

ACTION SHEET
CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETING OF 02/11/15
ITEM FROM FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING OF 02/02/15

ISSUE:

18. Request for Approval of a Resolution Authorizing the Reallocation of 2012 Parks and Trails Bond Funds, in the Amount of \$533,300, that are Currently Allocated for the Skate Features at Franklin Miles Park, Ragle Park and West De Vargas Park to be Reallocated for a Skate Feature at Genoveva Chavez Community Center. (Councilor Trujillo) (Richard Thompson)

Committee Review:
 Public Works Committee (approved) 01/12/15
 City Council (scheduled) 02/11/15

Fiscal Impact – Yes

FINANCE COMMITTEE ACTION: APPROVED AS DISCUSSION ITEM

FUNDING SOURCE:

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OR AMENDMENTS

Request to Publish for Public Hearing and direction to staff.

STAFF FOLLOW-UP:

VOTE	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
COUNCILOR TRUJILLO	X		
COUNCILOR RIVERA	X		
COUNCILOR LINDELL	X		
COUNCILOR MAESTAS	X		
CHAIRPERSON DOMINGUEZ			

**ACTION SHEET
ITEM FROM THE
PUBLIC WORKS/CIP AND LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING
OF
MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015**

ITEM 14

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE REALLOCATION OF 2012 PARKS AND TRAILS BOND FUNDS, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$533,300, THAT ARE CURRENTLY ALLOCATED FOR THE SKATE FEATURES AT FRANKLIN MILES PARK, RAGLE PARK AND WEST DE VARGAS PARK TO BE REALLOCATED FOR A SKATE FEATURE AT GENOVEVA CHAVEZ COMMUNITY CENTER (**COUNCILOR TRUJILLO**) (**RICHARD THOMPSON**)

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ACTION: APPROVED ON CONSENT

FUNDING SOURCE:

SPECIAL CONDITIONS / AMENDMENTS / STAFF FOLLOW UP:

VOTE	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN
CHAIRPERSON TRUJILLO			
COUNCILOR BUSHEE	X		
COUNCILOR DIMAS	X		
COUNCILOR DOMINGUEZ	EXCUSED		
COUNCILOR RIVERA	X		

City of Santa Fe, New Mexico

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

Resolution No. 2015-____ Skate Feature - GCCC

SPONSOR(S): Councilor Trujillo

SUMMARY: The proposed resolution authorizes the reallocation of 2012 Parks and Trails Bond Funds, in the amount of \$533,300, that are currently allocated for the skate features at Franklin Miles Park, Ragle Park and West de Vargas Park to be reallocated for a skate feature at Genoveva Chavez Community Center.

PREPARED BY: Rebecca Seligman, Legislative Liaison Assistant

FISCAL IMPACT: No

DATE: January 23, 2014

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution
FIR

1 CITY OF SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

2 RESOLUTION NO. 2015-____

3 INTRODUCED BY:

4
5 Councilor Ron Trujillo

6
7
8
9
10 A RESOLUTION

11 AUTHORIZING THE REALLOCATION OF 2012 PARKS AND TRAILS BOND FUNDS, IN
12 THE AMOUNT OF \$533,300, THAT ARE CURRENTLY ALLOCATED FOR THE SKATE
13 FEATURES AT FRANKLIN MILES PARK, RAGLE PARK AND WEST DE VARGAS
14 PARK TO BE REALLOCATED FOR A SKATE FEATURE AT GENOVEVA CHAVEZ
15 COMMUNITY CENTER.

16
17 WHEREAS, the 2012 Parks and Trails Bond Implementation Plan ("2012 Plan") included
18 appropriations for skate facilities at Ragle Park, Franklin Miles Park and West De Vargas Park; and

19 WHEREAS, the intent of the 2012 Plan was to designate remaining funds from the West De
20 Vargas and Franklin Miles Park skate facilities for the proposed skate feature at Ragle Park; and

21 WHEREAS, in consultation with the skate community, the Parks and Open Spaces Advisory
22 Commission and City staff, a location behind the Genoveva Chavez Community Center ("GCCC")
23 has been determined to be a more appropriate site for the new skate feature in comparison with the
24 proposed Ragle site, which would have been located beside the handball court; and

