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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Park and Facilities Master Plan provides a road map for providing high quality parks and recreation facilities for residents and visitors to the City of Napa. This plan includes a detailed examination of existing park sites and recreation facilities, providing the basis for an in-depth community discussion and analysis of the needs and priorities of park users. The community involvement in the planning process has built momentum and support for parks and recreation services as a key factor in Napa’s quality of life. The resulting recommendations lay out a path to a first class park and recreation system that realizes the personal, community, economic and environmental benefits of parks and recreation. Recognizing that this path will not be straight or short, the plan provides tools to guide decision making and project implementation over the next fifteen years and beyond.

PURPOSE

The Park and Recreation Facilities Master Plan is an implementation step of the Envision Napa 2020 General Plan, providing guidance to achieve the vision as laid out in the Parks and Recreation section of Chapter 5. This plan is designed to be consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the General Plan while updating the current situation, needs and desires of the community and identifying the next steps in achieving the community vision. The General Plan remains the authoritative document for setting City policy and takes precedent over the Park and Recreation Facilities Master Plan in the event of any inadvertent conflict.

EXISTING RESOURCES

The City of Napa’s 800 acres of parks and open space offer a variety of recreation experiences, skateboarding, golfing, walking and biking and playing sports at park types ranging from mini and neighborhood parks to large-scale community parks that draw people from throughout the community. Within these parks are the recreation facilities that support a variety of interests, from creative play to competitive sports as well as hiking, biking and enjoying the natural environment. Napa also provides spaces and programming for indoor recreation at City-owned and School District facilities. The plan highlights the important collaboration that exists between the City of Napa and the Napa Valley Unified School District to provide a mix of casual, individual and organized activities across the city. Other providers also supplement the recreation
opportunities, providing classes and organizing sporting events. The inventory and existing resources map included in this plan provides a solid understanding of the existing park system which informed the discussions with the Napa community as well as the analysis of land and facilities needed to serve the future population.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Napa Park and Facilities Master Plan is built on a strong foundation of public input and feedback. Between September 2008 and April 2009, nearly 2,000 Napa residents were an integral part of the planning process, providing input in a variety of ways, including:

- Community Workshops
- Telephone Survey
- Online Questionnaire
- Focus Groups and Interviews
- Intercept Event
- Sports Group Questionnaires

The mix of public involvement opportunities was carefully crafted to provide a variety of methods and types of input. The rich, qualitative contributions derived from the three community workshops was balanced by the quantitative analysis of a statistically valid survey. This survey tested the interests and priorities of a representative sample of Napa residents. Focus groups, interviews, questionnaires and an intercept event offered a diverse group of participants an opportunity to provide their best ideas and have conversations directly with the planning team. Additionally, a project website provided a central place for interested residents to check in with the progress and the next steps of the plan.

COMMUNITY NEEDS ANALYSIS

A key step in the planning process combined the observations of the existing parks and facilities with the detailed input from the community into an analysis of community recreation needs. The analysis was customized based on the types of facilities and Napa’s unique geography, transportation and future plans for community growth. The results of this analysis included current and future needs for park land as well as a selection of the key recreation facilities.
NAPA PARK AND FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

Park Land
The park land analysis is informed by comparisons against similar communities in California and a geographic access analysis that examined the travel distances to each park. Napa’s park system provides more acres of developed park land by population than any of the comparison communities but still lacks adequate access to parks in several areas of the city.

Outdoor Sports Facilities
The Outdoor Sports Facilities analysis focused in particular on the need for several varieties of competitive and informal sports fields as well as skateboarding facilities. The analysis used information reported by organized sports groups as well as a need to provide space for casual play to identify current needs for additional fields for soccer and for junior level baseball and softball. These needs will continue to grow slowly with population but are largely founded on current shortages based on strong participation in organized sports. The analysis determined that BMX and skateboard needs are largely met by current facilities but the primary skate facility will need to be replaced due to displacement and inadequate features.

Aquatics and Water Play
Based on similar communities and the ability to support expensive facilities, there is currently an adequate supply of swimming pools in the community. Strategic management of access and programming is needed to optimize these resources. To supplement the pools and provide local access to a place for water play, the analysis identified a need for up to 7 water play facilities. These could include interactive fountains, water playgrounds or other opportunities to get wet and cool off in the summer.

Outdoor Facilities and Park Amenities
The outdoor facilities and park amenities analysis identified a need for additional reservable group picnic areas, outdoor performance space/amphitheatres and community gardens. The analysis determined that additional dedicated dog parks are not currently needed. Dog park areas could be integrated into future community park designs.

River Access and Trails
The river access and trails analysis defers to the analysis of the Napa River Parkway Master Plan and other existing regional and City trails plans.
These identify a series of potential river access and trail improvements that can be phased and developed over time. Additional considerations include the short connections between these planned trails and parks and recreation facilities to maximize access to these resources.

**Indoor Recreation Facilities**

The indoor recreation facilities analysis focused on the availability of space to support the variety of programming that Napa residents want to engage in. The shifting trends in recreation facilities toward flexible, multi-purpose spaces and the unmet programming needs identified by the community result in a need for a different mix of indoor facilities. In order to support current and future indoor recreational activities, the analysis identified a need for multi-use classroom space, at least one additional gym and high-quality indoor fitness/dance studio spaces to support programming during daytime hours and at other times when school facilities are unavailable. The analysis also identified a need for additional indoor spaces to support smaller and larger-scale community gatherings.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Park and Facilities Master Plan draws on the public input and the analysis of needs to develop a vision of the park system. A key set of recommendations outlines the major steps needed to achieve this vision. In addition to these broad recommendations, the plan includes park profiles that describe each park in the Napa park system and make park-specific recommendations.

**Park System Concept**

The Parks and Facilities Master Plan envisions a park system that, by 2025, will feature a mix of smaller local parks and sites that create space for larger activities. Signature sites such as Kennedy Park will be focused on large-scale facilities that support gatherings and organized sports. The system of local parks will encourage active lifestyles across the City by providing close-to-home recreation opportunities. The community’s indoor recreation facilities will be expanded and upgraded to provide flexible spaces for generations of Napa residents to engage in evolving recreation programming. At the same time, Napa will enhance the opportunities to enjoy and appreciate its natural setting, connecting residents and visitors to the environment in new and creative ways in parks of all types.
Key recommendations made by this plan to achieve this vision are outlined below.

**Park Land**

- **Increased local park access** with a goal of a park within ½ mile travel distance of each residence;
- **Targeted school parks** utilizing existing public facilities where park land is lacking; and
- **Two additional community parks** spreading the benefits of larger parks to central and eastern Napa.

**Outdoor Sport Facilities**

- **Maximized sport fields usage** making the most of existing community assets and maintaining competitive fields to the highest standard;
- **New recreational fields** focused on soccer, junior baseball and junior softball with additional space for casual play;
- **New Napa skate facilities** replacing the Napa Skate Park with two unique facilities and continuing to support skate-spots in local parks.

**Indoor Recreation Facilities**

- **Develop a multi-generational community center** utilizing and expanding on the existing Napa Senior Center site as a central home for recreation programming and community gatherings;
- **Redevelop the Pelusi Center** creating a new, large-scale community gathering place that takes advantage of the views and proximity to the golf course; and
- **Expanded Las Flores Center** to increase capacity for early childhood care and education.

**Aquatics and Water Play**

- **Continue to utilize school pools** to provide swim lessons and other aquatics programming; and
- **Add water play facilities at six sites** including an interactive fountain downtown.

**Outdoor Facilities and Park Amenities**

Add new and expanded amenities to existing parks to increase the variety of recreation opportunities and support activities desired by the
community. Napa should add permanent restroom structures to eight existing parks and additional group picnic facilities to all community park sites. Other recommended amenities include river access, community gardens and social gathering areas. Within many of Napa’s parks there are also opportunities to expand access to natural environments.

**Trails**

While this is not a trail planning effort, the important overlaps are recognized in this plan. To make the most of the recreation aspects of trails in Napa, the City should expand regional trail access through ongoing planning and coordination with Napa County and regional trail groups. Further, future bicycle and pedestrian planning should identify new and existing parks as major destinations in the trail and bikeway systems.

