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existing conditions & needs analysis
INTRODUCTION

In August of 2015, the City of Monterey began the process of completing a comprehensive update of the City’s Parks and Recreation Master Plan. The current Parks and Recreation Master Plan was completed in 1986 and partially updated in 1995, 2000, 2006, and 2011. These interim updates primarily focused on specific projects and improvements needed to maintain the City’s Parks and Recreation system, rather than evaluating new needs, trends, demographics or enhancing service or the system. The new Parks and Recreation Master Plan (PRMP) will be informed by substantial community input, trends analysis, assessment of parks and facilities, as well as consideration of programs and policies. In addition, this new planning effort will strive to unite the many other plans that the City has enacted in recent years to establish continuity and alignment.

The following document is a summary of the existing conditions developed in the first phase of the update process, as well as the initial needs analysis. This report summarizes the following:

- Policy Context
- Community Profile
- Parks and Recreation Trends
- Community Input
- Facility Inventory

Together, these items are the basis for the Parks and Recreation Needs & Opportunities presented in section 6. The Needs and Opportunities section identifies primary issues, concerns, and opportunities that will be addressed in the final PRMP.

POLICY CONTEXT

Since the current parks and recreation plan was completed in 1986, the City has developed a number of plans that impact to some degree the current parks and recreation planning effort. Parks and recreation can be considered an overlay for the City that weaves together all of the community though its trails systems, green spaces, open spaces, paths, parks and centers. As such most of the City’s planning documents have elements that are important to consider.
## Plan Name | Date | Potential Impacts to the PRMP
--- | --- | ---
General Plan | Adopted 2005, amended several times up to 2013 | Provides overall city land use patterns and needs. Includes separate Open Space Element with specific goals that inform the PRMP and ensure protection of the critical assets of the natural areas, and viewsheds. In addition, the Urban Design Element provides some guidance for parks and open space. These goals will be primary in consideration of any new development or changes.

Housing Element | Update currently being done | The Housing Element is part of the General Plan and indicates where future residential growth can occur and therefore directly impact the need and location for future parks. According to the Housing Element, future growth is anticipated in the Lighthouse, Downtown, and North Fremont neighborhoods.

Downtown Specific Plan | October 2013, amended in October 2015 | The City’s downtown is linked together by a number of historic areas, plazas, green areas and pedestrian zones. All of these are related to the provision of a complete parks and recreation system. Several recommendations directly impact the PRMP including the plans for the Transit Plaza (Simoneau Plaza), Alvarado Mall, Custom House Plaza Improvements as well as circulation changes and increased pedestrian friendly elements.

North Fremont Specific Plan | April 2014 | Provides guidance on future development of this mixed use neighborhood area. Impacts and considerations to buffering new development and creating additional open space and park area is incorporated as is better bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Area identified for future growth in residential. Will likely require additional parks.

Waterfront Master Plan | Draft September 2015 | The Waterfront Master Plan covers a large area of the City’s waterfront from San Carlos Beach to Monterey Bay Park. There are substantial Parks and Recreation Facilities along the waterfront and are considered for enhancement and further development in the new PRMP. These two plans must be tightly aligned and coordinated to ensure there are not unintended conflicts or separate ideas for use. At the time of this writing the Waterfront Master Plan is still a draft, however, it is assumed it will be adopted and be the leading plan for future planning efforts.

Lower Presidio Master Plan | December 2002 | The Lower Presidio area, under a 50 year lease from the U.S. Army, is considered one of the City’s parks. This Master Plan lays out a comprehensive vision and plan for the area and will remain the leading plan and direction for the area as an appendix to the PRMP. The plan requires an amendment to allow bicycles in the area. There are a number of circulation and access considerations that must be addressed to achieve the plans identified in this Master Plan and to meet the goals of the new PRMP.
### Plan Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Potential Impacts to the PRMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey on the Move – Multi-modal Mobility Plan</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>This plan focuses on transportation and circulation improvements for bicycles and pedestrians and overall connectivity for the city. It should be well aligned to the PRMP, especially as it relates to management of bike traffic on the recreation trail, connections to and from parks and schools, and safer crossing on the recreation trail, from the Sports Center to Jack’s Park and across to the waterfront.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Master Plan</td>
<td>June 1992</td>
<td>Although the Beach Master Plan is old, it still has a number of good ideas that can be incorporated into the final PRMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Transition Plan</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>The City completed an ADA Self Evaluation effort in 2013. The ADA Plan identifies a number of required improvements and accessibility concerns to be addressed throughout the Parks and Recreation System and a comprehensive assessment of parks and facilities. The ADA Transition plan will serve as the precedent for future planning and improvements as it relates to the PRMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Coastal Program Land Use Plans: Cannery Row, Del Monte Beach, Monterey Harbor, and Skyline</td>
<td>2004, 2003, 2003, 1992 respectively</td>
<td>The Local Coastal Plans (LCPs) regulate and place specific conditions on land uses within areas under the Coastal Commission’s jurisdiction. A number of sites discussed in PRMP, including parks, beaches, recreation trail, and open space areas both along the coast and on Skyline ridge, are within the areas covered by the LCPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Implementation Program Plans</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Many of the neighborhoods have adopted Area Plans, as required by the General Plan. However, these plans are outdated relative to existing parks and recreation facilities that serve the neighborhoods. Therefore, the PRMP will serve as the guiding document citywide for these facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COMMUNITY PROFILE

Unique characteristics of Monterey

The City of Monterey is located on central coast, built on Monterey Bay and the surrounding hills. The City is nearly completely built out with very little space for additional growth. As of 2010, there were just over 27,000 residents living in an even mix of multifamily and single family houses. Monterey is a unique City with characteristics that make it a long-term home for residents and an attractive draw for visitors. These special characteristics also influence the needs for what and how the community engages with recreation, parks and programs.

History

The City offers a rich historic experience, with sites, artifacts and museums reaching back beyond the 1800’s including Native American, Spanish missionary, early settlers, civil war eras. The City’s cultural treasures include the Lower Presidio Historic Park considered of the most significant historic locations in California, Colton Hall where the first California Constitution was written, the path of History, numerous Historic houses (now museums) and plazas, as well as more mainstream attractions such as Cannery Row and the celebration of the life and literature of John Steinbeck.

Natural Beauty

The Monterey Bay is one of California’s most important marine ecological resources – the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary - and it offers amazing beauty, enjoyment of nature, and recreational opportunities to residents and visitors. People from the region and around the state come to Monterey Bay for scuba diving, kayaking, skin diving and other ocean recreation activities, as well as the beaches for gatherings, picnics, and more active sports.

Military Population

The City is home to a large military population with three major installations within the City boundaries: the Defense Language Institute, Naval Postgraduate School, and the Army Base at the Presidio, as well as a Naval Housing development. In the past the City has been able to benefit from strong partnerships and use of military facilities for parks and recreation. Since 9/11 and continuing concerns regarding terrorism, security concerns have made most of those facilities infeasible to access on a regular basis. The Naval Housing area is open to the public and has a wide range of parks.
and recreation facilities, which may be available for joint use.

**Neighborhood Improvement Program**

In 1985, the City of Monterey adopted a Charter Amendment to establish the Neighborhood Improvement Program (NIP) to effectively distribute tourist generated funds back into the neighborhoods. The NIP receives 16% of the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOC) for capital development of community projects, many for parks and recreation facilities. Projects are required to be a capital improvements opposed to operational in nature.

There are 14 different NIP neighborhoods, encompassing nearly the entire city (see adjacent map). Each neighborhood has a representative on the NIP Committee to evaluate community nominated projects and to consider which projects to fund that will benefit the community.

The NIP program is an important element to the success and high quality of facilities for parks and recreation in the City. The PRMP should be a resource for future NIP planning.

**Education Community**

The City of Monterey is home to a large number of higher education institutions, including, Monterey Peninsula College (MPC), Middlebury Institute, Chapman College, Defense Language Institute (DLI), and Naval Postgraduate School (NPS). In addition, the City is located near California State University Monterey Bay. This large, somewhat transient, population adds additional impacts to the City’s parks and recreation facilities. Most of these campuses offer additional recreational and athletic facilities, which provide added benefits to the City and serve multiple needs. However, the Recreation Trail, beaches and similar facilities serve these additional short-term residents.
Large Visitor Population

Monterey is home to the Monterey Bay Aquarium, which draws 1.8 million visitors annually (2013). In addition, the City and region draws over 8 million visitors annually. The City is a major draw for pleasure and business travellers. Improvements to the City’s conference center are poised to increase the number of potential visitors. These visitors provide both benefits and challenges to the City. The City receives significant revenue from hotel tax fee as mentioned. At the same time, the major visitors impacts makes it more difficult for residents to enjoy some of the facilities and it takes a large amount of staff time to maintain the facilities in these high-visitor areas. Currently there are no visitor fees dedicated to the operation and maintenance of the parks and recreation facilities.

Overview

The City has only grown minimally since the last plan was done in 1986 and it is unlikely that it will experience substantial growth in the future due to the lack of affordable housing and availability of land and water. However, there are some areas of the City that will see increased densification and the continued growth in visitor population. The City itself has a population of 27,810.
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MAP 1. CENSUS BLOCK PLANNING AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT AREAS
with the total plan area with a population of 30,605 people.

The median age in the City is 36.9, but varies considerably by neighborhood (see below). Overall, Monterey has a well-educated population and relatively high median household income of $63,072. Over the past years, the number of single-family housing units has been reduced and the average household size has dropped from 2.27 to 2.08 per household. Visitor levels are high. The City has a large young military population, which includes a substantial number of college and graduate students who are semi-permanent residents.

**Monterey County**

Monterey County has experienced moderate growth of 3.13 percent since 2000, with the largest growth occurring in neighboring cities of Sand City and Marina. Overall the County has a population of approximately 415,000 and a median age of 32.9. According to the Monterey County Convention and Visitors Bureau, the county has approximately 8.4 visitors annually. This information is important as many of the County’s residents and its visitors enjoy the parks and recreation facilities, parks and programs of the City of Monterey.

**People**

The City of Monterey’s median age of 36.9 is only somewhat older than the State median age. However, it varies greatly from one part of the City to the other with areas with a median age of over 50 and the Military areas being much lower – with median ages in the 20s. (Chart. Median Age by Census Track)

It is likely that the population will continue to evolve with cycles of younger families becoming older and then repeating. The Plan needs to have flexibility and the ability to change with these shifting demographics.

The number of people under the age of 19 (19%) is slightly higher than those over the age of 65 (16%), with the largest cohort in the age group of 35 to 64 (37% of the population). There are slightly more men than women in the City with the higher percent of men than women likely due to the Military presence in the community.

