or maintain any portion of a drainage retention/detention basin.
- 7) Other than Quimby Parkland: Any additional parkland outside of the 5 acres per 1,000 population shall be owned and maintained by the City, County, POA or HOA in which it is located. The District may enter into an MOU to maintain these facilities only if fully funded.

The 'City-wide' category was eliminated and the aquatics facility service level was redefined at 1 per 140,000 population. The Quimby provision requirement remained at 5 acres per 1,000 population.

With this new program, the final service level program was approved by the Cordova Recreation and Park District Board of Directors on September 12, 2012. This program can be viewed in **Appendix 4**.

**Table 2**  
**Capital Improvement Plan**

Facility	per 100K	Service Level
<u>Basic Park Improvements</u>		
Neighborhood Parks - Basic Improvements	240	1 per 417
Community Parks - Basic Improvements	260	1 per 385
<u>Playgrounds</u>		
Play Area - Neighborhood	45	1 per 2,222
Play Area - Community	6	1 per 16,667
Play Area - Universal	1	1 per 100,000
<u>Shade Structures</u>		
Group Shade/Picnic Area - Small Neighborhood	54	1 per 1,852
Group Shade/Picnic Area - Small Community	10	1 per 10,000
Group Shade/Picnic Area - Large Neighborhood	15	1 per 6,667
Group Shade/Picnic Area - Large Community	10	1 per 10,000
Group Shade/Picnic Area - Destination	2	1 per 50,000
<u>Sports Fields</u>		
Baseball Field - Little League - Lighted - Game	4	1 per 25,000
Baseball Field - Little League - Unlighted - Game	6	1 per 16,667
Softball Field - Adult lighted - Synthetic	3	1 per 33,333
Softball Field - Girl's Unlighted - Game	6	1 per 16,667
Softball Field - Girl's Lighted - Game	4	1 per 25,000
Soccer Field - bantam - Small - Community	5	1 per 20,000
Soccer Field - bantam - Large - Community	5	1 per 20,000
Soccer Field - bantam - Regulation Grass - Comm	17	1 per 5,882
Soccer Field - Regulation Synthetic turf - Lighted	2	1 per 50,000
Multi-use Turf Area - Small Neighborhood	18	1 per 5,556
Multi-use Turf Area - Small Community	2	1 per 50,000
Multi-use Turf Area - Large Neighborhood	7	1 per 14,286
Multi-use Turf Area - Large Community	3	1 per 33,333
<u>Sports Courts</u>		
Basketball Outdoor Neighborhood Park (1/2 court)	16	1 per 6,250
Basketball Outdoor Community Park (full court)	8	1 per 12,500
Bocce Ball/Petanque - competition (4 court)	3	1 per 33,333
Tennis Courts - Lighted (2 courts ea.)	10	1 per 10,000
Volleyball (sand) tournament (6-court complex)	2	1 per 50,000
Horseshoes - Neighborhood	10	1 per 10,000
Horseshoes - Community (2 court)	8	1 per 12,500
<u>Skate Parks</u>		
Skate Park - Community Park	2	1 per 50,000
<u>Aquatics and Spray Parks</u>		
Aquatic Center <sup>1</sup>	0.71	1 per 140,000
Spray Area - Community Park	5	1 per 20,000
<u>Gathering Places</u>		
Amphitheater for 500	2	1 per 50,000
Community Market Place	1	1 per 100,000
Neighborhood Gather Place	5	1 per 20,000
Community Gathering Place	4	1 per 25,000

<sup>1</sup> 71% of the total costs are being allocated to new development.

Source: Cordova Recreation and Park District; Goodwin Consulting Group, Inc.

Table 6-1 – Capital Improvement Plan (List of Standard Park Elements)

**Table 2 – Continued**  
**Capital Improvement Plan**

<b>Facility</b>	<b>per 100K</b>	<b>Service Level</b>
<u>Offsite Structures</u>		
Teen Before/After School/day Camp Activity Center	2	1 per 50,000
Community Center (24,000 sq. ft.)	2	1 per 50,000
Wellness/Senior Center (12,000 sq. ft.)	1	1 per 100,000
Site Storage Facilities	3	1 per 33,333
Corporation Yard <sup>2</sup>	0.4	1 per 250,000
District Offices <sup>2</sup>	0.4	1 per 250,000
Restrooms Small - Community Park	5	1 per 20,000
Restrooms Medium - Community Park	9	1 per 11,111
Restroom/concession/storage (1,700 sq. ft.)	1	1 per 100,000
Sport Park Concession	2	1 per 50,000
<u>Miscellaneous Features</u>		
Batting Cages	2	1 per 50,000
Batting Cages - Small	1	1 per 100,000
Dog Park - Community Park	3	1 per 33,333
Water Feature - Community Park	2	1 per 50,000
Disc Golf Course	1	1 per 100,000
<u>Parking</u>		
Off-street parking	1,475	1 per 68