**Non-Capital Projects**

In addition to recommendations for capital projects, a series of recommendations are made for non-capital projects that will enhance the system, including:

- **Create a capital reinvestment fund** to ensure the long-term vitality of the park system;
- **Continue to develop the School District partnership** to maximize community investment in schools and recreation facilities; and
- **Create a park brochure** with the updated map and important amenities such as restrooms indicated.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

The concept presented in this plan will require substantial community investment and will happen over a long period of time. To direct the community toward this park system vision, the Park and Facilities Master Plan provides a number of tools that will help guide the decision making process over the course of the plan. These tools include guiding principles, a capital cost model, other decision criteria and a plan for project funding and phasing.

**Planning Framework**

The planning framework identifies guiding principles that will guide park improvement prioritization during the planning period. These principles, derived from community input, can be applied to any project decision to
ensure that the decision moves the park system closer to the vision of this plan. The guiding principles include:

- Fun
- Accessibility
- Diversity
- Education
- Economic Sustainability
- Environmental Sustainability
- Quality
- Health and Wellness
- Sense of Place

**Capital Cost Model**

A capital cost model was developed to identify project components and costs. Based on the model, the total planning level cost of all projects identified in the plan for existing parks are estimated to be nearly $53 million or a total capital cost of $686 per resident. Costs of proposed parks, including 14 additional neighborhood parks, 2 community parks and the Bypass Skate Park will cost an estimated $77 million. The total estimated cost of capital projects in the plan is approximately $130 million.

**Other Decision Criteria**

The plan also suggests and discusses other decision criteria that should guide project choices, including:

- Reinvestment
- Funding opportunities
- Operations and maintenance
- Construction cost increases

**Project Funding and Prioritization**

This plan identifies a set of projects that far exceed the current funding levels for capital improvements and reinvestment in the park system. The recommendation of this plan is to pursue a strategy that implements these projects in phases that build support for a capital funding campaign. This campaign would be able to use the first set of projects as examples of the improvements Napa residents would see across the park system with the approval of a sustainable capital and maintenance funding source, which would have to be authorized by voters.
Three project phases are identified and described. **Phase One project costs are estimated at $2.75 Million** and balances preparatory planning and actions that will expedite future park development efforts including site planning and design. **Phase Two project costs are estimated to cost more than $25 million**, would require additional funding sources and feature significant capital improvement projects. Phase Three efforts would be directed towards ongoing improvements and enhancements to the park system.

**CONCLUSION**

This plan provides a detailed look at Napa’s parks and recreation facilities, clearly identifying the community needs through a high level of public input and careful analysis. The recommendations and implementation tools are designed to serve City staff, decision makers and the community over the next 15 years as Napa moves forward with investments in the future of this important system. Targeted, sustainable improvements to the system will create a system that will be not only a point of pride for Napa but a key element in the quality of life for residents and the attractiveness of the city as a destination.
I. INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 2008, the City of Napa initiated the Park and Facilities Master Plan to create a community-supported blueprint for providing high quality parks and recreation facilities for all residents. Based on the community’s vision of an exciting, connected and multi-generational park and recreation system, this Plan establishes a path to guide decision making and project implementation over the next fifteen years and beyond.

The City of Napa provides over 800 acres of parks and open space at 57 park and open space sites. Napa parks offer a variety of recreation experiences, from relaxing and enjoying nature to casual play and competitive sports. The park system also supplements the street and sidewalks of Napa in supporting walking and biking. From small neighborhood parks to the large multi-purpose community parks the park system is the gathering place for families, community groups and for special events and festivals that draw visitors to Napa from around the world. Building on a historic legacy of key park sites in the core of the city and along the Napa River, the City has expanded park and recreation opportunities in partnership with other public agencies, residential developers and the business community. This spirit of community improvement has developed the physical and organizational foundation that will be needed to create the first class park system this community deserves.

City of Napa residents clearly value the many benefits provided by parks and recreation. The community recognizes that parks and open space add to the quality of life and are essential components of a livable city. Parks and recreation also contribute to health and wellness, build stronger families and reduce social service and justice costs. Having places to recreate and enjoy nature and the outdoors is becoming increasingly important to residents of all ages.

The Napa of today is both similar to and different from the Napa of just a few years ago. The world-famous climate continues to shine on the area, as the Napa River winds its way through town. However, the steady progress of the Napa River Flood Project to manage annual flooding hazards has encouraged a wave of downtown development.
This activity is transforming Napa from a sleepy southern entrance to the Napa Valley to a destination in its own right, with attractive downtown restaurants, a flourishing public market and a diverse community that exemplifies the unique facets of California life.

Furthermore, the Napa valley is becoming increasingly connected. What was once a rural valley comprised of stand-alone towns is growing into an integrated region. Napa’s existing park system is strong, but needs enhancements to provide residents with the recreational opportunities that they desire and support for the ongoing resurgence of the local economy. This plan provides the guidance for Napa to improve its existing park system while maintaining a uniquely Napa flavor, one that supports a citizenry who enjoy a rich life in one of the best places on earth.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan is to inventory the existing park and recreation system, analyze community needs, identify strategies and develop the decision making tools that will guide the development of the park system. This master plan is based on changing trends in recreation, new patterns for recreation participation and the new realities of intensified development in the city. The plan updates the park classification system, recommends general locations for the development of future parks and connections to local trails and establishes guidelines for park planning and development. In addition, it also recommends improvements to existing facilities, introduces system-wide policies to improve the provision of recreation services and parks and describes a financing strategy to implement priority recommendations.

In short, the Plan provides the City of Napa with a road map to meet to the recreational needs of local residents through facility and amenity development that support a variety of activities and programs. The Plan provides strategic guidance and recommendations for how to develop an interconnected and accessible park system for all citizens to enjoy, emphasizing collaboration whenever possible to develop related facilities such as connections to trails that serve to connect residents to local and regional recreational resources.

This plan builds on, acknowledges and reinforces the work and recommendations of other community planning efforts, particularly the City of Napa General Plan (Envision Napa 2020), which sets the policy
direction for parks and recreation as well as trails and bikeways. Other planning efforts that directly impacted this effort include the Napa River Parkway Master Plan, and the City of Napa ADA Parks Assessment and Self Evaluation and Transition Plan.

The plan will assist with ongoing coordination between the City of Napa Parks and Recreation Services Department and other local agencies, including:

- The Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District;
- The County of Napa;
- The Napa County Flood Control District;
- The Napa County League of Governments; and
- The Napa Valley Unified School District.

The coordinated efforts of these organizations will help the community to maximize the benefits of major public investments.

COMMUNITY AND GEOGRAPHY

The City of Napa is located in the southern portion of the Napa “Valley”, approximately 50 miles northeast of San Francisco and 60 miles southwest of Sacramento. Overall, Napa is a region known for diverse soils, microclimates and wine grape production.

The Coast Range north of the San Francisco Bay consists of a series of northwest trending valleys separated by mountains of moderate relief, a topography that has resulted from the convergence and movement of tectonic plates. The Napa Valley is one of the major valleys of this region, nestled between the Mayacamas Mountains to the west and the Howell Mountains to the east.

The city of Napa spans 18 square miles of the valley floor. The climate of Napa County ranges from cool coastal areas to hot and dry inland areas. The city of Napa generally experiences cool, wet winters and warm, dry summers. Average annual precipitation in Napa is approximately 25 inches, and the city experiences an average of 64 days of measurable precipitation annually.

NATURAL SYSTEMS AND BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Napa Valley rests at the convergence of three California ecoregions: the north coast, the central valley and the central coast. This unique
The City of Napa is the county seat and the largest city in Napa County, and the most populous and urbanized community in the Valley. Approximately 76,000 people live in Napa, comprising roughly 57% of the County’s population. According to statistics cited by the City, the City of Napa’s population grew by 4.4% from 2000 to 2006, compared to the County’s overall 7.7% rate of growth cited during that same time period. Census figures from the 2006 American Community Survey indicate that over 85% of Napa residents are white and roughly 36% identify themselves as Hispanic or Latino, irrespective of race.