The City of Monterey is predominately white. However the surrounding region is very diverse with over 50% of the County Population identifying as Hispanic.
Housing and Households

The PRMP needs to address changes in household composition, size and location to ensure equitable access to parks, facilities and programs. In 1986, the average household size was 2.27. It has fallen to 2.08, likely reflecting fewer children. The City has had more growth in multifamily units than in single family household units, with the highest number of multifamily units in the Del Monte and Central Area Census Tracks. While the increase in multifamily housing units is likely to continue, Monterey is becoming less dense than 1986 overall. In 1986, housing density was at 3.80 units per acre and that has decreased to 3.09 units per acre. Current plans indicate that new density may be added in the Downtown area, North Fremont area and Lighthouse area.

Education and Income

Overall, Monterey community members are well off and well educated with nearly 50% of those 25 and older holding a college degree. Income levels throughout the City differ somewhat with the Naval Housing, Flats, and Unincorporated Census Tracks having the highest median income.
### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Monterey (2010)</th>
<th>% for City</th>
<th>New Monterey</th>
<th>Presidio</th>
<th>Downtown/Old Town</th>
<th>Monterey Heights</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Naval Housing</th>
<th>Del Monte</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Unicorp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density (Square mile)</td>
<td>2363.98</td>
<td>6137.43</td>
<td>3382.79</td>
<td>3990.14</td>
<td>3085.45</td>
<td>2137.25</td>
<td>4019.65</td>
<td>2486.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (acres from Org. Plan)</td>
<td>3,939</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Per Acre</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>30,605</td>
<td>27,810</td>
<td>5,082</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>5,693</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>2,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Planning Area</td>
<td>90.87%</td>
<td>16.61%</td>
<td>7.36%</td>
<td>10.78%</td>
<td>16.84%</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>6.73%</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Units (08-12 data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8,150</th>
<th>6,832</th>
<th>49.16%</th>
<th>1,350</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>682</th>
<th>2,131</th>
<th>392</th>
<th>470</th>
<th>1,237</th>
<th>760</th>
<th>1,054</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>7,147</td>
<td>7,025</td>
<td>50.55%</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home, Boat, RV</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Household and Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13,302</th>
<th>12,184</th>
<th>2,560</th>
<th>69</th>
<th>1,716</th>
<th>2,376</th>
<th>1,781</th>
<th>553</th>
<th>2,566</th>
<th>853</th>
<th>828</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>4,981</td>
<td>4,778</td>
<td>39.22</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>8,321</td>
<td>7,406</td>
<td>60.78</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>6,817</td>
<td>5,963</td>
<td>48.94</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Family Size</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple Family</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily</td>
<td>5,138</td>
<td>6,221</td>
<td>51.06</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Median Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Monterey (2010)</th>
<th>% for City</th>
<th>New Monterey</th>
<th>Presidio</th>
<th>Downtown/Old Town</th>
<th>Monterey Heights</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Naval Housing</th>
<th>Del Monte</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Unicorp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>10.22%</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>5,163</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>18.06%</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>3,709</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>12.41%</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>3,457</td>
<td>12.43%</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>4,132</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and older</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30,605</td>
<td>27,810</td>
<td>5.082</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>5,693</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>2,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Children Under 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Monterey (2010)</th>
<th>% for City</th>
<th>New Monterey</th>
<th>Presidio</th>
<th>Downtown/Old Town</th>
<th>Monterey Heights</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Naval Housing</th>
<th>Del Monte</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Unicorp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children Under 14</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>3,594</td>
<td>12.92%</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers 15-19</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Adults (20-34)</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>7,864</td>
<td>28.28%</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Age (35-64)</td>
<td>11,748</td>
<td>10,383</td>
<td>37.34%</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65 and older)</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>4,297</td>
<td>15.45%</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 02 Community Profile

### By Race (some duplication)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Monterey (2010)</th>
<th>% for City</th>
<th>New Monterey</th>
<th>Presidio</th>
<th>Downtown/Old Town</th>
<th>Monterey Heights</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Naval Housing</th>
<th>Del Monte</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Unicorp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24,148</td>
<td>21,788</td>
<td>78.35%</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>1,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>3,817</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Race, Other</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language Spoken at Home (2008-12 data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Spoken at Home</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Monterey (2010)</th>
<th>% for City</th>
<th>New Monterey</th>
<th>Presidio</th>
<th>Downtown/Old Town</th>
<th>Monterey Heights</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Naval Housing</th>
<th>Del Monte</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Unicorp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10,059</td>
<td>9,094</td>
<td>72.53%</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>10.14%</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>9.35%</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Monterey (2010)</th>
<th>% for City</th>
<th>New Monterey</th>
<th>Presidio</th>
<th>Downtown/Old Town</th>
<th>Monterey Heights</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Naval Housing</th>
<th>Del Monte</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Unicorp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15,389</td>
<td>13,990</td>
<td>50.31%</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15,216</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>49.69%</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>2,768</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>2,821</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PARKS AND RECREATION TRENDS

The City of Monterey has a well established and mature park system. There is an opportunity to better serve the community, enhance the experience, and create a more modern parks system by considering and incorporating current trends.

The Outdoor Life Style

Today, the active outdoor lifestyle has gone mainstream characterized by wellness and quality time with family and friends. To meet this new and changing demand, people are looking for ways to be outdoors in urban areas. Due to time demands of family and jobs, convenience and accessibility is critical. The opportunity for parks and recreation professionals is to provide meaningful outdoor activity near to home.

According to the 2012 “The Outdoor Recreation Economy” report by the Outdoor Industry Association 140 million Americans over the age of 16 participate in outdoor activities. Americans spend approximately $646 million dollars annually on outdoor recreation – twice as much than we spend on automobiles, gas or utilities. These activities are characterized by a sense of wellness, promotion of social interaction and a connection to the outdoors. The need for flexibility in recreation programs, as adults find less and less time to participate is critical, as well as the need to provide opportunities for stress release.

For youth ages 6-24, the highest participation in outdoor activities is in running/jogging and bicycling. The favorite activities (how frequently they participate) are also running/jogging and bicycling with the addition of skateboarding. Running is also popular with adults, but fishing has the second highest participation, followed by bicycling. Adults’ favorite activities are running, bicycling, and birdwatching.

The Outdoor Industry survey on participation identified a number of trends as illustrated in the chart below. These 3-year and 1-year trends are particularly important to Monterey as many of the activities are part of the bay/ocean front lifestyle. In the last three years, stand-up paddling has gone up 24%, kayak fishing 20%, and kayaking in general 8%. In the last year these trends are even stronger and included increase activities in snorkeling, scuba diving, as well as all types of kayaking.
Recreation Oriented Development is the new term for the aligning of parks, recreation and open space to drive new investment and focus development in established communities.

In order to effectively assess and develop a successful City park system, we need to understand the nature and extent of the new outdoor lifestyle generating demand for parks and recreation. We need to understand how outdoor amenities provide opportunities to activate cities in new ways, including aligning park development with new housing, with visitor services; land development; business development; and community development.

Integrated Park and Open Space System

A City’s park and open space system must offer a hierarchy of spaces ranging from small pocket parks and plazas to pedestrian boulevards and destination parks, all connected by pathways, trails, bikeways and green streets. Each space plays a distinct and key role in the system. Some will serve as large cultural venues and draw users regionally and beyond, some may become vital urban plazas linked to transit, restaurants and retail, while others may offer small green respites from the urban environment. Looking to other cities in the United States as well as Europe and beyond, we can think beyond the traditional concept of open space and explore how the spaces between buildings or how certain streets may play a role in creating a green infrastructure.

Health, Wellness and Walkability

Although California is a relatively healthy state, with just over 76% of the population reporting they are physically active, 24% of the population is obese, diagnoses of diabetes has increased 15% in the last 2 years, and physical inactivity has increase for seniors (65+) by 29%1. In September 2015, the US Surgeon General, Dr. Vivek H. Murthy launched a new initiative: “Step it Up! Surgeon General’s Call to Action to Promote Walking and Walkable Communities.” The initiative calls for walking...
as a daily activity and inspires professionals from health care to parks and recreation to support the development and creation of more walkable communities to encourage people to get out and walk.

Parks and recreation services, programs and facilities are being seen more and more as the “prescription” for prevention, poor health and wellness for communities. The State of Oregon and Washington DC both have programs in place that have health professionals issue parks prescriptions. Ensuring tobacco free parks, encouraging community walking programs, and creating health focused pedestrian and bike plans are all part of the solution that parks and recreation can serve.  

Climate Change, Resiliency and Sustainability

Climate change mitigation, resiliency planning and sustainability efforts are some of the most critical issues that cities will be addressing today and into the future. Parks play a central role in the ability to assist and address some of the issues related to climate change. This includes water conservation through smart irrigation technologies, sustainable planting approaches for parks, and overall maintenance practices. In addition, the provision and stewardship of open space offers a “carbon sink”, an important element to help mitigate emissions. Recreation programs and facilities that focus on walkability and bikeability are critical to reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT), a key statewide goal to reduce greenhouse gases. Open space and parks also can be important buffers for potential flood zones resulting from increased severe weather patterns, especially on the coast. Finally, energy conservation efforts and the use of solar panels for recreation facilities can help reduce the city’s carbon footprint, act as a model for businesses and residents, and save money in operations.

The Child in the City

One of the greatest challenges cities nationwide are facing, is how to retain and support families in the urban environment. This challenge includes creating an appropriate park system for child development – physical, social and cognitive – creating the opportunity to enjoy and experience nature, as well as provide safe streets and accessible schools. More than the development of tot lots, considering children in the city means looking at the entire network, from streets and plazas to trail and parks, as an interconnection support system. Each element of the system must consider children of all ages and families.

San Francisco Golden Gate Park, Koret Children’s Center Remodel
To effectively understand this demographic, we will need to consider a number of age groups: 0 - 5 year olds; 5 - 12 year olds; 13 – 18 year olds; young adults, and families as a whole. Each group presents particular demands that need to be weighed in the programming of the parks and open space system. Teenagers and young adults are perhaps the most challenging of this group. As a whole, they do not want to be categorized with children, may not want to be part of an organized group, and are often more interested in exploring a larger realm. Evaluating how to provide safe and interesting experiences for this group will be paramount to serving the full needs of residents.

Aging population

One of the strongest trends throughout the United States, California and the region is the aging of our population. The City of Monterey has an older, aging population and must consider and develop facilities and programs that will serve older adults with a variety of needs and interests. Seniors can no longer be lumped into a single category and be effectively served. With healthier lifestyles, people live longer and have more active lives than ever before. Parks and recreation providers need to consider multiple stages and interests of seniors’ diverse lives. Facilities and programs must provide for seniors: interested in developing new skills, and learning new activities; for those with some health issues and access concerns; for passive and more contemplative activities; for seniors looking for inter-generational interactions and for those who want more quiet environments.