A detailed analysis between the Gates + Associates baseline, national standards and the final 2012 Service Level Standard is demonstrated in a chart prepared by District staff and PROS Consulting (Table 6-2). The final service levels resulted in a 15% reduction in fee from the Gates + Associates levels. The column titled “PROS Rank” is derived from Figure 41 of the PROS study (found in Chapter 5 of this document). Reasons for the adjustments are explained in the last column of the chart.

## Sustainability

Park system planning must consider the initial construction cost, long-term maintenance and replacement cost to ensure District’s goals at met in perpetuity. Members of the North State Building Industry Association (BIA) provided input about park development fees and annual maintenance taxes (CFD special taxes). BIA information and support was vital in establishing a maximum pricing for impact fees and maintenance taxes.

BIA contended that the market would not bear the \$632 annual maintenance tax established in the September 2012 Capital Improvement Plan (C.I.P.). Negotiations to establish a fair and reasonable annual maintenance tax allowed for an initial lower annual tax rate of \$350 as formalized in the Montelena CFD. An initial lower annual tax was justified by the recognition that maintenance costs are not substantially required until the development project is near full build out. Park facilities are typically fully constructed in the middle or near the end of build out of the adjacent development. That allows maintenance fees collected during build out to be reserved and collect interest to contribute toward the initial shortfall. In addition to building up a reserve, a higher inflationary rate was negotiated as a means for the annual maintenance tax to increase at a faster rate. The Park Development Agreement states, “The District and Developer agree that the cost of living escalation factor shall be calculated using the greater of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for San Francisco/Oakland/San Jose or the Consumer Price Index for Pacific West Coast Cities, All Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers.” The higher inflationary rate will eventually allow the annual tax to achieve the level as established in the 2012 Capital Improvement Plan.

The District will lower replacement costs from those used in the 2012 C.I.P. by upgrading the quality of initial construction. Design and construction documents for each park will be evaluated to maximize savings in life-cycle costs; for example, park pathways will be constructed with concrete instead of asphalt for lower life-cycle costs. Under new management the District will improve preventative maintenance to further extend the life expectancy of new construction.



**Cordova Recreation and Park District - Capital improvement Plan - New Growth DEVELOPMENT - CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA**