In general, Napa residents are slightly younger and less affluent than County residents overall. Renters also make up a greater percentage of the population in the City of Napa (39%) than in the County (34%).

The Valley has earned a reputation as one of the premier wine regions in the world, and the City of Napa plays a central role in supporting this vibrant economy. By the beginning of the 20th century, Napa had become
the primary business and economic center for the Napa Valley. As agricultural and wine grape production developed north of the city, banking, commercial and retail activity, and light industry emerged within the city itself. Due to the city’s location, Napa has historically served as the southern gateway to the Napa Valley and the historic shipping center for the import and export of goods. Napa business services continue to support the County as a whole, and the city remains an important gateway to the Valley.

PLANNING PROCESS
The development and implementation of the Plan involved four phases, which are summarized below:

PHASE I: WHERE ARE WE NOW?
Phase I included an inventory of existing parks and recreation facilities, a review of previously completed planning studies, a brief demographic profile and park standards research. This phase also included introductory workshops with park staff and the Parks and Recreation Commission to identify key issues for the Plan.

PHASE II: WHERE DO WE WANT TO BE?
Phase II involved significant outreach to the community through a series of public involvement efforts, including a community questionnaire administered on the web and on paper, a statistically valid telephone survey, a community intercept event at the Napa Gift ‘n’ Thyme Holiday Faire, eight focus group meetings with a wide-range of park users and enthusiasts, three community workshops and meetings with the Parks and Recreation Commission. Through these forums, community members identified major park and recreation needs and priorities. This phase resulted in a Community Needs Assessment that combined the public
input and quantitative and qualitative analysis of the park system. This analysis provides the basis of plan recommendations.

**PHASE III: HOW DO WE GET THERE?**

During Phase III, a set of actions and recommendations were developed to help Napa realize its vision for parks and recreation based on the work completed in phases one and two. These recommendations were used as a basis for capital improvement and financing plans, which identify costs and funding sources for proposed parks and recreation projects. The public was invited to comment on plan development during a community workshop.

**PHASE IV: PLAN REFINEMENT AND APPROVAL**

In Phase IV, all products from the Plan development activities were compiled into the Napa Park and Facilities Master Plan, which was presented to staff, Parks and Recreation Commissions members and members of the City Council for review and approval. The final document will guide parks and recreation facilities development in the City of Napa for the next 15 years. Portions of the plan will provide ideas to inform the update of the Parks and Recreation Element of the City’s General Plan. Recommendations integrated into the General Plan will become official policy of the City.

**DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION**

The City of Napa Park and Recreation Facilities Master Plan is presented in eight chapters and an appendix.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Describes the purpose of the report, the planning process and the organization of this document.

**II. BENEFITS OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

Identifies and describes the numerous personal, community and economic and environmental benefits that a strong parks and recreation system provides to its residents.

**III. NAPA’S PARKS AND FACILITIES**

Presents park classifications, existing park and facilities inventory, recreation programming and other Department sponsored activities.
IV. COMMUNITY INPUT
Describes the wide array of community input methods.

V. PARK AND FACILITY NEEDS
Summarizes policies, trends and issues, park and facility needs and program needs identified in the City of Napa.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS
Presents the proposed park system, opportunity areas and recommendations identified for the City of Napa.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION
Provides the decision making tools, funding strategies and potential funding sources that will make the plan achievable.

VIII. CONCLUSION
Wraps up the document summarizing key points to motivate the community toward implementation.

Appendices include the following:

Appendix A: Park and Facility Inventory and Park Profiles
Appendix B: Capital Cost Model
Appendix C: Potential Funding Sources
Appendix D: Reference Maps
II. BENEFITS OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Parks, open spaces and recreational facilities are critical components of healthy and livable communities. They create invaluable opportunities for recreation and socialization, providing green spaces for people of all ages to play, while establishing and strengthening social ties. Parks are an integral part of civic green infrastructure. They support essential city functions in an environmentally sensitive manner while increasing property values, preserving local history and ecologies and bringing important public and environmental health benefits to cities everywhere.

Thought of as a whole, a parks and recreation system is more than an assemblage of grassy spaces, play equipment and recreational facilities. A parks and recreation system is an invaluable tool for promoting healthy and safe communities, as well as for attracting visitors and high quality redevelopment activities. Consequently, a parks and recreation department is a strategic ally to other City departments. Parks and recreation staff tend to be keenly aware of resident preferences, attitudes and recreation trends. These trends often drive the location decisions of the creative class (young artists and professionals that are one of the drivers of economic growth) which often prefers living in cities that provide superb recreational opportunities.

In recent decades, park and recreation agencies have paid greater attention to the many benefits of parks, and have shifted the focus of their marketing and management strategies towards how parks benefit the entire community. This focus represents a shift away from the basic physical features of parks towards a broader view, and was initiated in the mid-1990s by the National Recreation and Park Association.

The following section identifies some of the key personal, community, economic and environmental benefits of parks and recreation in general and in Napa specifically. While other benefits can be tied to these important services, the benefits described here represent the interests and motivations of this community.
PERSONAL

Evidence indicates that access to parks encourages physical activity, increasing health and reducing the risk of many life-threatening conditions. Both the Center for Disease Control and the American Journal of Preventive Medicine have published studies demonstrating that creating spaces for physical activity, or enhancing access to such places, increases the frequency of physical exercise of individuals, as well as the overall percentage of people who exercise regularly (Trust for Public Land 2006).

Many cities in the U.S. are parks-poor. The lack of accessible urban and suburban spaces for physical exercise has contributed to America’s health problems, including the growing rate of obesity and high rates of diseases such as heart disease and diabetes.

Studies have also shown that providing access to parks and the outdoors creates benefits for psychological health. Physical activity is commonly known to relieve symptoms of depression and anxiety. In addition, research indicates that contact with nature and access to open space generally enhances mental well-being.

Parks in Napa provide residents with abundant opportunities for outdoor recreation with over 20 miles of walking trails spread throughout neighborhood parks, at larger open space parks such as Alston and Westwood and along the Napa River.

Facilities such as the Senior Center and the adjoining bocce ball court provide an opportunity for Napa senior residents to participate in a variety of recreational programs. Extending participation in active pursuits into later years is a strong desire of the baby boomer population.

Children’s play areas and picnic areas throughout the park system provide families with places to play, socialize and enjoy the outdoors. Fuller Park has served as a community gathering hub for generations and the large-scale play equipment provides a major attraction for kids and families.
COMMUNITY

Beautiful parks, open spaces, recreation facilities and the programs they support are a source of community pride. Park systems frequently provide needed space for family, neighborhood and community-based activities that support social ties and build important community values.

Parks and recreation facilities along the Napa River, such as the Napa River Trail and Veterans Memorial Park, are two examples of spaces that support recreational and socialization activities while embracing Napa’s unique geography and creating a sense of place.

Accessible spaces for recreation are important for many parents who recognize the role of outdoor play in supporting the physical, behavioral and cognitive development of their children. According to a recent article published by the Greater Good Science Center, it is imperative that adults set an example for children to follow by engaging in outdoor recreation and play in an unstructured environment. Many studies have documented the role that play has in promoting cognitive, physical and behavioral development.

By providing appropriate and engaging recreational opportunities for children and youth, parks and recreation systems can promote healthy and active play as an alternative to crime and delinquency. Parks and recreation systems can create safe spaces and outlets for underserved communities where such alternatives may be otherwise scarce. According to the Trust for Public Land, neighborhood parks and community activities in local parks and community spaces are positively correlated with lower levels of crime.

The City of Napa’s Kennedy Park and Dry Creek Park vary greatly in their scale, and have become focal points for social gathering and a variety of recreational opportunities. Napa families also enjoy gathering along the Napa River and at community facilities such as the Pelusi Center and Las Flores Community Center.