25 WHEREAS, for the following reasons a skate feature at GCCC is more appropriate:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- GCCC is located further south where more youth reside
- Amenities exist at GCCC
- There is more parent and staff visibility and supervision at GCCC
- City Fire Station #7 is located next to the GCCC, in the event of emergencies
- Provides a new visibility for alternative sports
- The location will spark new and different types of users
- Recreation programs and events can be more easily created and accessed
- Keeps the family together in one location as there are activities for everyone
- Would increase GCCC parking by improving the overflow parking lot; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 11-9.1 SFCC 1987 “any reallocation of proceeds from a voter-approved general obligation bond that deviates materially from the information provided to the electorate by the city of Santa Fe shall be voted upon by the governing body after a public hearing”; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing regarding the reallocation of \$533,300 from Ragle Park, Franklin Miles Park and West De Vargas Park skate features that was designated in the 2012 Plan was held on _____, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the reallocation of such funds will be designated for a skate feature at GCCC.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF SANTA FE that the Governing Body hereby authorizes the reallocation of 2012 Parks and Trails Bond funds, in the amount of \$533,300, that are currently allocated for the skate features at Franklin Miles Park, Ragle Park and West De Vargas Park to be reallocated for a skate feature at Genoveva Chavez Community Center as follows. The reallocation shall be from the following projects to the GCCC skate feature:

Franklin Miles	\$113,000
Ragle Park	\$320,000

West De Vargas Park \$100,300

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 2015.

ATTEST:

JAVIER M. GONZALES, MAYOR

YOLANDA Y. VIGIL, CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


KELLEY A. BRENNAN, CITY ATTORNEY

City of Santa Fe Fiscal Impact Report (FIR)

This Fiscal Impact Report (FIR) shall be completed for each proposed bill or resolution as to its direct impact upon the City's operating budget and is intended for use by any of the standing committees of and the Governing Body of the City of Santa Fe. Bills or resolutions with no fiscal impact still require a completed FIR. Bills or resolutions with a fiscal impact must be reviewed by the Finance Committee. Bills or resolutions without a fiscal impact generally do not require review by the Finance Committee unless the subject of the bill or resolution is financial in nature.

Section A. General Information

(Check) Bill: _____ Resolution: X

(A single FIR may be used for related bills and/or resolutions)

Short Title(s): AUTHORIZING THE REALLOCATION OF 2012 PARKS AND TRAILS BOND FUNDS, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$533,300 THAT ARE CURRENTLY ALLOCATED FOR THE SKATE FEATURES AT FRANKLIN MILES PARK, RAGLE PARK AND WEST DE VARGAS PARK; FOR A SKATE FEATURE AT THE GENOVEVA CHAVEZ COMMUNITY CENTER.

Sponsor(s): Councilors Dominguez and Dimas

Reviewing Department(s): Parks and Recreation Department

Persons Completing FIR: Richard Thompson Date 01/28/2015 Phone: 955-2105

Reviewed by City Attorney: Kelly A. Brennan Date: 1/28/15
(Signature)

Reviewed by Finance Director: [Signature] Date: 1-29-2015
(Signature)

Section B. Summary

Briefly explain the purpose and major provisions of the bill/resolution:

This resolutions proposes to utilize funds from two completed Park Bond projects, both involving skate features, and Park Bond funds from the proposed skate feature at Ragle Park; in order to construct a larger facility at the GCCC.

Section C. Fiscal Impact

Note: Financial information on this FIR does not directly translate into a City of Santa Fe budget increase. For a budget increase, the following are required:

- a. The item must be on the agenda at the Finance Committee and City Council as a "Request for Approval of a City of Santa Fe Budget Increase" with a definitive funding source (could be same item and same time as bill/resolution)
- b. Detailed budget information must be attached as to fund, business units, and line item, amounts, and explanations (similar to annual requests for budget)
- c. Detailed personnel forms must be attached as to range, salary, and benefit allocation and signed by Human Resource Department for each new position(s) requested (prorated for period to be employed by fiscal year)*

1. Projected Expenditures:

- a. Indicate Fiscal Year(s) affected – usually current fiscal year and following fiscal year (i.e., FY 03/04 and FY 04/05)
- b. Indicate: "A" if current budget and level of staffing will absorb the costs
"N" if new, additional, or increased budget or staffing will be required
- c. Indicate: "R" – if recurring annual costs
"NR" if one-time, non-recurring costs, such as start-up, contract or equipment costs
- d. Attach additional projection schedules if two years does not adequately project revenue and cost patterns
- e. Costs may be netted or shown as an offset if some cost savings are projected (explain in Section 3 Narrative)

Skate

Finance Director: _____

Check here if no fiscal impact

Column #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Expenditure Classification	FYE 6-30-2015	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	FY _____	"A" Costs Absorbed or "N" New Budget Required	"R" Costs - Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected

Personnel*	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Fringe**	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Capital Outlay	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Land/ Building	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Professional Services	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
WIPP Construction	\$533,300	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____
Total:	\$533,300	_____	_____	_____	\$ _____	_____	_____	_____

* Any indication that additional staffing would be required must be reviewed and approved in advance by the City Manager by attached memo before release of FIR to committees. **For fringe benefits contact the Finance Dept.