Technology

Technology is offering parks and recreation providers with broad new opportunities as well as new challenges. Baby boomers tend to be more educated and more technology dependent, desiring more high tech and “amenity” rich experiences. Technology can simultaneously provide a mass communication tool while improving affordability and accessibility to community members.

Economics and Financing

Parks and recreation professionals have often had to fight for resources to build and maintain a high quality system of parks. This pressure continues with the trend towards higher cost-recovery requirements and higher user fees for new facilities. The need for new sources for revenue generation is encouraging parks and recreation...
professionals to become more entrepreneurial. Expanding opportunities for sponsorships, as well as looking to new potential partners for funding programs and facilities is becoming a priority. Additionally, identifying and securing long-term funding sources for maintaining and renovating existing parks is an ongoing challenge.

**Arts, History and Culture**

Increasingly, people are recognizing the value of and seeking out a more immersive and experiential type of recreation and travel. This is a move away from a more consumer approach and benefit’s Monterey’s extensive and intriguing history that includes the impressive range of adobe houses. Connecting history, art and culture within the parks is an opportunity to leverage this trend for both visitors and community members.

*New Museum at the Presidio Officer’s Club, San Francisco Presidio, layering history within the National Park*
OVERVIEW

The City of Monterey is committed to a robust process to engage the community in the development of the PRMP. This community’s involvement is particularly important in understanding parks and recreation needs in the first phase. The following is a summary of findings from the community outreach effort.

A range of activities were conducted to ensure as many individuals could be involved as possible, including:

- Online Survey (paper copies were also available)
- Small Focus Groups (5)
- Stakeholder Interviews (8)

- Open House/Community Workshop
- Outreach Toolkits
- Joint Parks and Recreation Commission/Neighborhood Improvement Project Public Meeting

All of the outreach activities were announced on the City’s website, at Centers, through social media sites, newspaper, radio and television.

ONLINE SURVEY

The City distributed an online survey in English and Spanish via existing email addresses, City website, newsletters, Facebook pages and flyers throughout the City. The survey was available from September 21st until October 26th, 2015. There were 516 responses with 2 on paper.

The survey included a range of questions to help determine how respondents currently use parks, facilities, and programs, which facilities and parks they frequented, what barriers and issues affect their use, and what are their future needs and wants.

Respondents rated the Monterey Parks and recreation System very highly with 82% of respondents rating it “Better” or “Much Better” than average. Only 14 or 3% rated the system as below average.

Respondent Characteristics

52% of the respondents were between the ages of 35 and 55 (born either in the 1970s or 1960s) fairly representative of the median age in the City. 16% of the respondents were born in the 80s and another 16% were born in the 1950s. More women than men responded with a 65%/35% split. Approximately 57% of respondents have children living at home.

Why do you use the parks?

When asked the reasons people most often use the City’s facilities and programs, the majority of respondents indicated that general wellness, enjoyment of nature, children and social elements were major...
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Factors. People also indicated that they play sports, canoe, and use the summer camp.

A majority of people indicated the following reasons:

1. Exercise, general wellness
2. To enjoy nature
3. To be social, be with friends
4. For my children (or grandchildren)
5. For wildlife viewing/Monterey Bay

**Favorite Activities**

Similar to why people use parks, respondents’ favorite activities included walking – the highest ranked by far – playing with kids, biking, relaxing, nature watching, fitness programs and boating.

- Walking (69%)
- Playing with Kids (43%)
- Nature Watching (43%)
- Biking (41%)
- Relaxing/Solitude (38%)
- Fitness Classes/Programs (34%)
- Boating/Kayaking (33%)

**Facilities most often used**

Community members indicated that they use a wide range of the City’s parks and facilities, in their neighborhood and throughout the City. The highest used facility by far is the Recreation Trail with 70% of respondents indicating they use it daily or weekly. The following provides an indication of the top used facilities in the City on a daily or weekly basis (unless otherwise noted).

**Neighborhood Parks**

- Archer/Hoffman Park (55.6%)
- Larkin Park (55.5%)
- Fisherman’s Flat Park (51.7%)
- Cypress Park (50%)
- Quarry Park (52.6%)
Trails
Trails were the least used facility except for the recreation trail.
• Recreation Trail (70%)
• Iris Canyon (36% weekly)

Beaches
• Window On the Bay/ Monterey Bay Park (46%)
• Fisherman’s Shoreline Park (42%)
• Del Monte Beach (42%)
• San Carlos Beach (33%)

Regional Parks
• Soldier field (50% weekly)
• Ryan Ranch (38%)
• Jack’s Ball Field (44%)
• El Estero Park Complex (37%)
• Lower Presidio (31% weekly)

Recreation Centers
• Monterey Sports Center (47%)
• Scholze Park Center (13%)
• Casanova Oak Knoll Park Center (20%)

Other facilities mentioned in the comments as frequently used:
• Sollecito Ball Park in El Estero
• Dennis the Menace Park
• Garland Park, Carmel Valley

Major issues
(Big or somewhat of an issue)
Several themes regarding issues and concerns were seen throughout the survey responses. The largest concern expressed in comments and in the following numbers was related to safety and homeless/transients. There were a couple of specific places mentioned, but it was more of a broad concern than just a locate concern. Cleanliness and park maintenance, particularly for bathrooms, were of equal concern to respondents, as was the availability and affordability of parking. Several people commented that the Sports Center was not affordable.
• Cleanliness (45%)
• Park Maintenance (40%)
• Safety (38% and 15% felt it was the Biggest Issue)
• Parking Availability (50%)
• Parking Costs (40%)
• Over-used Facilities (36%)
• Facility or Amenity Availability (35%)
• Program Availability (33%)

Meeting Needs
The majority (50% or more) of respondents indicated that the current parks and recreation facilities either meet needs “very well” or “extremely well”, and most of the rest of respondents feel that the facilities are ok. (See graph on following page) There were four major areas that were identified as not meeting needs at all:
• Basketball Courts (13%)
• Sports Fields (11%)
• Tennis Courts (13%)
• Swimming Pools (13%)

It is important to note that less than 15% of respondents indicated these needs. A number of respondents indicate a desire for pickleball courts as well.

Future Focus
Respondents indicated a variety of interests and needs for the future, with very few major facilities requested. The most frequently mentioned needed facility was “more and better bathrooms”, better general amenities, and lighting and safety.

In addition, more walking and hiking trails, better waterfront facilities for boating and activities, and programs for teens, families and kids were highly ranked as “very important” or “extremely important”. 44% of respondents felt that expanding the Sports Center was very or extremely important and 35% felt the same about more swimming pools and expanding the hours of operation of facilities. In the comments section, the need for dog parks, pickleball facilities, trails and aquatic facilities were emphasized.
Below are the Very Important or Extremely Important Facilities to focus on in the future:

**Sports**
- More Swimming Pools (35%)
- More Access/Hours of Operation (35%)
- More Soccer Fields (26%)
- Better Maintenance of Sports Facilities (34%)
- Better Scheduling (29%)

**Parks**
- More/Better Bathrooms (64%)
- More Lighting/Safety (55%)
- More Amenities (54%)
- More Walking/Hiking Trails (55%)
- More Waterfront Parks (47%)

**Recreation Centers**
- Better Facilities at the Waterfront (50%)
- More Facilities for Teens (47%)
- Improve and Expand Sports Center (44%)
- More Facilities for Families (46%)
- More Children’s Programs (41%)
SURVEY COMMENTS
Most of the questions allow participants to write in comments and add their ideas to the set list of responses. The following are the ideas that were mentioned most often. The items in bold were frequent mentions.

- **Bike Only lanes**
- **More Trails for Running, Hiking and Mountain Biking**
- **Lack of Soccer Fields**
- **Sports Complex**
- **Pickleball (indoor and out)**
- Outdoor Gym along Trails/In Parks
- **Dog parks + Poop bags and Garbage Cans**
- Pool improvements/outdoor pool/aquatics center
- Permanent **volleyball** courts/beach volleyball courts
- More Beach Parks
- Canoe/Kayak Facilities/
  Calm water kayak entry
- **Concern about homeless**
- More dance programs/better dance floor
- More innovative and interesting play areas
- Bring back the train
- Amphitheater
- Outdoor Events Area for Community/birthday parties
- **Recreation Trail improvements**
- Teen hang out areas
- Better/healthier vending machine options
- Special needs programs/parks for everyone
- Outdoor shower/foot wash at beach(es)
- More firepits on the beach
- **Art in the Parks, Art Center**
- **Increased security/lighting**
- History and ocean access on Cannery Row
- Fewer cars at beach
- Water play/Water slides
- Trampoline Park
- Flag Football
- More Park Staff
- Ropes and Climbing Park
- Bocce Ball
- **More bathrooms/Outdoor Shower**
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OPEN HOUSE AND FOCUS GROUPS

During the month of October the City held:

• Four focus group meetings (Monterey Business; Sports; Art, History and Museums; and Teens);
• A joint Neighborhood Improvement Program and Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting; and
• A public community Open House.

In addition, several community members and commissioners shared an Outreach Toolkit with their respective groups and gathered additional information.

The focus groups provide a small targeted forum to discuss the particular needs of each of the groups. At the Open House, community members walked around to five different stations and discussed their thoughts and concerns of specific areas, parks, community centers, and activities as they related to the current and future issues and needs for the facilities, parks and programs, and the desired outcomes for the planning effort.

Overview of Community Input

The community had many ideas related to the specific needs for sports, parks, trails and facilities. In addition, they identified some key characteristics and principles that should be incorporated into the PRMP as the City considers the development of new parks or improvement of the existing Parks. Following is a summary of the key points.

• Everyone is a visitor: Monterey offers recreation, sports, and their facilities to more than the people of Monterey. It has a regional draw and is a tourist destination. The day-to-day needs of the local community should be considered along with those from outside of Monterey.
• Foster Community: It is important that the parks and trails be designed to foster local community and create cohesion between the different areas of the City.
• Be bold! Energy! Activate! Dynamic activities - make the parks and programs more interesting, incorporating art and whimsy, unique elements
• The maintenance, cleanliness, safety, are very important
• Connections: Trail connections, connections between parks and destinations, and overall transportation connectivity is critical
• Better signage
• Package the experience: recreation, history, culture
• Partner with others: Cities, Schools and Private
• Make sure to have interactive multi-generational spaces

Example of Art in the Parks

• The spaces need to be “friendly” and enjoyable.
• Parks need to be created to accommodate and attract different types of users.

Further, community members, not necessarily by priority want the City to:

• develop facilities for teenagers to spend time (hang out);
• offer community volunteering options;
• provide athletic facilities, including beach volleyball (regulation tournaments) and other field sports;
• build an aquatic center;
• establish pickleball courts; and
• incorporate the history of Monterey.
• provide better safety on rec trail: create specific “lanes” for different modes
Following is a more detailed summary of community comments, including big vision ideas, thoughts, and concerns provided by the participants for general activities/functions, and ideas for specific improvements to parks/locations for the PRMP.

