



COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

CITY COUNCIL of SALT LAKE CITY

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Allison Rowland
Budget & Policy Analyst

DATE: March 7, 2023

RE: **ORDINANCE: THE GLENDALE REGIONAL PARK PLAN**

Item Schedule:

Briefing: February 21, 2023,
March 7, 2023
Public Hearing: March 7, 2023
Potential Action: March 21, 2023

ISSUE AT-A-GLANCE

The Council will review, and consider adopting, the draft Glendale Regional Park Plan, which aims to provide the guiding vision and design for the future park, as well as establishing a framework for development and programming at the 17-acre site. At full build-out, the project is meant to “represent the unique and diverse culture of the Glendale Community,” serving as a neighborhood park while also providing amenities that create a regional attraction. Like all plans, the Glendale Regional Park Plan sets out aspirations, and the funds for many of the features and activities have not yet been identified. This means that full implementation of the Plan will be contingent on funding availability in the coming years.

The Department of Public Lands led the multi-year efforts to prepare the Plan for repurposing the former site of the Glendale Water Park. The Department received Council approval to begin work last summer on “Phase 1” implementation, before the full draft Plan was completed and adopted, because a portion of the park must open by April 2024. This is a requirement of the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund, which originally funded the City’s purchase of the site. The Fund requires that active recreation be publicly accessible on-site within three years of beginning to remove existing amenities (see section L below).

The full draft of the Glendale Regional Park Plan includes a variety of special considerations because of the complexity of the site. The Plan proposed for Council adoption includes the following items, which are described in more detail in the sections below:

- Major park elements at full build-out such as an outdoor pool, splash pad, dog park, and roller skating ribbon, among other features, to be considered in phases as budget becomes available.
- Site ecology and restoration.



- Budget estimates for full build-out, which total \$30 million to \$50 million, with the acknowledgement this may change given inflation and phasing
- Maintenance and management recommendations as well as cost estimates (~\$620,000 per year).
- Recommendations on future Park programming.
- Diversity, equity, and inclusion at the Park.
- Proposed improvements to site access.
- Goals and metrics for the Park.

Previously completed steps in the planning process include site analysis, conceptual planning, extensive public engagement, and reviews by the Council on May 3, and October 4, 2022. Both the Parks, Natural Lands, Urban Forestry and Trails Advisory Board (PNUT) and the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) reviewed the Plan and provided letters of support. The Community Advisory Committee formed specifically to guide the development of the Plan, also reviewed the full draft Plan and supports it, as does the Glendale Neighborhood Council.

The Plan was also unanimously recommended for approval by the Planning Commission, with “the proviso that the City Council pay special attention to operations, maintenance, security, and staffing for the park as it goes into use.”

Goal of the briefing: Review the final draft of the Glendale Regional Park Plan and potentially consider adopting it.

ADDITIONAL AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. **Key Park Elements at Full Build-Out.** The key elements of Glendale Regional Park are described and illustrated in pages 41 and 42 of the draft Plan. They include:

1. **Community Gathering and Event Spaces:** a promenade/community plaza spanning the north central gateway, an event stage and lawn, smaller pavilions and picnic lawns and a riverside beach and boardwalk.
2. **Play Places for Everyone:** hiking, walking and paved trails, an all-ages and -abilities playground, climbing features, multi-use sport courts, dog park, and sledding hill.
3. **Places to Enjoy the Water:** a splash pad, kayak rental, access to the Jordan River for recreation, boat dock and ramp, and an outdoor pool.
4. **Places to Wheel Around:** an ice/roller skating ribbon, skateboarding area, and bike trails.

B. **Site Ecology and Restoration.** The specific location of the Glendale Regional Park site, along the Jordan River, contributes to the complexity of this project but also **offers significant opportunities for ecological restoration.** This was evident in the demolition and site preparation phases, which took longer, and cost more, than initially anticipated. In addition, the site had “a high level of impervious surfaces, with 54% of the site being covered in asphalt and concrete.” The proposed design would reduce this amount by half through low-impact development practices, using green infrastructure to absorb stormwater and creating additional ecological benefits.

To protect critical riparian habitat within the floodplain, improvements proposed in the Plan which fall within 100 feet of the annual high-water line of the Jordan River will follow guidelines outlined in the City’s Riparian Corridor Overlay District (RCO): “Development near the river corridor will seek to enhance floodplain functions through riparian restoration. Structures, such as boat ramps or docks, will be built in accordance with RCO zoning ordinances.”