The Napa Skate Park is a popular place for Napa teens to skateboard, spend time in downtown Napa and socialize in a community environment. Many recreational programs and activities in Napa are hosted on Napa Unified School District property and these facilities support a continuum of educational and recreational activities for the entire community.
ECONOMIC

Secure and well-maintained parks and open space areas have positive economic impacts on neighborhoods, and this relationship is well-documented in numerous studies.

The economic value that parks bring to local communities has clear implications for local parks funding. Texas A&M University also reported that in some cases, the additional property taxes generated from the higher value of homes in close proximity to parks were sufficient to pay the annual debt charges on the bonds used to finance the parks’ acquisition and development (Trust for Public Land).

Recreational amenities, including parks and green spaces, have positive effects on commercial property values and are integral to local redevelopment efforts. For many, the availability of accessible open space is a central quality of life issue and one that influences residential and commercial location decision-making. Research suggests that where families choose to live, businesses will follow. Clearly, parks and open spaces are a central ingredient in local economic development and this case is no more clearly made than in Napa.

The Napa Parks and Recreation Services Department maintains a number of small but significant parcels in the downtown area. These civic spaces serve as a vital amenity to all who use downtown, for business or pleasure. Public space in the downtown area creates linkages between the variety of private spaces and is valued by all who visit the area, be it for a place to sit and enjoy the day, eat lunch or take in an event such as a concert or a speaker.

Parks, open spaces and recreational facilities also support local and regional tourism. Parks such as Veterans Memorial Park or Kennedy Park, act as a major year-round attraction as they are home to significant natural and historical features and support organized events such as art and cultural festivals, theatrical performances and athletic events. These events often attract visitors to the surrounding area, generating economic activity that is circulated within the community.
ENVIRONMENTAL

Open space and park lands can provide multiple environmental benefits for local communities. Parks help preserve ecologically and historically significant natural resources, in part through the preservation of wildlife habitat. Parks can also help to protect significant historic features of the natural landscape, such as landmark trees or notable geologic or topographic features. The Connolly Ranch is one notable example of how the Parks and Recreation Services Department, in coordination with other agencies such as the Land Trust of Napa County, provides residents with opportunities to connect to Napa’s agricultural heritage and lifestyle.

Parks with healthy tree canopies can also help to improve local air quality and reduce the warming effect of local heat islands by capturing carbon dioxide and other polluting gases. On a broader level, ensuring the distribution of accessible neighborhood parks and nearby open spaces can encourage walking and biking to these community resources and reduce travel time and vehicle miles traveled to more distant recreation areas.

Parks can also play an essential role in protecting water and air quality. Parks and open spaces can be managed to help protect streams, rivers and lakes located adjacent to or on park lands. Green spaces help filter and reduce storm water run-off from more developed areas. Such efforts protect water quality for human use as well as for plants and wildlife, and there is no greater example of this than the Napa River Project. Additionally, Trancas crossing, Oxbow Preserve and the potential parkland development at the South Jefferson property provide Napa residents with the opportunity to enjoy access to natural habitat and observe local Napa’s unique environmental features.

The construction or renovation of parks facilities represents opportunities to integrate resource efficient, low-impact design practices into the future parks system. Many of these best or promising practices and strategies are aligned with existing community sustainability goals. By working to build an interconnected network of green corridors and open spaces, parks planners can help repair and restore ecosystems rather than detract from them (Byler 2008). A well-connected parks system can create important transit alternatives for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as support wildlife movement essential to the life cycles of some species.
III. NAPA’S PARKS AND FACILITIES

The City of Napa Park and Recreation Services Department provides residents with access to more than 800 acres of park land, including opportunities for both active and passive recreation. The City’s park system consists of a variety of recreation attractions, such as parks, open space, playgrounds, sport fields, a golf course, the Napa River and miles of natural and paved trails for walking, biking and hiking. In addition to parkland resources, the Park and Recreation staff maintains over 21 acres of landscaped areas throughout the city.

The Parks and Recreation Services Department provides a variety of recreation programs for both youth and adults including sports leagues and instruction, aquatics, day camps and after-school programs and a variety of recreational classes.

In addition, the Department is responsible for operations and maintenance of a wide array of parks and recreational areas that includes trails, public facilities and urban forestry. Department staff are responsible for parks and facilities rentals and assisting the Parks & Recreation Advisory Commission, Senior Center Advisory Commission, and the Tree Advisory Commission.

This chapter describes current resources managed by the Department, including existing City parks, recreation facilities and programs that serve City residents. It includes a description of the park classification system used to categorize and analyze specific park sites. It provides a summary of City-owned parks and facilities.

EXISTING PARK LAND

An ideal park system is composed of different types of parks, each offering unique recreation opportunities. Separately, each type of park may serve only one function, but collectively the park system will serve the entire range of community needs.

By classifying parks according to function, the City of Napa can provide a more efficient, cost effective and usable park system that minimizes conflicts between park users and neighbors.
Since the development of the 1992 Parks and Recreation Master Plan, Napa has continued to develop its park system and to seek innovative ways to meet community recreation needs. The following classification system is used in this plan to capture the variety of existing park types, provide strategic direction for future park planning, and reflect the community’s vision for the City. Throughout the analysis and recommendations of this plan park sites are classified as one of the following park types:

- Mini Parks;
- Civic Spaces;
- Neighborhood Parks;
- Community Parks;
- Natural Areas and Open Space; or
- Special Use Areas.

A map illustrating the location of these existing City parks by category is presented on the following page. Appendix A includes a detailed inventory of City parks and facilities, public schools and City-owned recreation buildings.
INSERT MAP 1: EXISTING PARK SYSTEM
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EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE

The existing Level of Service (LOS) for park land is a measure of the current amount of park acreage available to serve City residents. LOS is expressed as a ratio of acres per population. By calculating a level of service, the amount of park land provided in Napa can be compared to the amount provided by similar jurisdictions. In this manner, the City can determine whether their level of service is above or below the norm.

Based on a 2008 estimated population of 77,106 residents and a total City inventory of 820.5 acres of park land, the Park and Recreation Services Department provides over ten acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

As indicated in Table 3.1, the most dominant park type provided by the Department is the neighborhood park, in terms of numbers of sites. However, in terms of acreage, the highest level of service is provided for natural areas and open space (4.23 acres per 1,000 residents), followed by community parks (3.03 acres per 1,000). Table 3.1 summarizes acreage within the park land inventory by park category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks</th>
<th># of Sites</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Existing LOS (Acres per 1,000 residents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINI PARKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Parks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY PARKS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>233.7</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas and Open Space</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>325.8</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Areas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>178.1</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>820.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Existing level of service (LOS) is based on the 2008 population estimate of 77,106 residents living within the planning area.
PARK LAND BY CATEGORY

**Mini Parks**

Mini parks are small parks that serve residents in immediately adjacent neighborhoods. Mini parks provide basic recreation amenities, such as playgrounds, benches and landscaping. Mini parks generally are ½ to 2 acres in size and have a limited service area due to the minimal facilities provided.

The Parks and Recreation Services Department currently provides 10 mini parks such as Beckworth and Montclaire that comprise a total of 2.6 acres. These sites provide an existing level of service of .03 acres/1,000 residents.

**Civic Spaces**

Civic Spaces include small landscaped spaces and gathering areas. Typically smaller than one acre in size and easily traversed on foot, civic spaces provide social space—often supported by amenities such as benches, tables, landscaping, public art, water features or other amenities to support community events. These spaces are typically located within downtown districts, high density urban areas and transit stations. Civic Spaces can provide for the day-to-day open space needs of nearby residents and employees, as well as shoppers, transit users and people attending community events. They help balance high density development and communicate neighborhood character. These civic spaces serve downtown Napa and other gathering places in the community as a community-wide amenity

The Parks and Recreation Services Department currently provides seven Civic Spaces including Veterans Memorial Park, Dwight Murray Plaza, Opera House Plaza at Napa Creek, First Street Overlook, Coombs Street Plaza and Brown Street Plaza which comprise a total of 2.8 acres. These sites provide an existing level of service of .04 acres/1,000 residents.