**Vision for Monterey Parks and Recreation**

Community members expressed a strong vision for the future of the parks and recreation system that builds on existing facilities and celebrates community and the unique attributes of the City. Following are overall vision ideas.

- Activate! Develop a sense of place.
- Create a draw for under-used parks and areas of the recreation trail

**New Facilities**

- Outdoor gym equipment areas
- Lighted basketball courts
- Multiuse fields – on top of parking lots!
- Pickleball and hardball
- Ocean aquatics center
- Improved and more bathrooms
- More camping areas
- Beach volleyball
- Community gardens

**Art in the Parks**

- Public art in parks is a big benefit
- Integrate Art: Art on utility boxes; temporary mural wall(s)
- Take care of art, include security CCTV, make sure to include in budget

**Sense of Place**

- Celebrate, share and connect history
- Outdoor concerts in the parks
- Green parks: Plaza with trees and grass surrounded by benches for groups of friends to meet
- Hang out space for teens

**Connect!**

- Scenic areas
- Walkable and bikeable
- Downtown, Custom House Plaza and Cannery Row
- ADA access, especially on the beaches
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Dogs!
• More areas in all the parks for dogs
• Combination of family and dog areas: fenced dog area near play area
• Large fenced areas
• Need more dog walking and free running parks

Kids and Teens
• Hands-on activities
• Water play and wading areas
• Destination Parks – make the play areas more interesting and exciting. Reinvigorate places like Dennis the Menace Park
• Teens need facilities near the High School and Downtown. Library area is the best location. The Youth Center is too far.

Sustainability
• Use drought resistant plants
• Ecological elements to parks

Make a historic park on Cannery Row
(500 Cannery Row)
• Open bay view and access for divers and kayaks
• Historic look at the first cannery
• View for those on Rec Trail
• Presence for the Marine Sanctuary

Connect Transportation to Recreation Opportunities
• More ways to get around
• Serving locals first and then tourists
• Expand use of the Trolley
• Use pedi cabs and connect parking lots
• Links with shuttle (lighthouse curve)
• Reliable paths & alternative transportation facilities
• Connect trails to downtown
• Transit after school to recreation areas

Expand Funding Sources
Must build City support and other sources for parks and future facilities, as well as operations and maintenance
• Bond
• Public/private partnerships
• Taxes
• Make all new facilities and current ones self-sustaining if possible
• Utilize concessionaire (i.e. Field of Dreams)
• Look at creative approaches

Operations and Maintenance
Need more funding options to maintain high quality of parks
• Can the City sell excess land/properties to create an endowment?
• Could we create an endowment from a percentage of NIP funds with interest only for operations and maintenance
• Build volunteer opportunities
• Add infrastructure to decrease trash on beaches
• Develop better promotional materials including complete maps and marketing materials

Example of Activating Urban Setting
Example Dog Park
Attract Large Competitive Events
• Sports/tourism = economic development
• Aquatics Center, Ocean Aquatics, Sports Center (more details below)

Partnership Opportunities
Explore more private/public; public/public partnerships

Monterey Peninsula College
• Limited use of classes now (swim, yoga, dance, etc.)
• Currently rent football field for $2000/use

 Joint use with Monterey High School
• Existing Facilities are old and not standard
  - 25y x 12 pool – no lights and wired
  - Community use is restricted
  - Old field
• Potential for new pool, stadium field, track on the lower part of campus
• Considerations for managing joint use: policies; maintenance; schedules; equal usage

Art & Culture: Need real partnerships
• Memorandum of Understanding with Monterey Art
• Needs very formal agreements and understanding if it doesn’t work:

CLARITY
• Private and public partnership

Sports & Fields
Facilitate activities that community and private side can help with.

Recreation
• Sports balls to use/loan
• Recreation close to schools
• Rock wall
• Wall ball
• Need informal recreation
• Pickleball courts
• Hardball
• Bocci ball (How do you keep balls available for random visitors?)
• Indoor soccer

More outdoor fields/field sports
• Youth fields
• Lacrosse/field hockey
• Ultimate Frisbee
• On the Lower Presidio?
• Beach soccer – enough courts to host youth tournament

Great lighting at night
• More public tennis and basketball courts with lights

Create a new regional sports complex (Partner with others, adjoining cities)
• Pool, trails, fields, gym

Volleyball
• Bring to next level: Beach Volleyball
• Tournaments - NCAA Sport
• Use Santa Cruz model for tournaments
• Jr. Volleyball (9-18 yrs) & College level

Aquatics

Swimming Aquatics – competitive sports
• Diving
• Water polo
• Masters
• Swim teams
• Joint use opportunities?
• Outdoor play pool
Ocean Aquatics Center (near existing Kayak Center)
- Develop an Ocean Aquatics Center with a wide range of amenities for community and events – natural connection to Sports Center
- Dry storage for: outrigger canoe, kayaking, ocean swimmers. Bay access!
- Need to be near the waterfront for wheel to bay and storage
- Want place for canoes in waterfront plan
- Offer community paddles
- Sailboats need additional amenities (such as picnic areas)
- Add standup paddle potential
- Food and refreshments at the beach
- Scuba / skin diving
- Host Sports Fest: Multi sport (volleyball and boating); Include both land(dry) and water
- Don’t need parking right next to water

Playgrounds & Parks
Ageless Parks
- Not just typical playgrounds
- Opportunity to be welcoming for all
- Big slides – for teen/adult
- Big monkey bars - for teen/adult
- Spinning play equipment
- Area for disabled kids / universal assessable play
- Adventures: tunnels/ caves/ hideouts
- Expand beyond the catalog of play
- “Areas of tranquility”
- Active outside exercise equipment in park areas
- Add technology devices in the parks for music
- Grass area or soft fall rubber, not sand or wood chips

Temporary basketball court to bring youth to the waterfront at the Wharf parking lot by Wharf Marketplace

Nature Trails & Areas
- More interpretative signage on trails
- More signage at trail heads
- Need more benches through out
- Gull proof garbage can lids

Newport Aquatic Center, Newport Beach

Example of Pickleball Court
Programs

More dynamic activities
• Beyond what is existing
• Farmers Market
• Art Tour
• Shows
• Partner with Save Our Shores to develop education programs

Adult & Senior
• Senior Dances
• Ballroom dancing lessons
• Another senior center
• Zumba and yoga classes

Pre-School Programs
• Extended day program for working parents

Teens
• Movies in the park for Teens where you can “Drive in” but you can talk: noise ok
• Model building workshops

History & Culture & Art

Build on the uniqueness of Monterey - World class history and connect to sense of place!

Lower Presidio Park
• Beautiful views
• History of major sites “most significant” on West coast
• Need to improve perception and draw
• Likely can add grass “cap/fill” on top of archeological areas (as long as it can be removed) for informal fields and amphitheater (or similar)
• Need to get people here with better wayfinding and access
• Make it energetic

Develop a Visitor History Center:
• Considered locating one in Stanton, run by the convention & visitor center
• Could the Monterey Passenger Depot be a visitor center
• Expand cell phone History App. for parks?
• Improve History Path - a new one is being considered
• Create a better tramway connection?

Vision “small Charleston” Old Monterey

Town fund
• Help maintain and operate facility
• Link to recreation programming

Build stronger linkages and connections between the various Art, Cultural and History organizations
• For a small community, the art and culture organizations are very siloed
• Monterey Art Museum is underused
• Overall the museums don’t capture many tourists
• Downtown plan update with convention center, but the Museum was not identified
• Open up policies and minds for collaboration

Example of Taking Back the Streets
Specific Parks & Locations

Following are comments about specific parks in the City.

Monterey Recreation Trail
- Need more places to sit and rest
- Safety on Trail is important!
  - Developed clear separate lanes for pedestrians and cyclists
  - Separate fast from slow
  - Slow down traffic
  - Create wider lanes
  - Create more awareness of others
  - Safer crossings
  Need better signage
- Better connection to Rec Trail
- Implement Multimodal Plan
- Connect from Fremont Street
- Connect Rec Trail thru Heritage Harbor to Cannery Row to pull together areas
- Connect Rec Trail to Custom House Plaza to Hotel to Downtown
- Activate the areas around the Trail and add mini parks, outdoor gym equipment
- Realigned Trail above Monterey Plaza
- Realigned bollards from center of bike lane

Hilltop Park Center
- Liked park and well used
- Community members love the art at Hilltop
- Better dance floors
- Create comforting, welcoming lounge
- Far from some areas of the City

San Carlos Park and Beach
- Beautiful park
- Remove the existing grass and construct a tot lot with specific features that highlight
- Get a grant for an innovative parks designer
- Contact Cannery Row Business Association for their support
- Need a better shower facility

Huckleberry Hill Nature Preserve
- Great walking area
- Create better trails into Huckleberry Hill

Veteran’s Memorial Park
- Complete bocce court and basketball
- Consider pickleball courts
- Add basketball

Via Paraiso Park
- Replace basketball with pickleball courts
- Art opportunities

Friendly Plaza
- Pretty gardens

Deer Flats Park
- Possible pickleball court
- Allow dogs

Montecito Park
- It would be good to expand, but no space
- Maximize the use and beauty of this space
- Only recreational outlet for a
04 community input

Teen Center Trends
- High-density and often lower income section of Monterey
- Neglected: dangerous basketball surface distorted by tree roots
- Replace sand in playground with mulch
- Add lighting
- Walking path around the park perimeter
- Volleyball court
- Plant tall bushes around remainder of perimeter (most of the park is covered)
- Artistic seating near the street for children using school busses
- Improved picnic area

Fisherman’s Flats Park
- Possible pickleball court

Casanova Oak Knoll Park Center
- Expand open space

Ryan Ranch Park
- Bird watching club

Laguna Grande Regional Park
- Security!
- Great new soccer field
- Clean up lake area
- Audubon proposal is great
- Improve for more facilities in this neighborhood
- More interpretative signage on trails
- Need a senior center
- Safety and security improvements will lead to more use
- Dog friendly
- Outdoor gyms
- Lighted basketball courts
- Seaside / Laguna Grande entry feature
- Poorly maintained PG&E substation
- Improve!