The Plan’s goals include improving wildlife habitat, and it notes that phasing the project’s construction will reduce potential impacts to the site’s current wildlife population, particularly migratory song birds. Specifically, the many invasive Russian olive trees, which currently serve as habitat for many bird species, will be removed in phases rather than all at once, and new riparian plants will be established among the remaining Russian olives for a number of years before those are removed to allow the new plants to develop into a more sustainable forest.

As was noted in previous steps of the Glendale Regional Park planning process, the Department recommends pursuing certification through the Sustainable Sites Initiative (known as SITES), or a similar sustainability program, to support goals for ecological restoration and sustainable park development. The Plan notes that “During the master planning process, a SITES prescore assessment confirmed that the Glendale Park project meets the qualifications to pursue SITES certification. As the project consultant moves into the next design phase, this consideration should be integrated into the process to ensure that sustainable practices are adhered to and that the proper documentation is collected to pursue certification.”

Projects pursuing certification often incur higher costs in design and construction, however, they consistently return significant long term cost savings related to ongoing operations and maintenance costs. The Plan’s Appendix A includes the full SITES prescore worksheet and assessment for Glendale Regional Park.

C. **Budget Estimates.** The Glendale Regional Park Plan has been developed using \$225,000 approved in a Fiscal Year 2021 (FY21) budget amendment. Additional funds became available through the 2022 General Obligation (GO) bond, which was approved by voters last November along with an allocation from CIP in FY 22 and Budget Amendments in FY 21 and 23 (see chart below). The Department of Public Lands is working to identify additional funding opportunities, as well.

1. **Current Cost Estimates for Full Plan Implementation.** Current estimates of the cost for full build-out of Glendale Regional Park as envisioned in the Plan **range from \$30 million to \$50 million.** The figures are necessarily imprecise, especially in the current context of relatively high inflation in the construction industry. Funding availability and Department logistics will be key determinants for the speed at which Park construction can proceed. More precise estimates will be possible as detailed construction designs proceed.
2. **Project Phasing.** The total number of phases needed for build-out will increase overall costs, even if inflation returns to more typical recent levels. This is because cost-efficiency suffers with each new construction phase added. The Phasing Diagram on page 60 of the Plan includes the Department's recommended phasing approach, and includes additional information on phasing considerations, like hazards and safety. This diagram also indicates which of the planned features are most costly.
3. **Phase 1 Costs.** The initial estimates for Phase 1 construction ranged from \$3.5 million to \$5.5 million dollars. The Plan states that this phase "was designed to maximize usable park features and efficiently utilize funding, as it comprises only approximately 10% of the total park cost yet completes 30% of the full park buildout." (Additional information on Phase 1 can be found in section K below.)
4. **Previous Budget Allocations.** In recent years, the Council has approved funding for site preparation and Phase 1 implementation through budget amendments and as part of CIP, as follows.

FY21	Budget Amendment #5	Demolition of the waterpark and related infrastructure. Site preparation for redevelopment.	\$855,000
FY21	Budget Amendment #6	Preparation of the Glendale Regional Park Plan	\$225,000
FY22	CIP	Initially for Phase 1 implementation, but most of this amount had to be used for unexpected demolition and site preparation.	\$3.20 Million
FY23	Budget Amendment #4	Phase 1 Implementation.	\$4.35 Million

5. **Other Funding Sources.** The General Obligation (GO) bond that was approved by City voters in November 2022 is currently slated to provide \$27 million for capital improvements for Glendale Regional Park. The Department intends to continue to explore relevant grant, donation, and partnership opportunities.

6. **Ongoing Management and Maintenance Costs.** Expected ongoing expenses for full management and maintenance are not provided in the Plan, aside from the Ongoing Programming & Activation Costs noted below. **For FY23, the Council agreed to the Administration’s request that parks maintenance become eligible for some of the annual *Funding Our Future* sales tax revenue, with a \$2 million dollar allocation for that year.**
- ***The Council may wish to ask the Administration for details about how the *Funding Our Future* allocation was spent in FY23, and whether significant changes in the total amount are expected for coming years.***
 - ***The Council may wish to discuss the historical subsidy of activation/maintenance at other regional City parks such as Liberty Park (see item D below for additional information on this topic).***
7. **Ongoing Programming & Activation Cost Estimates.** Total annual ongoing costs for the programming and activation of Glendale Regional Park, as designed in the Plan, would be a **recommended minimum of \$613,000**, and inflation will likely affect these costs, as well as the others. See chart below, from page 74 of the Plan.