2. Revenue Sources:

- a. To indicate new revenues and/or
- b. Required for costs for which new expenditure budget is proposed above in item 1.

Column #:	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	Type of Revenue	FYE 6-30-2015	FY _____	"R" Costs Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	FY _____	"R" Costs - Recurring or "NR" Non-recurring	Fund Affected

From Funds

Franklin Miles	\$113,000	NR	\$ 0.00	NR	43018
Ragle	\$ 320,000	NR	\$ 0.00	NR	43044
W. De Vargas	\$ 100,300	NR	\$ 0.00	NR	43013

To Fund

GCCC Skate Facilities	\$533,300	NR			43064
-----------------------	-----------	----	--	--	-------

3. Expenditure/Revenue Narrative:

Explain revenue source(s). Include revenue calculations, grant(s) available, anticipated date of receipt of revenues/grants, etc. Explain expenditures, grant match(s), justify personnel increase(s), detail capital and operating uses, etc. (Attach supplemental page, if necessary.)

Revenue Source(s) are Parks Bond -- 0112400 funds from two completed Park Bond projects, both involving skate features, and Park Bond -- 0112400 funds from the proposed skate feature at Ragle Park; in order to construct a larger facility at the Genoveva Chavez Community Center Grounds.

Section D. General Narrative

1. Conflicts: Does this proposed bill/resolution duplicate/conflict with/companion to/relate to any City code, approved ordinance or resolution, other adopted policies or proposed legislation? Include details of city adopted laws/ordinance/resolutions and dates. Summarize the relationships, conflicts or overlaps.

N/A.

2. Consequences of Not Enacting This Bill/Resolution:

Are there consequences of not enacting this bill/resolution? If so, describe.

If this resolution is not enacted, a smaller skate feature would be built at Ragle Park, with additional parking required and accessibility issues to overcome. At the proposed site (GCCC), there is adequate space to develop existing overflow parking, and the terrain is relatively level.

3. Technical Issues:

Are there incorrect citations of law, drafting errors or other problems? Are there any amendments that should be considered? Are there any other alternatives which should be considered? If so, describe.

No

4. Community Impact:

Briefly describe the major positive or negative effects the Bill/Resolution might have on the community including, but not limited to, businesses, neighborhoods, families, children and youth, social service providers and other institutions such as schools, churches, etc.

Members of the skate community have endorsed this location, and the opportunity to combine funding for a greater level of design, and a larger facility in general. Recreation Division agrees that multi-generational (grandparents/parents/children) utilization of the facility requires a variety of recreational opportunities. Parks Division believes that location of facility will have no impact on maintenance capacity or costs of service.

Form adopted: 01/12/05; revised 8/24/05; revised 4/17/08

✳ c. Skate Feature Site Selection and Next Steps

Chair Booth said Mr. Lehm asked her to report to the Commission that he met with Councilor Trujillo and Liza Suzanne. He indicated he is happy with the site location at GCC that now allows room for the senior center in the future.

Mr. Thompson said if Ms. Suzanne is happy with the placement of the parking lot, facility development would have no objections.

The group discussed the ENN required. Ms. Guerrerortiz thought there would be one ENN and "noticing" sent to people around the three parks. Ms. Taylor agreed. Chair Booth said the only ENN needed will be at GCC.

Mr. Thompson said the bond language indicates that people voted to put money into the parks. He said as he reads the specifics, people should be told why what they voted on is being changed.

Chair Booth explained there are two resolutions. One is that any material deviation from the Bond Implementation Plan has to go through City Council and a public meeting is required. The other is that an ENN is required if there is a change of more than \$250,000 in a park. She asked Mr. Thompson to check with legal.

Ms. Guerrerortiz said she agrees people at Ragle should be told that the city will not be building in their community. She said a cover letter could explain the change and that the skate park will be elsewhere.

Mr. Thompson added that it will be important to tell the neighborhood how other features were expanded at Ragle.