**Comparative Analysis proposed by Gates and Associates**

February 2010 - baseline

**National Standards Proposal by Pros**

25% reduction in fee

**Combined Needs Based Survey and Comparative Analysis**

15% Reduction in Fee

CURRENT PROGRAM by GATES AND ASSOCIATES							NATIONAL STANDARDS by PROS CONSULTING							COMBINED ANALYSIS PROGRAM by CRPD STAFF								
Facility	per 100K	Service Level	Unit Cost	Total Cost	CFD Cost	Total revenue	per 100K	Service Level	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Change	CFD Cost	Total revenue	Pros Rank	per 100K	Service Level	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Change	CFD Cost	Total revenue	Reason for Proposal
Neighborhood Parks - Basic Improvements	240		\$259,851	\$62,364,240	\$157.86	\$5,406,073.56	150		\$259,851	\$38,977,650	-\$23,386,590	\$157.86	\$5,406,073.56	3	240		\$259,851	\$62,364,240	\$0	\$157.86	\$5,406,073.56	
Community Parks - Basic Improvements	260		\$265,048	\$68,912,480	\$142.97	\$4,896,150.62	350		\$265,048	\$92,766,800	\$23,854,320	\$142.97	\$4,896,150.62	9	260		\$265,048	\$68,912,480	\$0	\$142.97	\$4,896,150.62	
Baseball Field - Adult - Lighted - Game	1	1 per 100,000	\$611,170	\$611,170	\$1.99	\$68,149.54	8	1 per 12,500	\$611,170	\$4,889,360	\$4,278,190	\$15.92	\$545,196.32	20	0	0 per 100,000	\$611,170	\$0	-\$611,170	\$7.96	\$272,598.16	high school to provide/MS
Baseball Field - Little League - Lighted - Game	6	1 per 16,667	\$348,125	\$2,088,750	\$6.77	\$231,845.42	7	1 per 14,286	\$348,125	\$2,436,875	\$348,125	\$7.90	\$270,486.32	20	2	1 per 50,000	\$348,125	\$696,250	-\$1,392,500	\$2.26	\$77,281.81	low rank - high O/M cost - 4 field w/ girls soft in Rio del Oro
Baseball Field - Little League - Unlighted - Game	6	1 per 16,667	\$155,625	\$933,750	\$4.04	\$138,353.84	7	1 per 14,286	\$155,625	\$1,089,375	\$155,625	\$4.71	\$161,412.81	20	8	1 per 12,500	\$155,625	\$1,245,000	\$311,250	\$5.39	\$184,471.79	absorbs lighted loss
Baseball Field - Senior/LL/Teen - Lighted - Game	1	1 per 100,000	\$611,170	\$611,170	\$2.20	\$75,341.20	5	1 per 20,000	\$611,170	\$3,055,850	\$2,444,680	\$11.00	\$376,706.00	20	0	0 per 100,000	\$611,170	\$0	-\$611,170	\$0.00	\$0.00	low rank - high school provided
Basketball Outdoor Neighborhood Park	16	1 per 6,250	\$51,977	\$831,632	\$2.84	\$97,258.64	12	1 per 8,333	\$51,977	\$623,724	-\$207,908	\$2.13	\$72,943.98	19	8	1 per 12,500	\$51,977	\$415,816	-\$415,816	\$1.42	\$48,629.32	low rank - split into (16) 1/2 courts
Basketball Outdoor Community Park	12	1 per 8,333	\$51,977	\$623,724	\$2.13	\$72,943.98	8	1 per 12,500	\$51,977	\$415,816	-\$207,908	\$1.42	\$48,629.32	19	10	1 per 10,000	\$51,977	\$519,770	-\$103,954	\$1.78	\$60,786.65	low rank
Football Field	1	1 per 100,000	\$255,333	\$255,333	\$0.68	\$23,287.28	0	0 per 100,000	\$255,333	\$0	-\$255,333	\$0.00	\$0.00	26	0	0 per 100,000	\$255,333	\$0	-\$255,333	\$0.00	\$0.00	low rank - high school provided
Football Field with Synthetic track	1	1 per 100,000	\$619,434	\$619,434	\$1.33	\$45,547.18	0	0 per 100,000	\$619,434	\$0	-\$619,434	\$0.00	\$0.00	26	0	0 per 100,000	\$619,434	\$0	-\$619,434	\$0.00	\$0.00	low rank - high school provided
Indoor Soccer	1	1 district-wide	\$2,182,405	\$2,182,405	\$13.90	\$476,019.40	0	0 district-wide	\$2,182,405	\$0	-\$2,182,405	\$0.00	\$0.00	22	0	0 district-wide	\$2,182,405	\$0	-\$2,182,405	\$0.00	\$0.00	low rank - high O/M cost - private sector provided
Softball Field - Men's lighted - Synthetic	4	1 per 25,000	\$1,043,403	\$4,173,612	\$12.13	\$415,403.98	0	0 per 100,000	\$1,043,403	\$0	-\$4,173,612	\$0.00	\$0.00	23	2	1 per 50,000	\$1,043,403	\$2,086,806	-\$2,086,806	\$6.07	\$207,701.99	low rank - high O/M Cost