Table 2: Programming & Activation Budget Recommended Minimum

DIRECT STAFFING COSTS		YEAR 1
On site programming manager	\$76,000	Base starting salary of \$60,000 annually. Budget includes fringe benefits.
Park attendants	\$18,200	16 hrs/wk year round, \$17.50 wage plus 25% fully loaded.
Overtime allowance	\$4,550	May also be used for discretionary bonuses
Administration/ insurance	-	Assumes covered by City policies
Equipment / supplies	\$10,000	Laptop for manager; smartphones/tablets for attendant use, general supplies
Dedicated staffing subtotal	\$108,750	
HYPOTHETICAL DIRECT PROGRAMMING COSTS		YEAR 1
Arts & culture	\$80,000	Two-thirds of this cost is annual, cutting edge interactive art installations
Fitness	\$30,000	Mostly provided by free businesses seeking to market their classes
Hobbies & niche interests	\$45,000	Includes outdoor dancing, which is about one-third of the total budget
Live entertainment	\$100,000	Does not include production costs, which will be minimal
Markets & festivals	\$100,000	Allowance for self-produced events
Direct programming subtotal	\$355,000	
SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMMING COSTS		YEAR 1
Marketing	\$50,000	Limited to promotion surrounding public space programs and events
Holiday decorations	\$100,000	Allowance
Supplemental programming subtotal	\$150,000	

8. **Additional Staffing.** As alluded to above, the Plan anticipates that additional Public Lands staff will be needed to “support and activate the park to enhance safety and enjoyment of the space.” **In addition to recommending one new full-time on-site programming manager, and two part-time, seasonal park “attendants” (see above), in several sections of the Plan there are references to other new tasks recommended for Public Lands staff.** It is not clear whether these would require full-time commitment to Glendale Regional Park or could be shared among multiple sites. Examples include:

- a. an operations manager, to oversee capital projects, major repairs, landscape maintenance, and all third-party contractors.
 - b. a dedicated employee for specialized maintenance and repair needs such as fixing plumbing issues, repairing broken stairs, electrical repairs, building maintenance, etc. This employee could oversee multiple parks with appropriate support staff.
 - c. a marketing employee to maintain a dedicated website and social media accounts that are frequently updated with news and happenings. This website would also be a tool for customer service, a guide for private event permitting, and a place to receive inquiries, comments, and complaints.
 - d. a leasing agent who would focus on partnership agreements, either through the relevant City agency or through a park management entity, and would select the appropriate tenants for any kiosks, café space, river concessions, and any other commercially operable spaces within the park.
9. **A Different Park Budgeting Model?** Salt Lake City has traditionally funded its parks system primarily through general fund allocations which department spends according to its own priorities. The proposed Glendale Regional Park Plan recommends a different model for this park, *“with a dedicated and predictable budget that grows over time through revenue development. The park should be viewed as a business, with profits and losses, except that all profits should be made with the public interest in mind and, thus, reinvested back into the park for the benefit of local residents and visitors.”* The Plan includes a graphic and a brief discussion of public/private partnership structure on page 75.

➤ ***This would be a departure from the City’s current park maintenance model, as it is not likely that any park could generate 100% of the revenue needed to staff, program and maintain the space. The Council may wish to discuss the benefits and disadvantages of different funding models, and request information from the Administration about its views on the subject.***

- D. **Maintenance and Management Recommendations.** Regardless of the funding model, many of the maintenance and management recommendations for Glendale Regional Park, as well as those for its programming (see section D), are predicated on the City’s commitment to building a park that serves the neighborhood as well as acting as a regional draw—on par with Liberty Park, for example, though on a much smaller scale. *“To achieve this high standard, the City will need to make special considerations for Glendale Park’s operations staffing required to support the appropriate levels of security, sanitation, public realm maintenance, landscaping, programmatic operations, event needs, park concession leasing, and marketing...”* **Along with additional Department of Public Lands staff to help meet programming and partnership needs, specific management recommendations include working with key community partners and stakeholders, including organizations that promote inclusivity, equity, and partnerships, and hiring local and minority-owned businesses to program elements of the site (see section D).** Recommendations for programming, operations and management in the draft Plan can be found beginning on page 71.

