



## Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 19-156      **Version:** 1      **Name:**  
**Type:** Public Hearing/General Business      **Status:** Agenda Ready  
**File created:** 2/12/2019      **In control:** Parks & Recreation Commission  
**On agenda:** 3/19/2019      **Final action:**  
**Title:** Consideration of Potential Turf and Schematic Design Options for the Raymond G. Gamma Dog Park  
**Sponsors:**  
**Indexes:**  
**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. Raymond G. Gamma Dog Park Existing Schematic Design, 2. Marsalli Park Interim Off Leash Areas, 3. Schematic Design Option A, 4. Schematic Design Option B, 5. Synthetic Turf Comparisons

| Date      | Ver. | Action By                     | Action                   | Result |
|-----------|------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|
| 3/19/2019 | 1    | Parks & Recreation Commission | recommended for approval | Pass   |

## REPORT TO PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

### SUBJECT

Consideration of Potential Turf and Schematic Design Options for the Raymond G. Gamma Dog Park

### BACKGROUND

The Reed Street Dog Park located at 888 Reed Street (APN 224-02-001) was dedicated January 13, 2007 and renamed the Raymond G. Gamma Dog Park (Dog Park) by Council Resolution July 12, 2016. In September 2013, Council set a goal “to enhance community sports and recreational assets”. In August 2018, the City began construction of the Reed & Grant Streets Sports Park Project which, in addition to the primary Project objectives to provide new sports fields, a recreation center and playground to serve the community, will provide Dog Park “Phase Two” improvements including a paved parking lot, a permanent restroom building, and facility night lighting (see Attachment 1).

The City is interested in addressing user concerns related to the Dog Park’s natural turf, perimeter pathways, drainage, dust and maintenance issues, as well as consider the public request for synthetic turf and the potential Dog Park use of the un-programmed space adjacent to the railroad tracks. In summer 2018, the City contracted with Dillingham & Associates, the original Dog Park landscape architect (LA) to work with the Parks & Recreation Department to conduct community outreach through meetings and online survey, as well as to research and develop schematic design options that would improve the large and small dog off leash areas for the anticipated increased hours of use, address the health and safety considerations in the Park, and provide more efficient and effective operations and maintenance. The City also contracted subject matter expert Susyn Stecchi from Dog Parks USA with experience on over 1000 dog parks worldwide.

Due to the anticipated periodic and ongoing closure of the Dog Park for Project construction, the City met with the Dog Park stakeholder group in Summer 2018 to propose an interim solution. In December 2018, the City opened a fenced, natural grass, temporary off leash facility with areas for large and small dogs at Larry Marsalli Park on the corner of Lafayette and El Camino Real. The

Facility has been well used and will be open weather permitting for the duration of Reed & Grant Sports Park construction (Attachment 2). There have been public requests to keep it open long term.

## **DISCUSSION**

The City team met with community members and Dog Park users on October 30 and November 6, 2018. Discussion included natural and synthetic turf options and samples, expectations and project design criteria, alternative uses of space, mound heights, maintenance issues and challenges, relative sizes and preferred locations of the large dog and small dog areas, dog wash station, buffer from rail. In Fall 2018, an Open City Hall online survey regarding the Dog Park was completed by over 260 respondents with over 460 visitors providing 13 hours of public comment. Responses represented persons who frequent the Dog Park daily and weekly, primarily on weekends, and would like to visit afternoons and evenings. Responses were primarily from those with small dogs and those who typically bring 1-2 dogs to the park. The survey indicated a strong preference for having mounds versus flat areas, natural turf, and additional area for small dogs. There was less concern regarding seating, shade, and site furnishings.