Tennis Center
- Possible pickleball courts (residents have to drive to Seaside, Carmel, or Santa Cruz)

Spanish Park
- Underutilized and used by “wrong people”

Iris Canyon Greenbelt
- A pretty drive

Monterey Youth Center/El Estero
- Great pre-K program
- Dennis the Menace Park is fun for the children
- New bridge at Dennis the Menace park
- Too far for teens at the high school
- Community science credit
- Video games
- Free Wi-Fi
- Promote center
- Local artist performer

Monterey Bay Park
- Continue to expand
- More BBQ’s
- More parking
- The first thing visitors see when driving into downtown – pretty
- Need bathrooms

Ferrante Park Sports Field
04 community input

- Lighted outdoor basketball at Monterey Bay Park
- Bring in snack shop, toy rental, activities to engage visitor

Monterey Sports Center
- Wonderful place for residents
- Love the pools at the sports center

Del Monte Beach
- Need bathrooms
- Clean up trash
- Too many fires. Thick smoke for residents
- Limit number of fires on beach. Offer fire rings on other beaches
- Crime increasing

Ferrante Park
- Not usable for residents of Villa del Monte
- Odd-sized baseball field used only a few weeks mostly by people living outside the neighborhood
- Baseball field should be removed and converted into usable recreation space for the residents
- It is watered and maintained all year around.
- The space and resources are wasted in its maintenance

Custom House Plaza
- Invite people to enjoy: chairs, climbing structure for kids
- Use for weddings: add gazebo

Transit Plaza
- Ice skating
- Connected with Pearl
- Serve new housing
- Staff lunch
- Interactive fountain
- Bocce ball?

Example of Outdoor event space

Fisherman’s Shoreline Park
- Remove the grass and place additional canning equipment there similar to the hopper
- Make it a walking historic park and an entry statement to Cannery Row
- Use artifacts from the Cannery Row Marketplace warehouse: stored at Fort Ord.
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Monterey has a wide variety of parks and open spaces distributed throughout the City, from pocket parks to large community parks and open spaces. The City owns, operates and maintains the majority of park and recreation sites, but also enters into joint use arrangements with various other jurisdictional entities. Additionally, the City maintains or jointly maintains a number of urban plazas, as well as open spaces and greenbelts that are primarily passive use or serve as visual amenities. The Inventory section covers primarily active use parks, beaches, open spaces with recreation trails, and special purpose parks such as the Lower Presidio Historic Park that are maintained and operated by the City.

On pages 37 and 38 are two maps with the City’s owned and managed parks followed by a map of the community-wide available resources on page 40 including schools, joint use facilities, and regional parks.

**NEIGHBORHOOD & POCKET PARKS**

Neighborhood and pocket parks serve the neighborhoods in which they are located. Neighborhood parks typically include amenities for active recreation such as play equipment, sports courts, and multi-use turf. They also include amenities for passive relaxation, such as benches, tables, and landscaped areas. Pocket parks may contain small play structures, turf areas, and amenities for passive recreation.

Monterey’s parks include 11 neighborhood parks, ranging in size from less than one acre to almost 3 acres, totaling almost 18 acres. These parks include:

- Hilltop Park
- Oak Newton Park
- Archer Park and Hoffman Park
- Larkin Park
- Montecito Park
- Peter J. Ferrante Park
- Casanova Oak Knoll Park
- Fisherman’s Flats Park
- Deer Flats Park
- Laguna Grande Park
- Cypress Park

The City’s 12 pocket parks and plazas include tot lots such as, Spray Avenue Tot Lot and Laguna Grande Court Park, as well as small plazas and gardens such as the Sensory Garden, Spanish Plaza and Griffin Plaza, and plazas along the Recreation Trail such as Bruce Ariiss Way Park and Cannery Row Park Plaza.

**COMMUNITY PARKS**

Community parks serve multiple neighborhoods or provide features that draw users from the entire City. They may be large parks with multiple features such as sports fields, community centers, or destination playgrounds. They may also be smaller parks that due to their special features or location attract users from a wider area, such as Monterey’s shoreline and beach parks.

Monterey’s community parks range in size from less than one to 52.4 acres, totaling over 82 acres. These parks include:

- Scholze Park
- San Carlos Beach Park
- Via Paraiso Park
- Whispering Pines Park
- Jacks Ballpark
- El Estero Park Complex
- Monterey Bay Park
- Veteran’s Memorial Park
- Friendly Plaza and Colton Hall Lawn
MAP 2. CITY OWNED AND OPERATED PARKS & FACILITIES

See Map 3 on next page
MAP 3. CITY OWNED AND OPERATED PARKS & FACILITIES: WATERFRONT
OPEN SPACE

Open space areas include small passive parks, large greenbelts, and natural areas. These areas often include trails and benches, but in some cases are purely visual amenities. A little over 300 acres of open space is managed by the City, and includes:

- Lagunita Mirada
- Don Dahvee Greenbelt
- Huckleberry Hill Nature Preserve
- Iris Canyon Greenbelt
- Quarry Park
- Various other greenbelts

SPECIAL USE PARKS

The City has a number of parks that do not fit into a typical category and so are identified here as “Special” use. This includes several of the beaches that do not provide typical recreation amenities. Special Use Parks include Del Monte and McAbee Beach, the Lower Presidio Historic Park, Veterans Memorial Park, Francis Elkins Park, Fisherman’s Shoreline Park, Monterey Tennis Center, and Simoneau Plaza among others.

The 4.75-mile Monterey Bay Coastal Recreational Trail (Rec Trail) connects to an 18-mile regional trail along the Monterey Coast. It is a central element of the City’s park system and could also be considered a community park.

RECREATION CENTERS

The City owns and operates five Recreation Centers. The Monterey Sports Center is the jewel of the system with approximately 70,000 sf of space dedicated to community recreation, including a natatorium, gymnasium, fitness and weight rooms, dance studios and support space.

In addition, the City has an adult and senior center, Scholze Park Center, youth center, Monterey Youth Center, and two neighborhood centers - the Hilltop Park Center in New Monterey and Casanova Oak Knoll Park Center in the Casanova Oak Knoll neighborhood.

JOINT USE AND OTHER COMMUNITY FACILITIES

In order to better serve its residents’ recreation needs, the City has entered into joint use agreements with the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District. Most school sites remain open and accessible for neighborhood use of play equipment and youth sports fields. The City has also worked with the Presidio of Monterey in a joint use agreement whereby the City maintains Soldier Field and City youth leagues play on the sports fields. Joint use has its benefits and difficulties, including increased security and restrictions on use of the military facilities, and variable costs, maintenance, operations and scheduling conflicts with MPUSD properties. Although some facilities such as Monterey Peninsula College are made available for limited use, fees and access are at the discretion of the proprietary jurisdiction. (See Map 4 on page 40 for locations of these other facilities)
SUMMARY INVENTORY

On pages 42-45, there is a summary of the City parks by type, size, and by how well they meet their intended function. This is arranged by type of park and described previously. For each park type, a summary of the acres per thousand is provided.

An important element of this table, is the column that indicates how well each park or center fulfills intended use. Each city-owned site has been assigned one of three ranks: below expectations, meets expectations or exceeds expectations. Non-city owned facilities in general, were not evaluated but included for information only. “Expectation” is a subjective term that indicates the general consensus of how a park or center should meet needs. An example of this subjectivity may be applied to the Sports Center. The Sports Center was designed and intended for recreation purposes only, and as such exceeds expectations. However, some community members feel like there should be competitive activities, particularly swimming and in their opinion the Center is below expectations. For purposes of this analysis, the planning team has based its assessment on the intend use of the facility, park or center and not what some might wish it did.

These determinations were made through several inputs: community input at the workshops and survey; the planning team’s on-site analysis of the park or center; and based on input from the City’s recreation and park staff. Together these three inputs provide the ability to indicate how well a park meets expectations.

A complete Inventory database provides a detailed listing of all the parks and the features found in each one.

SERVICE LEVELS

Monterey currently provides approximately 7 acres of neighborhood and pocket parks, community parks and special parks per 1,000 residents. When public open space and regional parks are included, the total rises to 22.8 acres per 1,000 residents. Monterey’s parks are distributed throughout the City, providing a park, trail or open space within a quarter mile (a 5-minute walk) of most residents.

Overall, the level of service, accessibility to parks, quality of facilities and type of facilities available are excellent. While it is unlikely that the City will need substantial new parkland, there are areas for improvements and the need to revisit the existing park facilities and amenities to better serve the community. Section 6 goes into depth about the needs and opportunities for the City.
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### 1. Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Park Size</th>
<th>Fulfills Intended Use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casanova Oak Knoll Park Center</td>
<td>5,110 sf</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop Park Center</td>
<td>18,400 sf</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Sports Center</td>
<td>71,255 sf</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Youth Center</td>
<td>14,000 sf</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholze Park Center</td>
<td>9,437 sf</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Pocket Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Park Size</th>
<th>Fulfills Intended Use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Ariss Way Park/Cannery Row Worker's Memorial Park</td>
<td>.12 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannery Row Park Plaza</td>
<td>.18 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Ricketts Park</td>
<td>.03 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Plaza</td>
<td>.16 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartnell Gulch Park</td>
<td>0.6 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Grande Court Park</td>
<td>0.07 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagunita Mirada</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Plaza</td>
<td>.66 acre</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory Garden</td>
<td>.41 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Plaza</td>
<td>.43 acre</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray Avenue Tot Lot</td>
<td>0.1 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Neighborhood Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Park Size</th>
<th>Fulfills Intended Use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archer Park &amp; Hoffman Park</td>
<td>1.6 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casanova Oak Knoll Park</td>
<td>1.3 acres</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Park</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Flats Park</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman's Flats Park</td>
<td>1.5 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Grande Park</td>
<td>2.6 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3. Neighborhood Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Park Size</th>
<th>Fulfills Intended Use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Park</td>
<td>1.3 acre</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montecito Park</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Newton Park</td>
<td>2.5 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter J. Ferrante Park</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Community Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Park Size</th>
<th>Fulfills Intended Use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colton Hall Lawn</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Estero Park Complex</td>
<td>45 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman's Shoreline Park</td>
<td>3.17 acres</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly Plaza</td>
<td>.78 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop Park</td>
<td>2.8 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacks Ballpark</td>
<td>3.7 acres</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Park</td>
<td>4.8 acres</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Beach Park</td>
<td>2.87 acres</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholze Park</td>
<td>1.2 acres</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Paraiso Park</td>
<td>10.6 acres</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whispering Pines Park</td>
<td>3.1 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Special