**Neighborhood Parks**

Located within walking and bicycling distance of most users, neighborhood parks provide close-to-home recreation opportunities for surrounding neighborhoods. These parks are designed primarily for non-supervised, non-organized recreation activities, supported by facilities
such as playground equipment, outdoor courts, picnic tables, pathways and multi-use open grass areas or small sport fields. Neighborhood parks provide access to recreation for nearby residents, enhance neighborhood identity and preserve open space. These parks generally are two to five acres in size and serve residents within a ¼- to ½-mile distance. As a system, the neighborhood parks contribute to the entire community’s quality of life and to the economic value of nearby properties.

The Parks and Recreation Services Department currently provides 77.5 acres of neighborhood parks at 23 sites. O’Brien Park is a neighborhood attraction with a popular children’s playground and Dry Creek Park is known as a popular weekend picnic location that is well-integrated and accessible to the surrounding area. Together, the 23 sites create an existing level of service of 1.01 acres/1,000 residents.

**Community Parks**

Community parks are larger parks that provide both active and passive recreation opportunities that serve the entire community and often visitors from around the region and beyond. Typically, these sites are designed for active recreation, supported by facilities such as sport fields, outdoor courts, skate parks and recreation centers. Distribution of these facilities around the city allows Parks and Recreation Services to provide these larger and specialized facilities closer to residents. Community parks can accommodate large numbers of people and offer a wider variety of facilities than neighborhood parks, such as disc golf, volleyball, tennis courts, dog parks, group picnic areas and shelters. These parks may also include significant natural areas and trails. For this reason, community parks require more support facilities, such as off-street parking and restrooms. The minimum size of community parks is generally between 15-20 acres.

The City of Napa has four community parks: Century Oaks, Fuller, Kennedy and Las Flores (including multiple parcels for some parks) totaling 233.7 acres. These sites create an existing level of service equal to 3.03 acres/ 1,000 residents.

**Natural Areas and Open Spaces**

Natural areas and open space are permanent, undeveloped spaces which are managed primarily for their natural resource value, and secondarily for recreational use. Natural areas and open space may include wetlands, wildlife habitats, steep hillsides or stream corridors. These parks may
preserve or protect environmentally sensitive areas, such as unique or endangered plant species. By protecting natural habitat and scenic lands these sites benefit residents of Napa and the region. These spaces can provide opportunities for nature-based recreation, such as trail use, bird watching and environmental education. The size and shape of each natural area will vary depending on the resource it protects.

The City of Napa provides 325.8 acres of natural areas and open space at five sites: Alston, Westwood Hills, Timberhill, Trancas Crossing and Oxbow Preserve. Together, these provide an existing level of service of 4.23 acres/1,000 residents.

**Special Use Areas**

Special use facilities include stand-alone recreation facilities not located within larger parks. These can include single-purpose sites, such as golf courses, community centers, aquatic centers, sports complexes, boat ramps, and historic areas or skate parks. Since special use areas vary widely in function, there are no minimum sizes, but special use areas must be large enough to accommodate the intended use. Support facilities such as parking and restrooms are often included. Special use areas and the facilities they contain typically serve the entire city.

Currently, the Park and Recreation Services Department has eight special use areas including the Napa Senior Center site, Garfield Park, the Napa Golf Course at Kennedy Park, Pelusi Recreation Center, the Napa Skate Park, Main Street Landing, Kiwanis Park and Riverside Park which provide an additional 178.1 acres of special use land, resulting in an existing level of service of 2.31 acres/1,000 residents.

**COMMUNITY RECREATION FACILITIES**

In order to provide a variety of opportunities for sports, relaxing, socializing and play, a variety of recreational facilities are provided within Napa. This section breaks down these facilities into categories and presents the current status of the park system. A complete inventory of facilities by site is provided in Appendix B.
OUTDOOR SPORT FACILITIES

Diamond Fields

Baseball and softball, along with a number of casual games (e.g. kickball) are played on diamond shaped fields. Baseball fields must have a backstop and dugouts or player benches, and may have a grass infield. Outfield and baseline dimensions vary according to the intended age group and league. An outfield fence, although desirable, is not required. Fields must be level without holes. Softball fields must have a backstop, skinned infield, and dugouts or player benches. As with baseball fields, outfield and baseline dimensions vary with intended use. An outfield fence is not required, but fields must be level without holes or mounds.

Currently, the City of Napa and the Napa Valley Unified School District together provide 9 junior baseball fields (used by ages 12 and under) and 4 senior baseball fields. For softball, the City and School District together provide 5 junior sized fields and 8 senior fields. A citywide total of 26 formal diamond shaped fields translates into an existing level of service of 1 field / 2,966 residents.

In addition to formal fields, many parks and school sites have multi-purpose backstops that can be used for practice youth play (particularly T-Ball) and casual games. These fields are not maintained for competitive play and do not have dirt infields or fencing. However, many do feature a backstop and support informal and drop-in sports activities.

Currently, the City of Napa provide 9 multi-purpose fields at neighborhood parks. Schools provide 45 fields for a citywide total of 54 fields, translating into an existing level of service of 1 field /1,428 residents.

Rectangular Fields

Many types of activities can be played on a turf field of approximately 130 yards by 80 yards. Soccer field dimensions vary in dimension according to the intended age group. However, in order to support regulation play, a soccer field must be at least 50 yards x 80 yards for youth and 60-75 yards x 110-120 yards for adults. One full size field is often split for use by two or more youth teams for practices and games. Portable goals are generally used. Fields must be level without holes or mounds. Usually, a standard soccer field is large enough to accommodate football and lacrosse play. In most cases, football fields are designed to support soccer play as well.
Removable uprights facilitate flexible use of fields. Lacrosse is played on fields 110 yards long typically with portable goals.

Currently, the Park and Recreation Services Department provides no formal rectangular fields. Public schools provide 34 soccer fields in the planning area. This creates an existing citywide level of service of 1 field/2,268 residents. Additional fields are provided at private schools and other facilities but are not generally available for public use.

**Basketball Courts**

Outdoor basketball courts may be half court or full court and are generally used for informal pickup games. Basketball courts are frequently constructed in pairs at larger parks and schools. Courts must include regulation hoops and lines. The playing area should be covered with asphalt or some other hard surface. No major cracks or irregularities should exist.

The Department has seven half and five full outdoor courts. In addition, there are 37 outdoor basketball courts provided at public middle and high schools (basketball courts are also located at elementary schools throughout Napa but an exact count was not available). This translates into an existing level of service of 1 court/1,695 residents.

**Golf courses**

Golf courses may either consist of nine or 18 holes. Golf courses generally include support facilities, such as clubhouses, equipment storage, parking and cart paths.

The City has one 18-hole golf course at Kennedy Park, providing an existing level of service of 1 course/77,106 residents.

**Skateboarding/BMX**

The City of Napa currently provides one centralized skate park facility, located on Napa Sanitation District property in downtown. In addition to skateboarding, this facility allows street-style BMX biking as well. This facility will have to be relocated to allow for construction of replacement parking that will be removed by the Napa River bypass project within the next 5 years. Smaller “Skate Spots” are located at Fairview, Sunrise Meadows and Vinehill parks. A BMX track is located at Kennedy Park; the facility is operated in partnership with North Bay BMX, a volunteer-based organization.
**Tennis Courts**

Tennis courts are generally constructed in pairs or groupings of four or more. Courts must have adequate fencing, a net and a color-coated surface. No major cracks or surface irregularities should exist. Tennis courts are usually located at larger parks, such as community parks, or at high and middle schools.

The City of Napa’s two tennis courts are located at Las Flores Park. Schools, including Napa Valley College, contribute 40 tennis courts to this inventory, which raises the citywide total to 42. This translates into an existing level of service of 1 tennis court/1,752 residents.

**INDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES**

**Gymnasiums**

Gymnasium dimensions vary according to intended use, but in order to accommodate regulation basketball, gyms should be 84 feet in length by 50 feet in width. The playing surface should consist of resilient flooring materials. Gymnasiums may be located in free-standing facilities, but more often are located within community centers or school facilities. Gym space is typically counted by the number of full court, or equivalent, spaces in the facility.