Softball Field - Girl's Unlighted - Game	6	1 per 16,667	\$189,141	\$1,134,846	\$5.32	\$182,188.72	0	0 per 100,000	\$189,141	\$0	-\$1,134,846	\$0.00	\$0.00	24	8	1 per 12,500	\$189,141	\$1,513,128	-\$378,282	\$7.09	\$242,918.29	absorbs lighted loss
Softball Field - Girl's Lighted - Game	6	1 per 16,667	\$383,428	\$2,300,568	\$8.13	\$278,419.98	0	0 per 100,000	\$383,428	\$0	-\$2,300,568	\$0.00	\$0.00	24	2	1 per 50,000	\$383,428	\$766,856	-\$1,533,712	\$2.71	\$92,806.66	low rank - high O/M cost - 4 field w/ I league in Rio del Oro
Soccer Field - bantam - Small - Neighborhood	5	1 per 20,000	\$10,242	\$51,210	\$0.56	\$19,177.76	0	0 per 100,000	\$10,242	\$0	-\$51,210	\$0.00	\$0.00	13	0	0 per 100,000	\$10,242	\$0	-\$51,210	\$0.00	\$0.00	mid-rank locate in community park
Soccer Field - bantam - Small - Community	1	1 per 100,000	\$10,242	\$10,242	\$0.11	\$3,767.06	0	0 per 100,000	\$10,242	\$0	-\$10,242	\$0.00	\$0.00	13	6	1 per 16,667	\$10,242	\$61,452	-\$51,210	\$0.66	\$22,602.36	w/ add in from neighborhood park
Soccer Field - bantam - Large - Neighborhood	4	1 per 25,000	\$10,698	\$42,792	\$0.50	\$17,123.00	0	0 per 100,000	\$10,698	\$0	-\$42,792	\$0.00	\$0.00	13	0	0 per 100,000	\$10,698	\$0	-\$42,792	\$0.00	\$0.00	mid-rank locate in community park
Soccer Field - bantam - Large - Community	2	1 per 50,000	\$10,698	\$21,396	\$0.25	\$8,561.50	0	0 per 100,000	\$10,698	\$0	-\$21,396	\$0.00	\$0.00	13	6	1 per 16,667	\$10,698	\$64,188	-\$42,792	\$0.75	\$25,684.50	w/ add in from neighborhood park
Soccer Field - bantam - Regulation Grass Neighborhood	9	1 per 11,111	\$116,562	\$1,049,058	\$4.77	\$163,353.42	0	0 per 100,000	\$116,562	\$0	-\$1,049,058	\$0.00	\$0.00	13	0	0 per 100,000	\$116,562	\$0	-\$1,049,058	\$0.00	\$0.00	mid-rank locate in community park
Soccer Field - bantam - Regulation Grass - Community	10	1 per 10,000	\$116,562	\$1,165,620	\$5.30	\$181,503.80	0	0 per 100,000	\$116,562	\$0	-\$1,165,620	\$0.00	\$0.00	13	19	1 per 5,263	\$116,562	\$2,214,678	\$1,049,058	\$10.07	\$344,857.22	w/ add in from neighborhood park
Soccer Field - Regulation Synthetic turf - Lighted	3	1 per 33,333	\$911,474	\$2,734,422	\$7.16	\$245,201.36	0	0 per 100,000	\$911,474	\$0	-\$2,734,422	\$0.00	\$0.00	21	2	1 per 50,000	\$911,474	\$1,822,948	-\$911,474	\$4.77	\$163,467.57	low rank - two field at MSC - add two at Rio del Oro
Handball	2	1 per 50,000	\$20,343	\$40,686	\$0.05	\$1,712.30	0	0 per 100,000	\$20,343	\$0	-\$40,686	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	0	0 per 100,000	\$20,343	\$0	-\$40,686	\$0.00	\$0.00	no ranking - private sector to supply
Bocce Ball/Petanque - neighborhood (2 court complex)	4	1 per 25,000	\$34,846	\$139,384	\$0.46	\$15,753.16	0	0 per 100,000	\$34,846	\$0	-\$139,384	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	0	0 per 100,000	\$34,846	\$0	-\$139,384	\$0.00	\$0.00	moved to community parks
Bocce Ball/Petanque - competition (4 court complex)	2	1 per 50,000	\$442,948	\$885,896	\$2.22	\$76,026.12	0	0 per 100,000	\$442,948	\$0	-\$885,896	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	3	1 per 33,333	\$442,948	\$1,328,844	\$442,948	\$3.33	\$114,039.18	competition - reduced O/M costs - fenced
Horseshoes - Neighborhood	10	1 per 10,000	\$6,442	\$64,420	\$0.12	\$4,109.52	0	0 per 100,000	\$6,442	\$0	-\$64,420	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	10	1 per 10,000	\$6,442	\$64,420	\$0	\$0.12	\$4,109.52	low cost - no change
Horseshoes - Community (2 court)	8	1 per 12,500	\$11,643.64	\$93,149.12	\$0.34	\$11,643.64	0	0 per 100,000	\$11,643.64	\$0	-\$93,149.12	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	8	1 per 12,500	\$11,643.64	\$93,149.12	\$0	\$0.34	\$11,643.64	low cost - no change
Skate Park - Community Park	1	1 per 100,000	\$1,193,720	\$1,193,720	\$2.12	\$72,601.52	2	1 per 50,000	\$1,193,720	\$2,387,440	\$1,193,720	\$4.24	\$145,203.04	25	2	1 per 50,000	\$1,193,720	\$2,387,440	\$1,193,720	\$4.24	\$145,203.04	w/add in from BMX