A key principle behind this approach is that a park that is well-maintained and clean encourages visitors to treat the park with respect. Park cleanliness will also impact perceptions of safety, which in turn attracts visitors, including families, and increases the overall sense of civic pride and support for the park. Community partnerships are also considered essential to activating the park. *Staff note: this may require additional budget considerations beyond typical park maintenance funding.*

The plan also includes some detailed recommendations for Park management and maintenance that might be generalizable to other Public Lands properties as well, like staffing for park sanitation responsibilities or marketing individual parks.

- ***The Council may wish to ask the Administration whether it plans to revamp some of its practices for maintenance for other parks and public lands based on the recommendations in the Glendale Regional Park Plan.***

E. **Recommendations for Future Park Programming.** The Plan states that programming and management will be essential to creating a safe community asset. It points out that Salt Lake City residents and visitors are not necessarily accustomed to “robust programming of public spaces,” similar to what is seen in many larger cities, where open space is at a greater premium. It also suggests that “Many parks and plazas have failed to maintain a positive visitor experience because they have not programmed and managed their public realm to exceed local precedents.”

To achieve better results at Glendale Regional Park, the Plan recommends establishing a Park programming budget to provide equipment, marketing, outreach, and supplies. The proposed on-site programming manager would need to use this budget to leverage programming partners and interested groups to provide donations of time and materials, sponsorships, and other resources. **The Plan also suggests that a baseline programming budget from the Department could improve planning and fund-raising for this purpose, and help it grow over time, as a variety of potential revenue sources are developed from philanthropy, sponsorships, event rentals, food and beverage, programming, and government support.** (See section B, above for additional information on the proposed budget.)

According to the Plan, successful programming of arts, culture, fitness, entertainment, markets, and community festival events has the power to:

- define how the park feels.
- differentiate it from other parks and destinations.
- provide an active and appealing neighborhood anchor.
- provide a safe and clean place.
- capitalize on Glendale’s rich and diverse multicultural environment.
- capitalize on Salt Lake City’s outdoors orientation.

The types of programming the community prefers were pinpointed through the public engagement process (see section J below), and the Plan includes a long list of potential activities that could begin once Phase 1 is complete. Ideas for additional future programming are also included in the Plan on pages 45 to 47.

Potential Phase 1 Programming

Children/family Family fitness activities All-ability movement Music / literary education Organized play activities Animal education events	Outdoor / environmental Nature / meditative walks Birding / wildlife workshops Gardens / horticulture Public art	Arts / culture / community Audience area Outdoor movies Lawn games
River Programming Safety and awareness Skills workshops Habitat education Volunteer events	Arts / culture / community Art cart Arts and crafts Small music / performance Literary events Lectures Board games	Fitness / recreation / events Low impact fitness Organized recreation / workshops Community cultural events Outdoor hobbyist activities
Sports courts Clinics / lessons All-ability skills training		

The Plan notes that based on its market studies, Glendale Regional Park will best serve users in nearby neighborhoods through low or no cost activities for both adults and children. It emphasizes that forming and maintaining relationships with key community stakeholders, engaging with community organizations that promote inclusivity, equity, and partnerships, and working with local and minority-owned businesses will be the most enduring strategies to supporting programming of the site.

F. **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.** The Plan identifies three aspects for an overall program for Glendale Regional Park that would help the City promote equity and ensure the new park is inclusive of all residents:

1. growing minority-owned businesses through concessions and contracts;
2. supporting existing organizations that promote inclusivity and equity through programming partnerships; and
3. partnering with local organizations through internships and job training.

Examples of how this program could be implemented can be found on pages 49 to 51 of the Plan.

➤ ***To better understand the benefits and budget needs of these kinds of programs, the Council may wish to request the Administration provide examples from other cities of how these partnerships unfold in practice.***

G. **Proposed Improvements to Site Access and Connections.** The proposed Plan includes recommendations for new connections to trails, better public transportation access, and improved pedestrian crossings at 1700 South. The Park's design deliberately aims to strengthen connections within the neighborhood, including to the 1700 South Park and Glendale Neighborhood Park. It also would facilitate connections to the broader regional park system, with a proposed bridge to the Jordan River Parkway Trail, Glendale Golf Course, and the future Surplus Canal Trail.