The City of Napa’s only gymnasium space is offered at the Las Flores Community Center. This space is not big enough for full-court basketball play but is used for many other purposes. All other gymnasiums in Napa are provided by public schools, private schools, or private providers such as the Boys and Girls Club. For inventory purposes only full-size public school gyms were counted, based on their level of public access. In addition to the full size gyms noted in the inventory, there are several multi-purpose spaces, particularly in elementary schools, that are not included due to their limited usefulness for sports. There are 10 existing courts in gyms within Napa, which translates into an existing level of service of 1 gymnasium/7,711 residents.

**Small Day Care Center (Junior Museum Building)**

This small building in Fuller Park is currently used by Headstart for child care programming.
Las Flores Community Center

The 8,000 square ft. building is located in north Napa and includes a 5,000 sq. ft gym and multi-purpose room as well as one classroom, a kitchen, office and restrooms. More than 40 programs are offered at the center, with childcare/preschool and volleyball two of the more popular programs.

Pelusi Recreation Center

The 1,600 ft. facility is located adjacent to Kennedy Park and features a large meeting or event space, kitchenette and restrooms. The building supports recreational programming and can be rented to private or non-profit groups for meetings, receptions, parties or other activities.

Napa Senior Center

The 7,300 sq. ft. Senior Center houses a variety of senior activities and provides meeting space for numerous Napa social and activity groups. The site also includes a covered bocce complex that is very popular. The 1,600 Sq. Ft. Senior Center Annex, adjacent to the Senior Center, is used for recreational and senior programs. Two small houses are also included in the site. The Senior Center can be rented for private or non-profit groups for meeting and other activities.

AQUATICS

There are five School District owned pools in the City of Napa at the following locations:
- Napa High School
- Vintage High School
- Harvest Middle School
- Redwood Middle School
- Silverado Middle School

One additional pool is owned and operated by the Napa Valley College.

The School District pools are outdoor tanks that provide opportunities for lap swimming, swimming lessons, water polo and competitive swimming. During the school year these pools are only available for school use. During the summer months the City of Napa has been operating several School District pools for public use. Current budgetary constraints may further limit public access to these pools, even during the summer months. Napa Valley College operates an outdoor pool that is used for college programs and by a local swim club.
OUTDOOR FACILITIES AND PARK AMENITIES

**Playgrounds**
Playgrounds may be developed in all shapes and sizes and may contain multiple design components. Children’s play areas may be designed to serve multiple age groups to provide play opportunities for as many children as possible. Industry standards divide play equipment into two major categories by age: 2-5 and 6-12. Playgrounds can include a wide variety of play experiences that do not involve traditional structures. Facilities can incorporate thematic areas with interpretive and educational elements as well as natural play areas that provide creative play and exploration. Playgrounds can be constructed using a variety of materials, but must include impact-attenuating surfacing and a sufficient barrier to separate preschool and school age areas and keep children safe from traffic and conflicting uses.

The City maintains 31 playgrounds throughout the park system. In addition, there are 13 playgrounds at local schools. In all, there are 44 play areas in the City, which translates into an existing level of service of 1 playground/1,752 residents.

**Community Gardens**
Community gardens provide space for gardening and related activities. The existing partnership at Connolly Ranch is one type of community garden program that can be supported in part by the Parks and Recreation Services Department.

**Dog Parks**
Dog parks can be separated in off-leash areas where dogs can run free or areas in parks where dogs are allowed to be on leash. Napa’s off-leash dog areas are in Alston and Shurtleff Parks. Facilities specifically intended for dogs to be exercised and socialized off-leash also provide important benefits to dog owners. Communities often form around regular visitors who are often the best advocates for the upkeep of these facilities.

**Outdoor Amphitheatres**
Outdoor amphitheatres and performance spaces provide a location for a variety of programming opportunities and can be located in many types of...
Group Picnic Sites

Group picnic sites often include benches, barbecue grills and shade structures. Existing reservable Picnic Sites are located in Fuller and Kennedy Park and can accommodate groups of 25 or more. These facilities are complimented by the existing array of facilities at community parks including restrooms and parking. Many existing Napa parks have individual or small groups of tables that support neighborhood picnic activities but are not developed to accommodate larger community or group events.

River Access

The Napa River is the defining feature for the City of Napa and residents enjoy views of the river and the opportunity to access it for a variety of recreational activities including boating and birding. In 2005, the City of Napa completed a River Parkway Master Plan that identifies a series of existing and desired access points of several types from overlooks to boat ramps as well as desired location for parking and restroom facilities. Two formal access points are located at Kennedy Park and at the future Main Street Landing boat dock. The Downtown map of the Napa River Parkway Master Plan, indicating the locations of proposed facilities is included in Appendix D.

Other Amenities

There are many other types of recreation facilities that are integral components of the recreation and park system. These include support amenities, such as parking, restrooms, drinking fountains, bike racks, benches, trash receptacles and internal pathways within a park that make facilities accessible. Additional facilities can also be provided on a small or large-scale to provide active or passive recreation opportunities; to provide unique recreation experiences; to support special events and large group gatherings; to promote health and fitness; to foster opportunities for outdoor play and interaction within a natural environment; or to facilitate year-round recreation.
TRAILS

Trails can be soft-surfaced or hard-surfaced. Examples of soft surfaces include soil, crushed rock and wood chips. Hardened surfaces include asphalt (permeable or impermeable); concrete; crushed rock or soil stabilized with resin products or cement; open or solid masonry; and boardwalks. Most soft surfaces do not provide accessibility for people with disabilities, but these trails are preferable for some recreation activities, such as running. Most hardened surfaces are accessible, with the exception of some masonry surfaces. Hard-surfaced, multi-use pathway designs may incorporate adjacent soft-surfaced paths for running or equestrian use.

At the present time, the City of Napa continues to develop the Napa River Trail, which extends along both sides of the Napa River. There are also a number of other shorter trails in various locations throughout the city and there are a number of perimeter walking trails at neighborhood parks. In addition, Alston Park has five miles of trails and Westwood Hills offers seven miles of hiking trails. All together, Napa Parks provide residents with nearly 20 miles of trails. Other important resources are the River to Ridge Trail and the San Francisco Bay Trail connection that passes through the city.

Trails provide facilities for popular recreation activities and also overlap with the city’s transportation system. Trails and bikeways have been planned for as part of the City of Napa General Plan and ongoing efforts exist to develop and improve these pathways in Napa to enhance recreation and transportation options for cyclists and pedestrians. The official planned trail and bikeway routes are a part of the General Plan. The current versions of each of the trail and bikeway maps are provided in Appendix D for reference.
OTHER FACILITY PROVIDERS

There are several other agencies and organizations that make a significant contribution to the number of recreation facilities in Napa. These are noted briefly below. Due to the close shared-use arrangement, School District facilities are included in the inventory and used in calculating the existing level of service for these facilities.

NAPA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

There are 20 school sites within the city limits of Napa that are part of the Napa Valley Unified School District. These sites provide a significant portion of the sports fields, gymnasiums and aquatic facilities for Napa residents. There are five School District owned pools in the city of Napa and new synthetic turf fields located at middle and high schools in the city. School sites, particularly elementary schools also provide neighborhoods places to play and gather outside of school hours.

NAPA VALLEY COLLEGE

The Napa Valley College campus is adjacent to John F. Kennedy Park and features a number of recreational resources including 2 softball/ baseball fields, 1 asphalt practice field, 1 track, 2 regulation soccer fields, 8 lit tennis courts and a swimming pool.

NAPA BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB

The Napa Valley Boys and Girls Club offers a variety of after school programs at six Napa Valley Unified School District sites and also provides youth recreational opportunities at the Napa Boys and Girls Club facility which includes a gymnasium, tech center, teen center and art room.
IV. COMMUNITY INPUT

The City of Napa Parks and Facilities Master Plan process was informed by a variety of public involvement activities that generated input from Napa residents of all age groups and from all across town. The activities served to generate usable information that affirms Napa residents’ enthusiasm for their community and a number of tangible concepts for improving the park system. The direction of this plan is directly informed by the input provided by Napa residents.