Skate/BMX	1	1 per 100,000	\$348,040	\$348,040	\$0.98	\$33,561.08	0	0 per 100,000	\$348,040	\$0	-\$348,040	\$0.00	\$0.00	25	0	0 per 100,000	\$348,040	\$0	-\$348,040	\$0.00	\$0.00	no BMX - high risk - moved to Community
Skate BMX 'spot'	4	1 per 25,000	\$94,336	\$377,344	\$2.10	\$71,916.60	0	0 per 100,000	\$94,336	\$0	-\$377,344	\$0.00	\$0.00	25	0	0 per 100,000	\$94,336	\$0	-\$377,344	\$0.00	\$0.00	no BMX - high risk - moved to Community
Tennis Courts - Lighted (2 courts ea.)	10	1 per 10,000	\$249,489	\$2,494,890	\$1.79	\$61,300.34	20	1 per 5,000	\$249,489	\$4,989,780	\$2,494,890	\$3.58	\$122,600.68	16	10	1 per 10,000	\$249,489	\$2,494,890	\$0	\$1.79	\$61,300.34	mid-rank - no change
Track for fitness - 1/2 mile	2	1 per 50,000	\$53,513	\$107,026	\$0.45	\$15,410.70	0	0 per 100,000	\$53,513	\$0	-\$107,026	\$0.00	\$0.00	6	0	0 per 100,000	\$53,513	\$0	-\$107,026	\$0.00	\$0.00	high school to provide
Volleyball (sand)	4	1 per 25,000	\$38,100	\$152,400	\$0.64	\$21,917.44	0	0 per 100,000	\$38,100	\$0	-\$152,400	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	0	0 per 100,000	\$38,100	\$0	-\$152,400	\$0.00	\$0.00	moved to 6-court complex
Volleyball (sand) tournament (6-court complex)	1	1 per 100,000	\$228,600	\$228,600	\$1.04	\$35,615.84	0	0 per 100,000	\$228,600	\$0	-\$228,600	\$0.00	\$0.00	2	2	1 per 50,000	\$228,600	\$457,200	\$228,600	\$2.08	\$71,231.68	reduced O/M cost - fenced
Amphitheater for 500	2	1 per 50,000	\$892,901	\$1,785,802	\$3.05	\$104,450.30	0	0 per 100,000	\$892,901	\$0	-\$1,785,802	\$0.00	\$0.00	17	2	1 per 50,000	\$892,901	\$1,785,802	\$0	\$3.05	\$104,450.30	mid-rank - no change - (1) @ Rio, 1 @ Arboretum
Aquatic Center (38% of total cost to new development)	1	1 district-wide	\$5,199,417	\$5,199,417	\$23.80	\$815,054.80	2	1 district-wide	\$5,199,417	\$10,398,834	\$47,600	\$1,630,109.60	5	1	1 district-wide	\$5,199,417	\$5,199,417	\$0	\$23.80	\$815,054.80	high rank	
Teen/Before/After School/day Camp Activity Center	3	1 per 33,333	\$913,800	\$2,741,400	\$5.89	\$201,708.94	0	0 per 100,000	\$913,800	\$0	-\$2,741,400	\$0.00	\$0.00	12	2	1 per 50,000	\$913,800	\$1,827,600	-\$913,800	\$3.93	\$134,472.63	mid-rank - 1 provided by PAL
Community Center (40,000) sq. ft.	1	1 per 100,000	\$10,965,600	\$10,965,600	\$39.25	\$1,344,155.50	0	0 per 100,000	\$10,965,600	\$0	-\$10,965,600	\$0.00	\$0.00	15	0	0 per 100,000	\$10,965,600	\$0	-\$10,965,600	\$0.00	\$0.00	removed 40,000 sq.ft. due to O/M Costs - use high school gyms
Community Center (24,000) sq. ft.	1	1 per 100,000	\$10,965,600	\$10,965,600	\$23.55	\$806,493.30	2	1 per 50,000	\$10,965,600	\$21,931,200	\$10,965,600	\$47.10	\$1,612,986.60	15	2	1 per 50,000	\$10,965,600	\$21,931,200	\$10,965,600	\$47.10	\$1,612,986.60	added (1) 24,000 sq. ft. facility to replace 40,000 sq. ft. facility
Wellness/Senior Center (12,000) sq. ft.	1	1 per 100,000	\$5,482,800	\$5,482,800	\$11.78	\$403,417.88	0	0 per 100,000	\$5,482,800	\$0	-\$5,482,800	\$0.00	\$0.00	14	1	1 per 100,000	\$5,482,800	\$5,482,800	\$0	\$11.78	\$403,417.88	mid-rank - no change
Community Market Place	1	1 per 100,000	\$544,558	\$544,558	\$0.72	\$24,657.12	0	0 per 100,000	\$544,558	\$0	-\$544,558	\$0.00	\$0.00	3	1	1 per 100,000	\$544,558	\$544,558	\$0	\$0.72	\$24,657.12	high rank - locate at Rio del Oro
Dog Park - Neighborhood	3	1 per 33,333	\$202,426	\$607,278	\$2.54	\$86,984.84	0	0 per 100,000	\$202,426	\$0	-\$607,278	\$0.00	\$0.00	7	0	0 per 100,000	\$202,426	\$0	-\$607,278	\$0.00	\$0.00	moved to community parks
Dog Park - Community	1	1 per 100,000	\$547,071	\$547,071	\$1.73	\$59,245.58	2	1 per 50,000	\$547,071	\$1,094,142	\$547,071	\$3.46	\$118,491.16	7	3	1 per 33,						