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Park Size</th>
<th>Fulfills Intended Use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Del Monte Beach</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Elkins Park</td>
<td>.12 acre</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobsen Park</td>
<td>.49 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Presidio Historic Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAbee Beach City Park</td>
<td>0.14 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Coastal/Recreational Trail</td>
<td>3.87 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Municipal Beach</td>
<td>.75 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Tennis Center</td>
<td>6 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Division Corporation Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
<td>Park Size</td>
<td>Fulfills Intended Use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simoneau Plaza</td>
<td>0.2 acres</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister City Park</td>
<td>.29 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran's Memorial Park</td>
<td>50 acres</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Special 97.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5 Acres/Thousand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Regional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Grande Regional Park</td>
<td>34.8 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Regional 34.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Acres/Thousand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Wooden Grove</td>
<td>0.5 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Flats Greenbelt</td>
<td>40 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descanso Greenbelt</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Dahvee Park</td>
<td>35.8 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman's Flats Greenbelt</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry Hill Nature Preserve</td>
<td>81 acres</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Canyon Greenbelt</td>
<td>32.1 acre</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Salinas Hwy (Minealas) Greenbelt</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry Park</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Ranch Park</td>
<td>100 acres</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline Drive Greenbelt</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washerwoman's Pond</td>
<td>1.8 acres</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodridge Acres Greenbelt</td>
<td>3.8 acres</td>
<td>Meets Intended Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Open Space 407.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.5 Acres/Thousand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Joint Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay View Elementary</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Charter School/Del Monte Elementary</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Elementary School</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa Elementary School</td>
<td>6.5 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
<td>Park Size</td>
<td>Fulfills Intended Use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa Park Sites (3)</td>
<td>5.5 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin Elementary</td>
<td>.5 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista Elementary School</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey High School</td>
<td>4 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula College</td>
<td>8 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier Field</td>
<td>9.5 acres</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Colton Middle School</td>
<td>4 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Joint Use 44  1.6 Acres/Thousand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Community Resource</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custom House Plaza</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Pines Golf and RV (US NAVY)</td>
<td>102.64 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey State Beach</td>
<td>63.41 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Navy Beachfront</td>
<td>66.55 acres</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Community Resource 234.6  8.4 Acres/Thousand

| Total City Park Acreage                | 637.4*   | ..................................................21 Acres per Thousand ** |
| Active/Passive Park Space              | 195.44   | 6.4 acres per thousand     |
| Regional Parks                         | 34.8     | 1.2 acres per thousand     |
| Open Space                             | 407.17   | 13.3 acres per thousand    |

* Does not include Joint Use or Community Resource Categories

** Based on Plan Area population of 30,605
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The following represent the major needs and opportunities derived from community input, the facility assessment and inventory, community profile, and City input that will be further explored in the PRMP. Less significant, specific improvements and enhancements to neighborhood and community parks are incorporated into the Inventory.

GENERAL NEEDS & OPPORTUNITIES

FUTURE GROWTH

The City population is not anticipated to grow much, if at all, over the coming years, with the exception of some densification in the Lighthouse Area, North Fremont Street and Downtown. This lack of growth is due in large part to the lack of suitable buildable sites. The previous Plan did anticipate growth that never occurred, in particular in the unincorporated areas. For the areas that are likely to experience growth, new parks may not be required, but the existing parks that serve those areas may need to be redesigned or upgraded to better suit the populations. Equally, it will be important to implement key recommendations in the Downtown Plan, North Fremont Plan, Lighthouse Plan and MMMP that improve connections and improve access to existing parks and amenities.

In contrast to the low residential growth, the City’s visitor and tourist population has soared since 1986 and is likely to continue to grow as the Conference Center is remodeled to attract more meetings and the overall attraction of Monterey increases for tourists. This imbalance in growth presents a challenge to the City. The City needs to make sure that there are ample facilities to serve the needs of the community, maintaining the unique character of the coastal town, while also supporting the economic benefits of tourism. The waterfront, State park areas and recreation trail are the central locations where this challenge is focused. Another, but less challenging issue is that Monterey Parks and Recreation facilities and programs are attractive and used by residents in the surrounding communities, increasing maintenance and operations demands on staff and budgets.

ACCESS TO PARKS

It is generally considered important for a community member to be able to walk to a park within 1/4 mile of his or her residence. On the following page is a map of the City of Monterey with all of the City facilities with a quarter mile walking radius from each park. Barriers to walking such as topography, major road crossings or freeways, and access barriers such as the military facilities are identified and are considered limits to access. The map clearly illustrates that for the broad majority of residents in the City there is access to some kind of park or open space. The areas that do not indicate access are actually military owned locations with ample facilities for their constituents.

OPPORTUNITY SITES

Map 5 on the following page illustrates the primary opportunity sites for new parks or facilities in the City. Some of the sites are already owned by the City, while some are owned by a different organization. Following is a brief overview of those sites and potential for future development.

Reservoir Site

Located on the far side of town on the border of New Monterey and Pacific Grove, this undeveloped reservoir is currently planned for stormwater storage, but has
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MAP 5. 1/4 MILE WALKING ACCESS TO PARKS
potential for joint development for walking trails and some additional park amenities.

**Drake Belden Site**

This small privately owned lot in New Monterey being considered for purchase is not significant enough for much development. It would serve primarily as a pocket park, or an area for a small dog park.

**Custom House Plaza**

The City has an extended partnership with the State regarding this historic State-owned plaza near Fisherman’s Wharf. This large open area has the opportunity to be a major draw and connection/hub from the waterfront to the Downtown. It offers some challenges as it is so large that it can seem desolate at non-peak times. A concept design for a revisioned space is included in the Downtown Specific Plan.

**500 Cannery Row**

This is a large site on the Bayfront, along Cannery Row that is currently permitted as a desal plant. If this site could be developed and transferred to the City, it could become a major destination park and create a strong reason for pedestrians to walk along Cannery Row rather than using a very congested segment of the Recreation Trail. Improvements to the sidewalk and site will vastly improve views and enjoyment of this area, which could be a substantial economic development opportunity.

**Cattelus East**

These two adjacent properties, owned by the City and located near the Wharf 2 and Monterey Beach, currently house a kayak retail operation, boat storage and unpaved parking. Several options for use of this space are considered on the following pages, including lighted basketball courts, and a new ocean aquatics center.

**Ocean/5th Street**

The city is considering purchase of this lot, and small building for a pocket park with a tot lot.

**Adjacent Properties to the Recreation Trail**

There are a number of adjacent properties along the Recreation Trail that provide opportunities for additional facilities. Some are owned by the Navy, some by private owners and others by the City. A deeper evaluation of needed spaces should be done to determine which parcels are most valuable to the community as recreation/park space.
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La Mesa Sites 1 & 2
There are two existing sports fields within the La Mesa Housing area owned by the Navy. The city is discussing potential joint use opportunities.

Garden Court Park
This is a small lot near the airport that has a water storage tank and could be a space for a small park.

Olmsted Site
The Monterey Unified School District owns 50 acres at Tarpy Flats. Originally the property was identified as a site for a future high school, but due to restrictions created by airport flight patterns, it is unfeasible to construct a school at this location. The District Administration has indicated willingness to discuss potential joint development of the site for recreation. However, a determination needs to be made as to whether a sports complex would be subject to the same use restrictions as a school.

Corporation Yard
The City’s Corporation Yard near Ryan Ranch appears to be oversized for the City’s needs and may have some space for other park/recreation uses. The site offers beautiful views, a flat building site and water access. The adjacent RV storage facility operated by the City is also a potential opportunity site to be considered. This is a tentative opportunity site that will be addressed in coming phase.

Ryan Ranch Park
Ryan Ranch is owned by the city and is composed of two parcels, a 25 acre site that has access to water and is relatively flat, and a second parcel that is 75 acres and is currently used as a disc golf, hiking, and occasional fire department training area. The second parcel does not have access to water.

Natural Area
This is a small privately owned parcel adjacent to Fremont Street and contiguous with Laguna Grande Regional Park that is being considered by the city for purchase. The space is currently undeveloped and could become a small natural open space or a dog park.
MAP 6. OPPORTUNITY SITES
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CONNECTIONS

With limited additional land available for more green space, the City needs to optimize its existing system and better link the parks and areas together. This should be done primarily through walking paths, bike lanes, transit and visual cues that encourage and illustrate a connection between locations. Increasing car connectivity is not a priority. Further there is an opportunity to “take back” some of the street areas for people by creating “parklets”, as has been done along Alvarado Street, as well as creating much safer and better street crossings that prioritize pedestrians over vehicles.

Wi-fi and internet access is a different kind of connection that is lacking, particularly in the Centers. The City should consider at a minimum to install free, high speed wi-fi in all of the Centers.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Continuing to maintain and improve the parks and facilities at the expected high level for these three user groups – residents, surrounding communities and tourists – is costly. Currently there is no reliable source of funding to pay for it. The NIP encourages identifying new facilities and parks to build (or acquire) without providing the necessary new funds to make sure they are well maintained.

One of the greatest needs identified by the community was the need for cleaner and better maintained parks and facilities, especially bathrooms. Safety issues, particularly with homeless and transients are connected to this maintenance issue as the better maintained and well used parks and facilities are less likely to be havens for these populations. Additionally, the need for additional operating hours for centers was identified. Without adequate staffing and funding these needs cannot be met.

Finally, the City has a large number of parks and centers that are aging and need not just regular maintenance, but replacement and improvements to overall amenities and park elements. Some of the work may be able to be funded through capital funding, but many of the smaller items like replacement of water fountains, new garbage cans, benches, and such are not.

Addressing this funding gap is perhaps the most critical need for this planning effort.

ARTFUL AND SENSE OF PLACE

The City has a robust system of parks. However, most of the parks have little to distinguish them from one another. There is an opportunity to create many more distinctive parks by incorporating art, history and whimsy. This can be done on a phased basis but should be done thoughtfully and with good planning. Management and maintenance of art work needs to be considered as well as the potential higher costs of these artful elements.
SPECIFIC FACILITIES

RECREATION TRAIL

The Recreation Trail is the most widely and frequently used parks and recreation facility in the City. It is used for exercise, to commute, for tourists and for enjoying the views along the waterfront. As such, it is very overcrowded in certain areas and has multiple challenges up and down the path due to this broad success. To effectively address Trail needs, the following breaks the path into four areas of consideration:

- Trail-wide
- Cannery Row
- Custom House Plaza to Waterfront
- Monterey Bay Park to Seaside

**Trail-wide concerns:**

**Crossings**

Nearly all of the recreation Trail crosses streets at midblock, making an awkward and very challenging interface between those on the path and cars and trucks on the streets. Currently, the City has tried to address some of these issues by installing colored striping, signs and bollards. However, the location, size and visibility of these markers are not sufficient in a number of areas, particularly on the busiest of days. More aggressive and extensive modifications and traffic calming approaches will likely need to be employed to mitigate the concerns. Several critical intersections have been identified for improvements by the NIP process.