The City reviewed the public comments and design options that would effectively meet both operation and maintenance needs. The design team considered park surfacing that would provide: durability needed for the intensity of use (high traffic), soil conditions (compaction/urine), effective sanitation methods to support animal health, park safety, lower operation and maintenance costs (irrigation, mow, clean), lessen quantity and duration of maintenance (or deterioration) closures, provide higher visibility and inclusive use/ADA, be more aesthetically pleasing, and reduce dust and mud. The team also considered the relative sizes, uses and potential location of the large and small dog areas. Based on these factors, two design alternatives were developed for review and comment: Option A (Attachment 3) and Option B (Attachment 4). The design options are summarized in Table 1 below.

| <b>Table 1. Raymond G. Gamma Dog Park Comparison Chart</b> |                             |                             |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Attributes</b>  | <b>Existing Dog Park</b>    | <b>Option A</b>             | <b>Option B</b>             |
| Large Dog Area   | 25,015                      | 25,141                      | 26,326                      |
| Small Dog Area   | 9,553                       | 14,478                      | 13,378                      |
| Total Area of Dog Park                                     | 34,568                      | 39,619                      | 39,704                      |
| Net Total Additional                                       |                             | 5,051                       | 5,136                       |
| Location of Dog Areas                                      | Large-North;<br>Small-South | Large-North;<br>Small-South | Large-South;<br>Small-North |
| Mounds   | 36" high                    | 18-24 inches                | 18-24 inches                |
| Dog wash station   | No                          | Yes                         | Yes                         |
| Turf   | Natural Grass               | Synthetic Turf              | Synthetic Turf              |
| High traffic wear  | No                          | Yes                         | Yes                         |
| Wet condition use  | No                          | Yes                         | Yes                         |
| Duration of closure  | Long                        | Short- none                 | Short- none                 |
| Frequency of closure                                       | Often                       | Periodic                    | Periodic                    |

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The action being considered is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15301 “Existing Facilities”, 15302 “replacement or reconstruction”, and 15303 “new construction or conversion of small structures” as the activity consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting or minor alteration of existing public facilities or topographical features involving negligible expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agencies determination.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

The estimated costs for the schematic design Options A and B are approximately \$875,000 to \$1 million and in line with similar projects. The estimated costs include design, construction, administration, mobilization, general conditions, bonding, permits, insurance, escalation, City Project administration and contingency. While the City did receive a small donation toward synthetic turf, the options are unfunded and therefore would need an identified significant funding source and budget appropriation by Council to the City’s FY2019/20 Capital Improvement Project budget. The City currently has other priority Park projects, such as playground replacements that are in the design development and construction bid phases ahead of any potential Dog Park improvement project. Given construction cost escalation, additional funding may be needed from available sources for current projects. Any additional or alternate items to those shown in options A and B would be an added cost to the project. If a project is approved by Council, the LA would produce Plans, Specifications and Engineer’s Cost Estimate (PS&E) that integrate Dog Park upgrades with the adjacent sports park improvements. Depending upon coordination of project schedules, there could be potential cost savings for some aspects of the project. Design efficiencies and project delivery options will be explored. Current Dog Park operation and maintenance activities are included in the Parks & Recreation Department’s annual operating budget.

### **PUBLIC CONTACT**

Public contact was made by posting the Parks & Recreation Commission’s agenda on the City’s official-notice bulletin board outside City Hall Council Chambers. A complete agenda packet is available on the City’s website and in the City Clerk’s Office at least 72 hours prior to a Regular Meeting and 24 hours prior to a Special Meeting. A hard copy of any agenda report may be requested by contacting the City Clerk’s Office at (408) 615-2220, e-mail [clerk@santaclaraca.gov](mailto:clerk@santaclaraca.gov) or at the public information desk at any City of Santa Clara public library

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff does not have a recommendation on Schematic Design Option A or Option B. However, a synthetic turf specification that has antimicrobial properties, short filament length with thatch for durability, supports efficient maintenance considerations, and warranty are recommended.

Prepared by: James Teixeira, Director of Parks & Recreation

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Raymond G. Gamma Dog Park Existing Schematic Design
2. Marsalli Park Interim Off Leash Dog Areas
3. Schematic Design Option A
4. Schematic Design Option B
5. Synthetic Turf Comparisons