METHODOLOGY

To develop a solid foundation for the Park and Facilities Master Plan, the analysis and recommendations are based on the input of the community. Public involvement activities were designed to ensure the participation of a diverse cross-section of the city’s population. By providing multiple chances and ways for citizens to engage, the results reflect a balance of strong quantitative data and rich qualitative detail. In total, nearly 2,000 Napa residents have participated in the planning process, along with information from 10 organized sport leagues representing thousands more park users. These activities took place from September 2008 through April 2009, and included a wide variety of opportunities in which to participate that are described in the following section.

The activities were designed to provide Napa residents of all types with a voice in the planning process. The collected information has been reviewed for common themes. Using these key themes to guide the plan tempers the influence of individuals or interest groups and produces a direction that represents the largest group of Napa residents.

INPUT OPPORTUNITIES

PROJECT WEBSITE

A project website, www.napaparksmasterplan.org was established in the fall of 2008 to serve as the online home for the planning process. In addition to general information about why the community has been engaged in planning for parks and recreation facilities, the site also served as a project information clearinghouse. Interim planning documents, such as the analysis summary memos, were posted to the site for review by the public. Summaries of the other public involvement activities were also
available. The site hosted the online questionnaires and featured an opportunity for users to submit comments and questions for consideration in the planning process. Citizens with an ongoing interest in the project could sign up for updates that would be delivered via email whenever new information was available.

COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS
Three community workshops, held during January 2009 at geographically distributed Napa locations, attracted more than 220 people to learn about the planning process and provide general and specific input about the current park system and ways to improve it. All meeting announcements and workshop materials were translated into Spanish for non-English speaking Napa residents wishing to participate in the workshops. Bilingual staff were at the workshops to provide translation assistance as needed.

TELEPHONE SURVEY
The Napa Parks and Recreation Survey was designed to obtain statistically valid answers to questions about residents’ interest in a wide variety of facilities in the park system as well as potential additions. Two-part questions inquired about the level of unmet need in the community for the same types of opportunities. This survey was managed to collect randomly distributed results. The responses of the 441 residents completing the survey can be considered representative of the entire population of Napa with a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of plus or minus 4.53.

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE
In addition to the Napa Parks and Recreation Survey, a shorter questionnaire was available on the project website from October 15, 2008 to March 15, 2009. It was promoted using a variety of methods including local media coverage and multiple listings in department publications and communications. The questionnaire was available in both English and Spanish. A total of 705 adult questionnaires and 400 youth questionnaires were completed. While the questionnaire is not randomly distributed, the results were consistent with many of the survey findings.

FOCUS GROUPS AND INTERVIEWS
A series of focus groups and individual stakeholder interviews (a total of eight meetings) were held, each targeted towards specific parks and recreation users and related interests. Groups represented during this process
included the business community; conservation, youth, Latino residents; parents, seniors, educators and the Napa Valley Unified School District.

INTERCEPT EVENT

Attendees of the Napa Gift ‘n’ Thyme Holiday Faire in December, 2008 completed 70 intercept questionnaires. This short questionnaire provided an opportunity for residents to share their current park use patterns, needs and priorities as well as engage the project team in conversations and in sharing ideas. Additional surveys were completed by visitors to various Napa recreation facilities during December.

SPORTS GROUP QUESTIONNAIRES

Ten of Napa’s sports leagues responded to a participation questionnaire distributed by the Napa Parks and Recreation Services Department. The questionnaire allowed user groups to provide input on participation trends, field use for practices and games and other scheduling and logistical issues.

KEY FINDINGS BY INPUT TYPE

COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

Specific input was generated at the workshops about recreation programs, additional park types, additional facilities and amenities, potential modifications and improvements to the existing park systems and location ideas for additional parks and facilities. Ideas included:

- Assurance that the skate park is replaced with a permanent facility;
- Address communities that have no parks near homes;
- Add new activities to existing parks;
- Create a centrally located multi-purpose recreation center; and
- Improve connections between parks and neighborhoods.

Many of these suggestions made at these workshops have been refined and are presented as recommendations in the plan.

TELEPHONE SURVEY

Results of the survey indicate unmet needs for places to gather, to host additional programming and to hold special events.

- 60% of households surveyed indicated a need for additional park shelters and picnic areas.
- In the community survey, 39% of households indicated a need for outdoor amphitheatres.
76% of survey respondent households were “Very Supportive” or “Somewhat Supportive” of developing a new indoor recreation center.
Survey respondent households cited a high need for Adult Fitness and Wellness Programs.
26% of respondents indicated that they participate in activities on sports fields and of those, 74% of these are satisfied or have no opinion about available time for playing.

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE
The online questionnaire results were both qualitative and quantitative in nature. Some of the key findings from the online questionnaire include:

- 90% of questionnaire respondents indicated that parks, recreation services and open space are critical or very important to Napa’s quality of life.
- Lack of facilities, not enough to do, and safety were the most commonly cited reasons for seldom or infrequent park usage. Other common responses included the lack of bathroom facilities, quality of playground equipment and playing fields and dog restrictions.
- In response to the question How can Napa’s park system be improved? “Upgrading Existing Parks” was the most popular answer.
- Nearly 70% of questionnaire respondents reported that they participate in recreational program offerings provided by the City of Napa.
- Environmental/ nature-based programming and special events were the most popular responses to the questions about ideas for additional recreation programs.
- Questionnaire results also indicated support for additional programming for Napa youth and seniors.
- Questionnaire respondents indicated an interest in additional Aquatics programming.

FOCUS GROUPS AND STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS
Focus groups and stakeholder interviews were conducted early in the planning process to identify potential issues and opportunities that may be identified during the park plan. Many of the concepts discussed at these meetings were heard throughout the planning process. Key findings include:
• Downtown Napa is a very popular location for Napa teens. Many teens also expressed an interest and preference for having a space to gather in downtown.

• Partnerships with local service providers and agencies were identified as strategic opportunities, specifically:
  ▪ Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District
  ▪ Queen of the Valley Hospital
  ▪ Upward Bound youth group
  ▪ Existing neighborhood groups and organizations

• Existing parks can be improved with the development of additional facilities, including:
  ▪ Bike racks
  ▪ Aquatic features like splash and spray parks
  ▪ Community gardens
  ▪ Art
  ▪ Additional picnic areas (especially reservable)
  ▪ Culturally specific picnic areas, such as pig roast area.

• Other programming suggestions included:
  ▪ Coordinated recreation program to support existing gang prevention programs.
  ▪ Recreation programming for Spanish-speaking seniors.
  ▪ Concurrent recreation programming for mothers (including Spanish-speakers) and children that will allow mothers the opportunity to participate in a class while their child is in another class in the same building.

**INTERCEPT EVENT**

The intercept event was conducted early in the planning process at a traditional Napa event, the Gift ‘n’ Thyme Holiday Faire. Findings from the event include:

• The vast majority of survey respondents were long-time Napa residents who were either born and raised in Napa or have lived in Napa for over 10 years.

• Most respondents were regular Napa Park users, using Napa Parks a couple of times a week to a couple of times a month. Very few respondents either use Napa Parks daily or never use Napa Parks.
Napa residents use Napa Parks for a variety of reasons and desire additional active recreational amenities and programs. Sports courts, amenities and programs were the most often cited park elements and programs that people would like to see more of. Several residents expressed concern about current sports field quality and maintenance.

Additional amenities and programs suggested by respondents included:

- Mini Golf Course
- Disc Golf Course
- Community Gardens
- Biking and skating classes
- Martial Arts classes.

**SPORTS GROUP QUESTIONNAIRES**

The key information provided by the sports group questionnaire was the quantified information about current field use. The number of teams and details of practice and game schedules allowed for the supply and demand analysis in the recreation needs assessment. In addition, general comments were gathered about the condition of fields and issues specific to the particular sport. Comments included:

- Concern about the reliance on school district fields for most community sports groups
- Fields at school sites require more maintenance, additional mowing, etc.

**OVERALL FINDINGS**

The overall findings have been identified and compiled through the variety of public involvement methods described above and represent the common themes heard from the community as a whole.