## Park Standards

### DEFINITIONS AND STANDARDS

The *Inventory and Assessment Plan* provided definitions for the different park types in Section 3.2.3. This document provides a brief summary of the definitions for the most common park types and a list of standard amenities for each park type. More specific standards are found in the “Design Guidelines, Construction Specifications and Standard Details”. The District will not accept Quimby credit for parks under power transmission lines.

#### *Regional Facilities*

- ◆ One regional amenity - Mather Sports Complex and one regional park - Hagan Park
- ◆ Future Rio Del Oro park site may accommodate regional park needs in new growth areas
- ◆ Available to District-wide residents but also marketed outside of the District
- ◆ Sporting facilities or unique features are intended to attract regional tournaments
- ◆ Designed for large crowds and durability
- ◆ Regional use of the facility adds to tourism revenue



*Mather Sports Complex*

#### *Community Parks*

- ◆ Ideally 15 acres or larger
- ◆ Active programming
- ◆ Service area radius of 1 – 1 ½ mile
- ◆ Street frontage on two sides (High School property on one side may substitute for street frontage)
- ◆ In addition to athletic facilities, each community park typically has:
  - ▷ Restrooms
  - ▷ Play structures - community sized
  - ▷ Group shade/picnic areas, large and small
  - ▷ Furnishings such as benches, picnic tables, barbecues (large and small), drinking fountains, trash cans, bike racks, etc.
  - ▷ Horseshoes – 2 court



*Stone Creek Amphitheater*

#### *Neighborhood Parks*

- ◆ Ideally two to 15 acres in size, with four to six acres being the preferred size
- ◆ Service area radius of ½ to ¾ mile
- ◆ Residential street frontage on three sides (elementary school property may substitute for one street)
- ◆ Each neighborhood park typically has:



- ▷ Play structure serving toddlers to 5 years old and 5 to 10 years old.
- ▷ Group shade/picnic areas, small and medium sized
- ▷ Furnishings such as benches, picnic tables, barbeques (small), and trash cans

### *City Open Space*

The City of Rancho Cordova Open Space requirement of one acre per 1,000 residents is not part of the Quimby park land dedication. Half of city Open space is to be provided as Neighborhood Greens and half of this acreage is to be provided as larger City facilities or as additional land that contributes to traditional CRPD parks. City Open Space may be added to CRPD’s traditional parks at the discretion of the District and with assurances of adequate funding for improvement, operation and maintenance of such lands.

### *Neighborhood Greens*

- ◆ Size typically ranges from ½ to two acres in size
- ◆ Small developed and landscaped areas within residential neighborhoods
- ◆ The City prefers walkable locations away from parks
- ◆ May include interior trail loops and pedestrian paseos as connectors
- ◆ May include benches, tables and shade structures
- ◆ Design should enhance a “sense of place”

### **Quality Standards**

The District requires that new parks be built to a specified quality standard. Design standards and construction standards are enforced throughout the development review process, preparation of design documents and by inspections by District staff during construction. The District has published a manual called “Cordova Recreation and Park District Design Guidelines and Construction Specifications”. This document must be periodically updated to reflect changes in building codes, technology and construction methods. The 2012 version is currently being reviewed for necessary revisions. All park development agreements require compliance to District standards of design and construction. The District manual is attached as an exhibit to all Park Development Agreements and is distributed to consultants who design District parks. These combined measures ensure that parks meet the District quality standards.