**Bicyclists**

Bicyclists are the fastest moving elements on the Trail and are often frustrated by the slow and meandering tourists, surreys and families with strollers, inspiring swerving in and out of people. There are several “brands” of bicyclists – the thru commuters, the tourists, fitness/recreation, and the family/pleasure bicyclists. Perhaps the easiest group to address is the thru commuters. Implementing the City’s already approved Multimodal Mobility Plan (MMMP) and constructing the bike lanes provided would give these bicyclists a viable alternative route to get to their destinations. Currently the plan is for a Class 3 bike lane along Wave Street, sharing lanes with traffic. It would be better and more attractive to bicyclists to make this a Class 2 bike lane, if possible. Also, the North Monterey Bicycle Blvd. along Laine with connections thru the Lower Presidio could relieve congestion.

For family bicyclists, particularly those who live in town, creating a more interesting, better equipped (amenities) and convenient access to the Del Monte section of the Trail (also in the MMMP) may offer a similarly attractive alternative to the more congested sections of the Trail. (see below for Del Monte)
Usage policy and guidelines

The Trail is such an attractive thoroughfare, that all kinds of users are interested in being on it, including skate boarders, skaters, Segway tours, bicyclists, surreys, pedestrians, families with strollers and more. The challenge is to determine if there should be any restrictions for use and if so how and who enforces those. This is most critical on the congested areas near Cannery Row and Custom House Plaza. Locational or time restrictions may be appropriate, but difficult to enforce.

In addition to which users can or cannot use the Trail, the City should consider if it needs a policy that allows, charges or restricts the use of City property for recreation programs such as CrossFit, yoga, diving and similar activities.

Amenities

The trail has an inconsistent level of amenities to serve users. Drinking water stations (see image), benches, garbage cans, and dog “pup mitts” dispensers should be evenly placed along the trail from one end to the other.

Rest areas - The provision of benches to provide rest and a spot for views is very important. Choosing benches, ones that will not offer long-term locations for homeless or become new ramps for skate boarders is important. Well designed, artful sitting areas can be created and used in various locations to create a sense of place, a safe respite and a better use of currently dead space.

Bike Racks - With the number of bicyclists, providing safe and easily accessible bike racks is important. Identifying locations that reduce congestion while maintaining visual safety is essential. Use of artful and fun designs in line with other design elements can add interest and whimsy to the Trail. The MMMP addresses potential locations for racks.

Improve Trail Experience

Wayfinding – The City is embarking on developing a wayfinding plan, and the Transportation Association of Monterey (TAM) is developing one for the region. Enhanced wayfinding signage would benefit all users. Locational, directional (pictures of signage in Berkeley) and historical elements could all be enhanced and expanded throughout the trail. Another useful amenity could be ¼ mile marker signs along the Trail to encourage and educate people about the length of the their walk/ride and to help gauge distance to other destinations.

Lighting – There is existing lighting on the Trail, however there are some areas that
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MAP 7. RECREATION TRAIL: CANNERY ROW SECTION

- **New Class 3 (or 2 if possible) Bike Lane**
- **Potential Improvement to Turnaround**
- **Concentrate use with wheeled vehicles; encourage Peds onto Cannery Row.**
- **Improve Pedestrian walkways; Create design elements to nudge pedestrians to this path; consider removing 1 side of parking on weekends**
- **Improve crossings; Design to prioritize pedestrians and use design to nudge traffic elsewhere**
- **Design to prioritize pedestrians; major traffic calming**
are not as well-lit as others. Good lighting and lighting design is important for the safety of riders for navigating the Trail as well as for being safe from potential crime.

*Remove barriers* – Along the Trail there are various barriers that have been created over the years by various projects and activities. This including poorly placed curbs, odd placement of lighting or amenities and other similar items that can become challenging during high traffic times.

*Retail*

There is an opportunity to attractively incorporate retail establishments along the Trail to serve refreshments, offer bathrooms and to activate areas with fewer people. This can be done with small, pre-designed retail kiosks, or by allowing businesses to open onto the trail and better engage the Trail.

*Cannery Row Section*

The Cannery Row section of the Trail is the most congested area of the trail with tourists visiting Cannery Row and the Aquarium and traveling to and from Pacific Grove. It is also has the fewest views to the waterfront. At the same time, due to current Rec Trail guidelines, many of the buildings have their backs to the Trail, creating dead spaces along those sections with a somewhat desolate environment in off peak times.

The challenge then is to create an enjoyable and safe path for users during high traffic times and low traffic times. Options to address these issues may be a combination of physical improvements and policy implementation.

**Options to consider:**

*Physical Separation* – Some community members are strong advocates for creating a physical separation of the trail with a curb or a separate decomposed granite area for pedestrians similar to the Pacific Grove section of the trail. The issue with this approach in this section is there is not a consistent amount of space to expand the trail to accommodate this change. Changing widths may create higher level of confusion and would not necessarily address the issues related to fast bikes and slow moving surreys and family groups.

*Restricted Uses* – Restrictions for bike use on this section of the trail could be implemented at particular times – such as on weekends and other high use times in the summer. This kind of policy change could only occur if an effective and well-designed alternative for bikes is made available - such as the construction of a dedicated bike lane on Wave Street and Laine Street, as articulated in the MMMP. Surreys could also be further restricted, but their popularity with tourists may be so great as to make this not a viable option. Further restricting surreys would not alleviate the fast bike conflicts with families/strollers, young children on bikes, Segways and pedestrians.

*Encouraged Separate Paths for Different Users* – A similar but different option is to create attractive alternatives for each user to reduce congestion off the Trail. This would include: implementing the new bike lane on Wave Street and Laine Street through the Lower Presidio and encouraging commuters to use that path; improving and/or expanding the sidewalks along Cannery Row and developing signage for pedestrians to encourage them to take that route (address in Wayfinding Plan). In addition, the City should consider time-specific removal of one side of parking along Cannery Row to allow pedestrians a wider, less congested and more enjoyable route along the business route (approximately 25-30 spaces). The Trail on this
Increase wayfinding and attraction to move from Cannery Row to Custom House Plaza and Back. (Wayfinding Plan)

Develop pedestrian connection to Lower Presidio, utilizing existing hotel bridge or new. (Waterfront Plan)

Enhance path along water as indicated in Waterfront Master Plan. Evaluate adding Event/Amphitheater space

Enhance the connections to and thru Custom House Plaza up to Alvarado Street and into Downtown. Provide for activation, views and large crowds (MMMP, Waterfront and Downtown Plans)

Improve crossing from Waterfront area and across the parking to the Beach

Realign crossing of Del Monte through Spanish Plaza, connect to Sports Center and Parking (Waterfront Plan)
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MAP 9. RECREATION TRAIL: MONTEREY BAY PARK TO SEASIDE

Identify potential locations for enhanced facilities, natural play features, dog parks and improved safety.

Strengthen and enhance connections, gathering areas and activities in this section.

Potential New Bathrooms

Proposed New Parking Lot
section would be then optimized for families with small children on bikes, surreys and more slow moving vehicles.

**Custom House Plaza/Waterfront**

This section of the Trail has the opportunity to connect some of the most important historic sites in Monterey and to create a rich experience for visitors and residents alike. The new Wayfinding Plan should improve signage, historic markers and destination indicators. A pedestrian and bike link to the Lower Presidio Historic Park, as indicated in the Waterfront Plan and MMMP, should be implemented to make the park more accessible.

Similar to the Cannery Row section, there are areas along this section that are very congested, particularly during events and weekends. The width of the Trail differs quite a bit along this section with some areas with a full additional “lane” in decomposed granite for pedestrians with others that are constrained by buildings and planting on both sides. It appears, depending on ownership and topography, that there may be opportunities to make this section consistently wider at three “lanes” the entire length.

Like the Cannery Row Section, conflicts between fast moving bikes and pedestrians are still an issue and considerations for restricted use or alternative bike routes should be seriously examined. The potential bikes/surreys/pedestrian conflicts will not be alleviated by having 3 lanes like the Pacific Grove area, as the area is just too congested during peak times. There are several destinations, such as Lower Presidio, along this section that could be enhanced and made more significant with the development or connection to a plaza, viewing section and historic interpretation.

This section of the Trail has the opportunity and need to create strong connections to some important destinations: Downtown and Historic Sites through Custom House Plaza; the Presidio; the Wharfs and Waterfront; Sports Center and Jack’s Ball Park; and parking lots. These connections need to be both physically accessible and easy as well as very visible, attractive and obvious. (Also addressed in the MMMP and Downtown and Waterfront Plans.) Much of this can be done with better wayfinding strong design, removal of barriers and visual cues for users. Other connections, particularly to the Lower Presidio and to the parking lots/Sports Center may require substantial infrastructure improvements such as a pedestrian bridge or realignment of the crossings of Del Monte Avenue. (See Map 9 on page 58)

**Monterey Bay Park to Seaside**

This section of the trail is the least used and has the most opportunities for improvements and to better serve the community, particularly those east of Monterey Bay Park.

The Waterfront Master Plan includes the development of a new parking lot on the east side of Park Avenue backing onto the Recreation Trail. Any design of a large parking lot needs to be sensitive to ensure that it does not further cut off interest and activity in moving from Monterey Bay Park eastward.

This section of the trail could be better developed as a community-oriented side of the trail compared to the more tourist-oriented section near Cannery Row. Adding activity nodes such as outdoor gym equipment, distinctive children’s play elements – not prefab play equipment, but rocks, forts and water play, interactive art elements to make visible the history of the railroad would help to engage and serve the community. There are a few picnic areas that could be further enhanced.

Implementing the improved connections outlined in the MMMP would enhance this approach.
The City has a clear need for additional sports fields, from a community perspective and quantifiable need. The City has been able to use for the last 20 or so years Soldier Fields, which includes a soccer field and three baseball fields in the Presidio, owned by the military. However, since 2001 the security and access to those fields has increased making it infeasible for broad community use. These fields need to be replaced by another facility and still needs additional capacity.

Sollecito Field in El Estero Park and Jacks Ballpark are the City’s two lighted ballfields; Sollecito field with a standard 90’ baseline diamond, and Jacks with a 60’ diamond. Peter J. Aldrete ballfield in Via Paraiso Park is also a 60’ diamond, unlit, as is Peter Ferrante Park ballfield. Soccer practice is occasionally overlaid on the outfields, and a youth soccer field with synthetic turf is located at Laguna Grande Park. Several neighborhood parks include informal youth practice fields, including Hilltop Park, Larkin Park and Archer Park. A number of sports fields, either youth practice fields or game fields, may be available under joint use agreements, including school sites at Foothill Elementary, Bayview Charter School, La Mesa Elementary School, Walter Colton Middle School and Monterey High School. Joint use agreements may also be possible for two sports fields in the La Mesa Naval housing area.

**Options and locations**

There are some community members who see an opportunity and need for a competitive/tournament style sport field complex in Monterey while others are more interested in a Community serving complex. A tournament complex (Similar to Field of Dreams) would be designed to generate revenues and likely be managed by a third party vendor. It would have the opportunity to draw people from the region and state depending on the size and configuration. If the operators are required to prioritize revenue, access to the community would likely be limited. A community-oriented facility could serve the needs of the community, but likely not generate revenues. It could incorporate a walking track around the fields, play areas and the like. Several potential locations and concepts for additional fields have been identified.