1. **Transit.** The Plan highlights a gap in public transportation access to both Glendale Regional Park and for the broader Glendale neighborhood. The closest rail connection to Glendale Regional Park is the River Trail Station along the Green Line (2340 South 1070 West), which is a 1.3 mile walk. Nearby bus routes do not have stops that are within comfortable walking distance, either. The importance of closing this gap is greater still because the Plan reports that the share of Glendale households without personal vehicles is three to four times higher than it is in the City as a whole. The draft Plan also suggests improving public transportation connections to enhance park access, increase sustainable transportation options, and facilitate park activities and events.
2. **Pedestrian and Bicycle Access.** The Plan suggests that 1700 South could be narrowed to create safer access to Glendale Regional Park, since vehicle traffic along it is "very low for its width," and says the Transportation Division is currently evaluating the potential for improvements there related to active transportation. The Plan also proposes an additional crosswalk between the existing ones near 1300 West and at the Jordan River Parkway Trail, which are over 1/4 mile apart. Also, the proposed Surplus Canal Trail would provide a direct connection between the park and residents of western Glendale who currently live beyond a 10-minute walk from a park.

➤ ***The Council may wish to clarify with the Administration whether or not the proposed site access improvements are included in the Plan's cost estimates for full build-out.***

➤ ***The Council may wish to ask the Administration how work among departments and with organizations outside the City could be facilitated to help resolve some of the barriers to connection for this area of the City.***

H. **Goals and metrics for the Park.** The section of the draft Plan titled “Goals and Metrics” (pages 53 to 56) focuses on assessing the success of the planning process in meeting the public’s goals but does not explicitly address how the fully built-out Park itself might be assessed. It states, “The draft plan also looks at specific metrics, based on the original park goals, that measure the plan’s success in addressing improvements in ecological function of the site, improvements in access to and within the site, and in creating community spaces for gathering and events. **Gauging elements of the final concept plan, through performance-based evaluation, provides a measure to determine if goals set during the beginning of the park planning process are being attained.**”

- ***As a next step, the Council may wish to request that the Administration work to adapt these goals set in the planning process into a distinct list that can be used to measure progress toward full-build out of the Park and assessing its ongoing performance.***

I. **Park Mission.** The mission of Glendale Regional Park, is defined in the Plan as follows:

“Glendale Regional Park will be an iconic neighborhood park that celebrates and preserves community, culture, and diversity. It will also be a regional destination connecting to the Jordan River and Salt Lake City’s park network. Making nature and recreation within an arm’s reach, the park will improve the natural resources and quality of lives for current and future generations of Westside residents.”

This mission coincides with the *Salt Lake City Public Lands Master Plan*, adopted by the Council last year, which identified a need for investment in Westside parks, and for enhancing park spaces along the Jordan River. It specifically calls for the Glendale Regional Park to be improved to create a regional attraction and event space that celebrates and preserves community culture and diversity, along with making water recreation accessible to more people. The Glendale neighborhood was identified by the previous *Public Lands Needs Assessment* as being a high-needs area for park investment whose residents visit parks less frequently than residents of the east side of the city.

J. **Community Engagement.** Community engagement for the master plan process and for the development of the preferred plan began in October 2021. It included youth and stakeholder engagement, development of a Community Advisory Committee (CAC, organized for this project and composed of leaders in the Glendale community to represent a variety of organizations, businesses and affiliations), an online survey and public open house, and in-person engagement events. A detailed description of the public engagement efforts can be found at <https://www.slc.gov/parks/parks-division/glendale-waterpark/>.

The final preferred plan and final draft plan for the site was reviewed by the Parks, Natural Lands, Urban Forestry and Trails Advisory Board (PNUT Board), the Community Advisory Committee, and the Glendale Neighborhood Council. The final preferred plan was made available to the public in July 2022, and the draft plan document became available August 25, 2022, initiating the 45 day- public noticing period required for Planning Commission.

K. **Site Development Phasing.** Implementation of the full Glendale Regional Park Plan will be phased to reflect funding and strategic opportunities, as well as staff capacity and logistics. The Department has stated,

“detailed design of each phase will refine the design, construction materials, site character, maintenance requirements, and construction costs. Additionally, specific proposed improvements (such as an outdoor pool) will require additional feasibility studies as well as collaboration with community partners and other City departments and divisions.”

