

Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan PRC and Community Feedback
Summary of Feedback Themes and Plan Revisions

On November 17, 2025, the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) discussed and provided feedback on the draft Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan (Plan), which had been posted for public review on November 3, 2025 through December 14, 2025. During this six-week review period, staff met with community members and received written input through the project website and by email. During the PRC meeting, Commissioners and community members commented on what they saw as the strengths and weaknesses of the Plan, providing thoughtful suggestions for the Plan's improvement. Staff conducted a thorough review of the draft Plan to identify opportunities to incorporate PRC and community feedback. This resulted in a significantly revised Plan, with:

- Added analysis about the implications of future growth; the role, access limitations, and condition of school-based fields, and other topics of interest to the PRC and public;
- Increased emphasis on the importance of biodiversity and tree canopy and safe park/neighborhood connections;
- Clearer links between analysis and recommended actions;
- More specificity about how actions would be accomplished, priorities would be set, and accountability would be tracked;
- Emphasis on the development of new parks as a priority, not as an aspirational goal;
- Greater transparency about the feasibility and timeline of achieving the goal of three acres of park land per 1,000 residents (3 ac/1,000) and the differences between Planning Areas vis a vis this goal; and
- Improved Plan organization.

The amount of change made to the draft Plan was too extensive to present the revised Plan showing track changes. The purpose of this attachment is to summarize the themes from the PRC and community feedback and the ways in which those themes were addressed in the revised Plan being presented to the City Council for feedback on January 27, 2026.

Feedback Theme	Revision to Draft Plan
<p>Unclear approach to 3 ac/1,000 goal (feasibility, timeline, Planning Area vs. citywide)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added information to Plan Introduction (Chapter 2) • Added information to new Cost of Implementing the Action Plan and Potential Funding Options Subsection (Section 8.6.7) • Added Park Access Subsection (Section 5.3.2) in Park and Facility Assessment Section to discuss differences in park distribution by Planning Area, reliance on school fields, and impacts of transportation barriers • Expanded description of Planning Areas and impacts of potential growth in Planning Area Overview Subsection to the Parks Assessment Section (Section 5.3.1), Level of Service (Section 5.4) and in Appendix G
<p>Insufficient analysis of implications of future residential/population growth, including implications of state housing legislation, Housing Element, and other City land use policies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added Future Growth Subsection to Level of Service Analysis Section (Section 5.4.5) • Added discussion of population growth in new Identifying and Responding to Risks Subsection (Section 8.5.4) in Action Plan Development and Framework Section
<p>Insufficient analysis on condition and role of school fields on park access; concern about overcounting school field hours of use if before school hours are included in adjusted inventory of school field acres</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added School Fields Assessment Subsection (Section 5.3.11) to Park and Facility Assessment Section and table of amenities by school field in Appendix G • Clarified distinction between City parks and school fields throughout Plan • Confirmed that before school hours are not included in calculation of adjusted school field acres in Level of Service Analysis Section (Section 5.4.3) • Added discussion of school field access in new Identifying and Responding to Risks Subsection (Section 8.5.4) in Action Plan Development and Framework Section
<p>Unclear priority for new park development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed concept of tiers with letters and labels, replaced with categories of park investment magnitude: Develop New Parks, Enhance Existing Parks, and Update Existing Parks in Framework for Prioritizing New Park Planning and Park Improvements Chapter (Chapter 7)

Feedback Theme	Revision to Draft Plan
<p>Disagreement about emphasis on 10-minute walk analysis and implication that saying 92% of Mountain View residents are within 10-minute walk means there is sufficient park access</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced and rewrote text • Added discussion of 10-minute walk in context of park access in new Park Access Section (Section 5.3.2), which considers impact of transportation barriers
<p>Insufficient emphasis on importance of trees, vegetation, native planting, and biodiversity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added Integration of Biodiversity into Park Design Subsection (Section 6.3.2) to Chapter 6 Guidelines for New Park Design and Park Improvements • Expanded goal and strategy statements in Goals, Strategies, and Action Chapter (Chapter 8) • Added Action Items to Action Plan (Section 8.6) aligned with draft Biodiversity and Urban Forest Plan (BUFP) • Added Action Item to Action Plan (Section 8.6) regarding resource needs to implement the BUFP • Emphasized importance of tree canopy in providing shade in parks and clarified role of shade structures in Park and Facility Assessment Section (Section 5.3) • Emphasized that trees are part of the City’s living infrastructure in Introduction (Chapter 2), Condition subsection (Section 5.3.8) under Parks and Facility Assessment Section, and in Landscape Features language of the Park Design Guidelines by Park Type Section (Section 6.2)
<p>Insufficient emphasis on importance of safe park/neighborhood connections</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added Park Access Section (Section 5.3.2), including expanded analysis of impact of transportation barriers and table listing Planned Active Transportation Improvements • Added Action Item to Action Plan (Section 8.6) regarding resource needs for active transportation planning and engineering • Added Action Item to Action Plan (Section 8.6) regarding coordination with the Active Transportation Plan to promote safe and convenient access to Parks and Open Space

Feedback Theme	Revision to Draft Plan
<p>Unclear link between recommended actions and analysis and public input</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added How the Action Plan was Developed Section (Section 8.5.1) to Action Plan • Added bold text and Action Item numbers to analysis and public input findings to show how findings led to action recommendations • Added 12 Action Items to Action Plan (Section 8.6) • Added Guidelines for New Park Design and Park Improvements Chapter (Chapter 6), consolidating separate sections • Reformatted Park Design Guidelines by Assessment Criteria Section (Section 6.1) to align guidelines with assessment findings • Added Public Input Highlights Section (Section 4.1) to Public Input Chapter
<p>Unclear how actions will be prioritized and accomplished, how success of the Plan will be tracked, and how risks to successful plan implementation will be anticipated and addressed; interest in moving as quickly as possible on action items</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added milestones to Action Plan (Section 8.6) • Added reference to performance metrics to Action Plan (Section 8.6) and reference to Action Items in Performance Metrics Subsection (Section 8.7) in Goals, Strategies, and Action Chapter • Added Action Items to Action Plan (Section 8.6) regarding resource needs for Plan implementation • Moved up timeline on some Action Items in Action Plan (Section 8.6) • Added Action Plan organized by timeline (Section 8.6.5), to complement Action Plan organized by strategy • Added Cost of Funding the Action Plan and Funding Options Subsection (Section 8.6.7) • Added Land Acquisition Strategy Subsection (Section 8.6.8) • Added Identifying and Responding to Risks Subsection (Section 8.5.4) in Action Plan Development and Framework Section • Added Prioritization Criteria Subsection (Section 8.6.6) in Action Plan Section
<p>Unclear analysis and implications of benchmark levels of service and equity maps</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shifted from prescriptive service benchmarks to simplified approach looking at Planning Areas • Removed Equity Maps and replaced with park and amenity distribution maps in Level of Service Analysis Section (Section 5.4) and Appendix G

Feedback Theme	Revision to Draft Plan
<p>Plan is lengthy and difficult to follow</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added Executive Summary (Chapter 1) • Added section headers and subheaders to make content easier to find in the table of contents and through online navigation • Reorganized sections to improve flow (e.g. moved sections on population density and Healthy Places Index from Analysis Chapter to Community Profile Chapter (Chapter 3); added Park Guidelines Chapter (Chapter 6), combining content from other sections; moved survey of potential funding mechanisms to Appendix H)
<p>Missing information about status of 2014 Parks and Open Space Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added information to Plan Introduction (Chapter 2) • Added Appendix A