The City owned Ryan Ranch has 25 acres that has access to water and is relatively flat. It is not as easily accessible to the community but could serve the needs.

The School District owns land on Olmsted Road near Foothill Elementary School that was original designed to be a high school. Due to the airport and flight path, the District cannot at last check, build a school there. The location is closer to the center of the City and a joint development program could benefit the school and the City.
Various locations in the City could be used for informal practice fields, including Monterey Bay Park, and joint use sites in La Mesa housing area.

There is potential to consider adding a sports field on any new parking structure that is created in the waterfront area or investigating other similar options.

**PLAZAS AND IN-BETWEEN AREAS**

The City owns and maintains a number of plazas, as well as spaces within parks and in the city, that do not have a specific use and/or are not necessarily large enough for an activity. Many of these in-between spaces are magnets for homeless and transients. Spanish Plaza, and the picnic area on the far side of El Estero Park are two examples of this kind of space. The homeless and transients were major concerns of the community and, especially how this population impacts park safety. These in-between spaces need to be activated in some way to make sure there are lots of people, lights and activity within the areas to deter loitering. There are several strategies that can be utilized: provide programmed activities continually (this may be needed when and if Simoneau Plaza is no longer a transit center); link the area to a retail or other active use; use it as a connector and encourage lots of foot traffic; ensure that plantings and lighting are not conducive to loitering; and use art and space to encourage all members of the community to gather. Some spaces may be better decommissioned as a plaza if there is not a way to connect, activate or leverage other activity.

**MONTEREY SPORTS CENTER**

The Sports Center is a very well used, operated and maintained facility, achieving over 90% cost recovery. The facility has been expanded once and there is a desire and potential need to expand the building again. Staff has identified the need to add a larger more effective warm water therapy pool, additional fitness space and to enlarge the locker rooms. Part of the expansion, planned to move into the adjacent parking lot, would also increase the connection and views to the waterfront.

Based on current operations, it seems reasonable to expect the continued success of such an expansion. However, an additional aquatics natatorium is high cost building type and very high cost operating space. It is not clear if the new space will meet the expected cost recovery rate needed. The City does need additional aquatics facilities, but specifically competitive swimming facilities, likely outdoors.

Further feasibility analysis should be completed to determine the level of demand for the proposed natatorium and likely cost recovery. Some type of expansion, particularly of the fitness and support spaces would likely be cost effective.

Some community members feel that the Center is too expensive to use.
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HILLTOP PARK CENTER

Hilltop Center is the second largest center in the City with 18,000 sf of useable space, however, it is underutilized with just 24,000 annually. By comparison, Casanova Oak Knoll Park Center is 5,100 sf and has over 32,000 participants annually. The Center is located on the far edge of the City and is not well utilized or extensively programmed. The building, an old school, is not very inviting, nor is it designed as a community center. It feels disconnected and poorly appointed with worn floors, paint and amenities. Used for art and dance classes, meetings, a preschool and some teen activities, it has not been a success.

A building upgrade and redesign would help to improve its “brand” and make it feel more like a community hub. More innovative and dynamic programming may draw more participants. One concept is to make Hilltop more of a specialty Center for the Arts with specialized spaces for ceramics, painting, music and the like as well as for adult dance and movement. Creating more of a destination Center could help draw people from the entire City. Equally, this would not preclude the Center from continuing its popular preschool and afterschool programs, but may improve them. The ample parking can be a plus and with a remodel, it can become a more exciting location to visit.

MONTEREY YOUTH CENTER

The Youth Center is well-used with approximately 45,000 program participants annually. However, it does not serve the City’s teens effectively, primarily due to locational issues. (See below “Teens”) It has very popular gymnastics and preschool programs, one of the best dance studios in town and a great location next to Dennis the Menace Park with great views to the Lake. The Center itself would benefit from a remodel and upgrades that would improve efficiencies, storage and usability. The lobby is large and perhaps could be better designed for the Center. The dance studio is in a separate building and is difficult to oversee. The City should consider repurposing the Teen Center section into a rental space that opens to the lake for parties and events. Adding that space would provide greater opportunities for staff to manage and balance requests for other activities. If this were done, renaming the Center would make sense.

Parking is an ongoing challenge, particularly on the weekends. Identifying additional...
parking areas, as well as encouraging alternatives to cars – transit and bikes - is important. To that end ample bike racks should be provided.

**SCHOLZE PARK CENTER**

The Scholze Park Center is a very well utilized center primarily focused on the provision of senior programs and services. It is a little under 10,000 sf and serves approximately 46,000 users annually. The staff does a very good job of scheduling and programming the building to its fullest potential and it is generally at or beyond capacity during the day. They have challenges with getting strong participation in the evening and are experimenting with different program ideas.

The entrance area does not effectively engage visitors and needs to be remodeled to both visually indicate it is an entrance and to serve its job at reception and welcome more effectively.

The surrounding park is generally under-utilized in comparison and could be better incorporated with the Center programs. Space for Bocce, movement classes, art, and similar activities could be considered and may help with capacity.

**ADDITIONAL FACILITY NEEDS**

**PICKLEBALL**

A large contingent of community members have advocated for the development of pickleball courts in the City. While not typically identified as a “Need” the addition of a pickleball court (or more) would meet demand in the community and add additional variety to the City’s offerings. The sports is designed to be easy to play for all ages. Existing tennis courts could be repurposed for this activity. A typical pickleball court (34’ x64’ in total) can fit on one standard tennis court. An alternative is to build a new set of courts.

Community members identified a number of possible sites that need to be evaluated further for feasibility (e.g., Veterans, Via Parasio, Deer Flats and Fisherman Flats Parks).

**LIGHTED BASKETBALL COURTS**

The community has identified a need for a new, lighted basketball court(s) accessible to the entire City. Currently the City does not have a central located well lit facility for drop-in basketball.

Locating the Court near the water, accessible to parking and within an area that is appropriate for active, noisy behavior is important. The ideal location is in the proximity of Monterey Bay Park and the Kayak Shop. (see diagram on the following page) There are three potential locations within that area that can both accommodate and benefit from the addition of this activity and facility.
Option 1. New Lighted Basketball Court. Near Active area, easy to get from Sports Center and Wharf parking. Would limit growth of new VBall Cts.


Option 3. New Lighted Basketball Court. Reconfigure the Catellus Property, boat storage to allow for Basketball Court.
The Court(s) should be integrated into the area, using high quality design and materials to ensure it is well appreciated and in keeping with the surrounding area.

TEENS

The City has several “centers” for Teens – the Monterey Youth Center, the Hilltop Center and the Casanova Oak Knoll Park Center. While they generally can serve younger pre-teens and afterschool programs, they have not been successful in attracting actual teens on a regular basis. When asked in a focus group, the Teens did not know where the Youth Center was, however they did request all of the elements that are provided in the center. The location for this driverless and generally fickle group is critical. Many of the teens go to downtown and to the library in particular. The library is relatively close, safe and central to where they can purchase food and easily hang out.

The City should repurpose the existing Teen Center areas for pre-teens, afterschool programs and other special, scheduled teen programs or other needed activity and consider developing a different and better located teen center utilizing the furnishings from a repurposed Youth Center. While not presented as an option, the Library would be an ideal location with access to the outdoors.

ADULTS AND SENIORS

Overall, most adults and seniors feel that their needs are being met by current programs and facilities. The one area that was mentioned is the need for more adult dance classes and to improve the floors and amenities for these classes. Many are currently held at Hilltop or Scholze Centers and neither have floors and mirrors designed for dance.

CHILDREN’S PLAY AREAS

Overall, the City has ample play areas for children. Although, there may be need for some additional play areas in conjunction with new housing in the Downtown, Lighthouse and Fremont Areas. The greatest need is to enhance the existing playgrounds, neighborhoods parks and tot lots to be more interesting and engaging. The play equipment is typically prefabricated and does not offer much variety or sense of place and feels very generic. The City has an opportunity to phase over the next 10 years more artful, playful and thoughtfully designed play elements in each park. Water play may also be a desirable element. Themes connected to the history of the City or particular area of the community can be inspiration for the new elements.

Dennis the Menace Park

Dennis the Menace is a central destination park that is well loved by the community as well as visitors. However, it has been overloved and is in need of a major renovation. In addition, many of the improvements over the years have been more functional than in
In order to retain (and regain) its status as a destination park, a new comprehensive design and renovation should be completed that reconsiders how children and families use it today, how to better connect to the surrounding El Estero park and to provide a safe and yet whimsical and engaging environment for children of all ages and abilities. A main element of the park is the train, which has been decommissioned for safety reasons. There is a current effort to bring it back as a play element. San Francisco children’s park in Golden Gate park went through a similar process resulting in a new park that is as much if not more loved than before – all while maintaining a connection to its history and place.

DOGS

The City has one dog park that is under performing. There is a need for additional dog parks throughout the City and within the various neighborhoods. The development of dog parks can be done within under used areas within existing parks allowing for ease of access for the community. There is substantial support for improving access and availability of off leash dog park areas. There may be ideal locations along the Del Monte section of the Recreation Trail that can be designed as a dog run. The Lower Presidio may also offer an ideal location for a dog park.

The dog policy overall should be evaluated to determine if dogs can be allowed in most parks on leash, some parks off leash or restricted to only a few parks.

OCEAN AQUATICS

The City offers boaters – kayaks, canoes, paddle boards, sail boats and the like – a world class location for recreation and competitions. However, the current facilities are not in keeping with the potential. The City has the opportunity to create a new Ocean Aquatic Center to attract events and other competitions to the City. The extent to which the City can and wants to create this kind of center will impact what kind of attraction it will be. At a minimum, the City should add amenities such as picnic benches and water stations near the current kayak store. For a competitive center, a building that includes storage, fitness spaces, offices and similar spaces would be needed. There is a strong possibility for joint development with the private sector for this effort. The East Catellus properties are potential opportunity areas to improve and enhance the facilities. There is also potential to reconfigure the entire property to better site the boat storage as conceptualized in the Waterfront Master Plan.
SWIMMING POOLS

The City manages the Swimming Pool at the Monterey Sports Center, and otherwise relies on use of private or public school facilities for competitive swimming and programs. The Sports Center is dedicated to serve recreation swimmers first and competitive teams second. This results in very few opportunities for teams to use a City pool.

The High School pool is out-of-date and not configured for competitive swimming. There is potential to develop a joint use facility at the high school, if the City is provided ample pool time, or a stand-alone center elsewhere on its own. A new outdoor pool could be part of a larger sports complex with fields (also see Sports Field).