Mr. Thompson asked if a workshop is needed to review project by project.

Ms. Guerrerortiz said she wanted more about the project status: budgets, ENNs, schedules for design development, etc.

Chair Booth added that Commissioners want a short description of the projects and that can be covered in a regular meeting.

d. Strategic Planning Next Steps: Recommendations for the Mayor

Chair Booth said the meeting has been postponed until Monday, January 5th, 2015.

e. 2008 Audit RFP Update – Not Discussed

f. ~~Community Garden Evaluation and Lessons Learned (Exhibit 1)~~

~~Chair Booth said the goal is to inventory and analyze the current community garden parks in coordination with the majordomos and parciales; in relation to the resolution that formed it. The resolution was to create two parks; evaluate those and then expand. Recommendations were to be made based on the findings and what POSAC's role could be in the city's urban agricultural policy.~~

~~b. 2012 Parks and Trails Bond Implementation Status~~

~~Mr. Thompson said the goal was reached on the second bond sale and the city ended up with \$1.61 million. Martin Gabaldon the project manager and Jason Kluck the designer, realized a surplus in the first projects and the remaining project budgeting has been completed. Mr. Thompson said he will provide a financial report at the December meeting.~~

~~Chair Booth asked about the status of the Water History Park and was told it is design/build, third party with input from the Santa Fe Watershed Association.~~

* c. Skate Feature Site Selection and Next Steps (Exhibit 1)

Chair Booth said several people looked at both sites. She asked Mr. Lehm to talk about the site visits and invited Liza Suzanne from GCC (Genoveva Chavez Community Center) to answer questions.

Mr. Lehm said he was glad to have so many attend. He said the group discussed the status of Franklin Miles Park and the repairs and everything looks great.

He explained that the group looked at Ragle to get a sense of the advantages and disadvantages. An advantage is that the site is closest to Santa Fe High School and the preparation expenses could reduce the amount left for the skate feature. The site is fairly level and putting in a parking lot would be easy; paved parking would be needed only for ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act). Water and electricity would be needed at the site.

A disadvantage is that the site is close to the existing skate park (about a mile and a half) and needs more preparation. Possibly the neighbors would not allow a skate park; an ENN would be needed. There is a question about the close proximity of two different user groups; the handball and skateboard group and the isolation from the remaining park presents a safety/security concern.

At the backside of GCC the advantages are: the site is further south where more youth live; there are existing amenities; the site has existing safety features and GCC staff and the fire department nearby. The location could spark a new perspective for an alternative sport and a new generation for users of a different kind. The recreation staff could create programs and events that include skateboarding and activities for the entire family would be in one location; ice skating, skateboarding, the gym, etc. The site is next to the overflow parking and would create more parking and more paved parking for GCC overflow parking.

A disadvantage is that the space has been projected for another use, such as a senior center.

The front of the Chavez Center had many of the same advantages and the field is not used much because of the slope. The expense to remove the prairie dogs would be eliminated. A disadvantage is the parking pressure would increase and there would not be a new parking lot. There are bus routes to both sites.

Mr. Trujillo said skateboard tournaments had been discussed and he was concerned with how many more people would use the GCC facilities.

Ms. Liza Suzanne said she found there was not a lot of negative impact at Monica Lucero or the Disc Golf Park; in fact it probably helped bring users to the Chavez Center.

Mr. Trujillo said another of his concerns is that money was spent to put in a sprinkler system and he wondered how the public would react to tearing that up.

Mr. Thompson said Parks recognizes the internal challenge to market park facilities and amenities. He said they have a list and will identify markets and targets.

Mr. Trujillo said he was fine with the Commission's decision not to include Ragle as an option. He asked which site would be better; the front or back of GCC.

Mr. Lehm suggested the back site. He said the site is level and next to existing parking and parking would be easy to add.

Ms. McDonald said if the back is chosen they should look at how to harvest water off of the parking lot, because of water pressure on the arroyo. She said it is a wonderful opportunity to establish vegetation. She wanted to be sure that is included in the programming.

She asked about the lights and if the trails closed at 10 p.m. Mr. Thompson replied that facilities and parking lots have to be lit until the 10 p.m. curfew.

Mr. Coriz said he thought the back side was better and it would be nice to have restrooms and water accessibility. He said a lot of kids are dropped off while their parents run around town and GCC is a perfect site for them.