1. **Deadline for Phase 1.** The Public Lands Department adopted an aggressive planning, design, and construction schedule for this site because it was originally funded by the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/lwcf/index.htm>). This Fund requires that active recreation be publicly accessible on-site within three years of removing existing amenities. This means the first phase of the project must be complete by April 2024.

As noted in previous staff reports, to meet this timeline the project team advanced with the detailed design of Phase 1 park elements before the Master Plan has been adopted. This allowed adequate time for the development of construction documents, contracting a construction firm, site preparation, and public notice before construction begins.

2. **Phase 1 Strategy.** Elements and amenities were selected for Phase 1 based on the following criteria:
 - e. Inclusion of recreational elements that meet the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund requirements;
 - f. Features that can be constructed within the expedited timeline and fit within current budget allocations;
 - g. Connecting Phase 1 to the existing Glendale Neighborhood Park and its amenities (such as the restroom) to maximize park use and access;
 - h. Inclusion of improvements that will not be affected or closed during construction of future phasing; and
 - i. Community support amenities that are typical of a regional park and are eligible for impact fees.
3. **Phase 1 Elements and Amenities.** Elements and amenities typical of a neighborhood park were identified by the project team for funding using \$3.2 million dollars of parks-specific impact fees, which were allocated by the Council in FY22. The team will prioritize design and construction of these items, but because of quickly rising costs the Department may need to request additional impact fee funding to complete the list. **The list, in priority order, is as follows:**
 - a. Playground with accessible design and assistive technologies for all ages
 - b. Pavilion
 - c. Looped pathways
 - d. Community plaza and gathering space
 - e. Landscaping and site restoration (which is scalable, based on budget)
 - f. Multipurpose sport court
 - g. Parking (existing parking is available if this must be removed from Phase 1)

Site restoration, including addressing and managing noxious weeds and invasive vegetation, will begin during Phase 1 construction. In addition, the Department will strive to preserve the health of onsite ecological and environmental assets, including existing trees and canopy. The Glendale Regional Park Master Plan will provide additional recommendations for site management and restoration during and after construction.

- L. **Site Background.** The Glendale Regional Park site was known previously as Raging Waters, Seven Peaks, and other names over the years. The water park site was closed in 2018, after the City declined to renew the contract with the most recent vendor. The site has remained closed but was subject to recurrent vandalism and theft of some remaining assets, in spite of fencing and private security contracted by the Department of Public Lands.
- M. **Plan Leadership.** Due to the site's size, location along the Jordan River, and complexity, the Department of Public Lands formed an internal City leadership group, which includes representatives of Public Lands,

Engineering, Public Services, Transportation and Sustainability. The City's consultant on this project, Design Workshop, also collaborates with this group. Design Workshop's team includes specialized subconsultants, including River Restoration for environmental health and restoration recommendations, David Evans and Associates for public engagement, and Agora Partners for programming and partnerships. Design Workshop was also the consultant for *Reimagine Nature*, the Twenty-Year Public Lands Master Plan.

POLICY QUESTIONS

1. Several potential future budget items are mentioned in this update, including one-time costs for construction that are bond-eligible, and ongoing costs for additional staffing and programming that are not bond eligible. ***Given that not all of these items are not eligible for impact fee funding or the GO bond approved by voters last year, would the Council like to request the Administration provide information about the strategies it is considering to fund these items?*** (Note: in the FY 23 budget the Mayor proposed and the Council agreed to add "Parks Maintenance" to the Funding our Future sales tax funding. \$2 million was allocated in FY 23 and was deployed in various parks around the City.)
2. The Council may wish to request additional information on the role planned for the Community Advisory Committee once the final version of the Plan is adopted. ***Does the Administration foresee a continuing role for this group of local community leaders and organizations based in Glendale? Would the Council like to suggest some potential roles to explore?***
3. The Plan notes that transit and walking connections are currently inadequate. ***Given this situation, the Council may wish to are there enough parking spaces to serve users in the shorter term, and how the number of spaces compares to other parks of similar size and function.***
4. ***The Council may wish to ask whether the Administration intends to expand the Park Ranger program to provide coverage to Glendale Regional Park, and whether the recommended seasonal Park "attendants" are intended to take on some of the duties of the Park Rangers.***
5. Recommendations on future programming opportunities at Glendale Regional Park would expand the Public Lands Department into some areas of service with which it has relatively little experience. ***Would the Council like to ask the Administration how it plans to help the Department succeed in this area?***