Ms. Hansen said she supports the back of GCC. She said if lighting is done appropriately and under the Night Sky Ordinance there would not be problems from neighbors. She liked that the parking lot could be expanded and the idea of water harvesting, but was concerned about the [proposed] senior center. Mr. Trujillo replied that until money is available a senior center on the south side is a dream.

Chair Booth said she also supports the backside for the reasons named.

Chair Booth opened the floor to public comment at this time.

Ms. Rachel Wexler said she represents the Department of Health (DOH). She said public health is working on healthy aging and the New Mexico DOH is getting involved. She said healthy aging is about having access to multi generational communities and a dream is to have a senior center adjacent to the skate park. She said if they dreamed even bigger, it would be how to plan so the two engaged with one another.

Ms. Mary Schruben clarified that bus service from GCC is serviced by bus #4, but she is not aware of a bus that goes by the corner of Zia and Yucca. Mr. Trujillo replied that bus stops could be looked at.

Mr. Pete Gardini said he liked the idea being by GCC and would like a design/build this time.

Mr. Thompson said the community had been heard; they want one house for design/build. He said the reallocation would be taken to City Council for their determination and funds are available.

Mr. Trujillo thanked POSAC for doing due diligence. He said his only concern is the lighting and the neighbors that live adjacent to the site. He said if those affected say they do not want lights, he would support that to be considerate to the neighborhood. He said he is not opposed to solar lights on timers and for tournaments there could be a variance to have lights.

Councilor Trujillo offered to sponsor the resolution. He said he would like to see the skate spots concept.

Ms. Suzanne said the lights should be easy to direct since they only have to shine in one direction.

Chair Booth said she would start working with Ms. Byers in Legal.

Chair Booth talked about how several older skaters keep DeVargas clean and clean up the graffiti. She said there is very little graffiti in DeVargas and Franklin Miles Parks because Mr. Gardini uses his own paint and paints every weekend.

Mr. Gardini said most of the skaters bring their kids on Sundays to sweep and clean. He said skaters try to confront people that do graffiti and they send that message to the younger generation.

Mr. Thompson said the city has made great strides with Keep Santa Fe Beautiful and offered resources to make it easier. He said Parks will work closely with the design/build team on the surfaces. He said the stakeholder meetings are critical and the main objection is the design/build. The request will be vetted through the RFP and local procurement with the hope to get a local firm.

Mr. Lehm suggested getting GCC's feedback about whether new parking is an extension of the existing parking lot with the skate feature next to that, or in between the two parking lots.

Chair Booth suggested they meet on site to look at that. The group discussed the site and decided to meet Tuesday, December 2nd at 1 p.m.

Chair Booth thanked Mr. Trujillo and said she appreciated his openness to discussion and change. Mr. Lehm thanked Mr. Trujillo as well.

d. ~~Strategic Planning Next Steps~~

~~Chair Booth said the Mayor has asked the Commission to come back with ideas and she and Ms. McDonald and Mr. Thompson developed the points. She said the points were all previously discussed by the Commission in strategic planning.~~

~~Chair Booth read each of the points. She said a tenth point was suggested by Ms. McDonald: to actively look for financing.~~

~~The Planning Steps were discussed. The group conversation is summarized as follows:~~

Skate Park Options

Ragle by the Handball Court	Advantages of this site	Disadvantages of this site
<p>Close to Santa Fe High School. Site preparation expenses could reduce amount left for skate feature.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very close to the existing skate park. 2. Needs more site preparation than GCCC. Would need to create ADA parking and access for both the skate park and the handball court. 3. Very possible neighbors will not allow it? 4. Questions about proximity of two such different user groups. 5. Isolated from the rest of the park – not as much passer-by supervision for safety and security. 	

GCCC Back Parking Lot	Advantages of This Site	Disadvantages of this Site
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further south where more youth live. 2. Amenities already exist. 3. Parent traffic = safety. GCCC staff = safety. 4. Fire department is next door for emergencies. 5. New perspective for alternative sports. This will spark a new and different generation of users. 6. GCCC Recreation Staff can create programs and events. 7. Keeps the family together in one location. There are activities for everyone. 8. Would increase parking for GCCC with it's own parking lot. 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Space projected to be used for other purposes in the future?

GCCC Front	Advantages of This Site	Disadvantages of this Site
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Same as 1-7 above. 2. Build ready. Wouldn't need any preparation. 3. Not very used as a field in any case because of the slope and rough surface 4. Would eliminate on-going expenses related to removing prairie dogs. 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could increase parking pressure. 2. Would eliminate the field.