**STRONG SUPPORT FOR NAPA PARKS**

Napa residents are passionate about their park system and greatly value the recreational and community-building opportunities that the current park system provides. According to residents, the park system embraces Napa’s unique climate and location, building a sense of place and identity that residents and visitors alike can enjoy. In particular, residents appreciate the existing access to open space opportunities and are largely supportive of the Parks and Recreation Services Department because they
believe that parks help make Napa a more desirable place to live, preserve open space and the environment and may help reduce crime.

**PARKS SHOULD BE A SHOWPLACE FOR SUSTAINABILITY**

Parks are an opportunity to showcase resource conservation and low-impact development methods. All aspects of park development and maintenance, from landscaping to facilities, are opportunities for showcasing the environmentally-friendly practices that Napa residents value.

**INCREASE LOCAL ACCESS**

Increasing local access to park and recreation facilities was a recurring theme during the public involvement process. This can take many forms, including the development of additional parkland or the development and improvement of non-vehicular access to parks and community facilities.

**PROVIDE A VARIETY OF RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES**

Residents would like a mix of recreational opportunities, including trail walking, bird watching and places for sports such as soccer, lacrosse and bocce ball. This variety of recreational opportunities reflects the diverse ages and cultures of Napa residents.

**IMPROVE IMAGE, IDENTITY AND AWARENESS**

Many existing Napa parks are in need of additional features and an improved amenity mix to supplement the existing parkland inventory. Increasing safety and park cleanliness were themes commonly heard throughout the process. Parks such as Kennedy and Fuller are highly used, in part because these are the only parks that some residents are familiar with. Improved image identity and advertising of the overall system could increase awareness and usage.

**MAINTAIN AND BUILD NEW PARTNERSHIPS**

Residents indicated that the future success of the Parks and Recreation Services Department’s ability to continue providing excellent recreational opportunities for residents will depend, to some extent, on maintaining and expanding existing institutional partnerships, such as those with the Napa Valley Unified School District.

**EXPAND AND IMPROVE PARK AMENITY MIX**

A common theme across all of the public involvement activities was a desire for an improved and increased mix of amenities in existing parks.
Given Napa’s climate, shade structures and water features are elements that were frequently suggested. Other additional amenities suggested included restrooms, benches, trees and art installations.

Table 4.1 summarizes the total participation in the activities described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshops</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Survey</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Questionnaire</td>
<td>705 adult, 400 youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Group Questionnaires</td>
<td>10 leagues(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept Surveys</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,853</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the large number of participants, representing a broad swath of Napa residents, the key community input findings form a strong foundation for analysis of the park system and recommendations to improve parks and facilities.

\(^1\) The total number of participants in the 10 leagues was reported at approximately 5,000 youth and adults.
V. PARK AND FACILITY NEEDS

Napa’s park system, including the variety of park sites as well and the many recreation facilities, provides a wide range of benefits to the community. However, as the community has grown parks have not always been evenly distributed in new neighborhoods. Also, changes in the ways that residents recreate have created demand for new and different recreation facilities. These are the most prominent two factors that have resulted in unmet needs in the community. This chapter identifies the community-wide needs for park land and facilities using a multi-faceted approach that combines quantitative analysis, comparisons to similar communities and the input from the Napa community about the activities residents would most like to see. It is important to note that not all of these needs will be met by the City of Napa. Some needs will be addressed by community partners, other agencies and private facilities. Other projects will be set aside in favor of higher priorities.

PARK LAND

Park land is the basic element of a city park system. In order to provide the necessary space for Napa residents to recreate, the park system needs include a variety of types and sizes of park sites spread across the community. The key issue in assessing park land needs is determining the amount of park land that is needed to meet local access goals and provide appropriate space for the recreation activities and facilities needed in the community. This analysis first considers the system-wide needs and then breaks down the discussion by park type.

SYSTEM-WIDE LAND NEEDS

Several factors can be analyzed at the system level to provide a broad look at how adequately the park system is serving Napa. The first analysis compares the park system to four comparable communities, examining the total amount and the mix of park land provided. The second analysis uses Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to examine which parts of the city are within walking distance of a local park.

Level of Service Comparisons

There is no perfect number that defines the size of an ideal park system. The optimum number of acres and the ways those acres are used depend on community goals, as well as community resources. That said, a ratio of park acreage per 1,000 residents is a common measure of level of service.
LOS) and provides a way of comparing “apples to apples” across communities and identifying trends.

Comparisons to other park and recreation agencies in California provides a way to gauge where Napa’s existing level of service (LOS) might be high or low. For this analysis, the park land standards for the cities of Fairfield, San Luis Obispo, Vacaville and Walnut Creek were identified and compared based on their proximity to Napa and similarity in terms of demographics and role as a regional destination.

Table 5.1 shows the level of service for each comparable community by park type. Natural areas and open space is separated due to the larger quantities of open space provided by other communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fairfield</th>
<th>Vacaville</th>
<th>Walnut Creek</th>
<th>San Luis Obispo</th>
<th>Average LOS</th>
<th>City of Napa Current LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini Parks</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Areas</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Park Land</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas and Open Space</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>41.41</td>
<td>60.41</td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Park Land</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate that, with the exception of natural areas and open space, the City of Napa provides a similar or greater amount of park land than comparable agencies. The City of Napa generally provides greater amounts of community park space and lesser amounts of neighborhood park space than comparable agencies.

A limitation of standardized measures such as acres per 1,000 is that this figure examines quantity, but it does not indicate quality or location. A city can have a very high acreage, but if the system has few or poorly maintained resources, it may not be serving the community as well as a smaller system in another city. In addition, a city could have a very high acreage, but uneven distribution of that acreage, resulting in poor service. Napa compares very favorably to the selected communities in terms of...
developed park land. In total Napa provides nearly 25% more developed park acreage (mini, neighborhood, community and special use parks) than the average level of service of these comparable communities. The lower total park land level of service is a result of a lower amount of City-owned natural areas and open spaces compared to these communities. The existing level of service for Napa includes the larger open space areas at Alston Park and Westwood Hills but does not include areas that are held for other purposes, such as the watershed and reservoir lands at Millikan Reservoir and Lake Hennessey. Analysis of the impacts of these lands is included in the open space and natural Area analysis.

**Geographic Analysis**

In an ideal park system, parks should be situated so that facilities and open space are easily accessible to potential users. For this reason, park access is one of several key criteria in establishing an appropriate level of service for the provision of park land. In Napa, the need for park access is based on the assumption that basic park services (a developed park including a play area and a place to enjoy the outdoors) should be provided within walking distance of all city residents. Typical pedestrians are willing to walk between ¼ and ½ mile (5-10 minutes) to reach a park destination. The table below summarizes the distances that pedestrians are willing to travel to parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Distance to Parks:</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal walking distance</td>
<td>¼ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum walking distance</td>
<td>½ mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four factors, transportation modes, barriers, access points and travel distance, were considered in a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) model to determine service area coverage for parks and trail facilities in Napa. The model provides a map of city areas that are within ¼ to ½ mile from existing local parks. A service area is determined for each park based on the standard distance traveled on the street and trail networks from access points to each of these sites. The borders of each service area are modified where interrupted by identified barriers.

The output of the analysis described above is presented in Map 2, Local Park Access Analysis, on page 43. Two shades of purple indicate the areas within ¼ and ½ mile of a local park. While much of the city is covered by
the ½ mile service area, there are a number of residential areas that are not. These residential areas are highlighted as opportunity areas. Further analysis of the barriers within these opportunity areas provides a preliminary count of the number of parks that would be needed to extend park access coverage to all residential portions of Napa. To provide parks within ½ mile of each resident in these opportunity areas would require an additional 17 local sites.

The geographic analysis of each park type will address how these opportunity areas translate into needs for new park land. Additional geographic analysis includes the distribution of facilities across the community and is contained in the discussions of specific facility types later in this chapter. This more nuanced look at what residents have available nearby also influences the walk-ability and satisfaction with the park system.
INSERT MAP 2: LOCAL PARK ACCESS ANALYSIS
LAND NEEDS BY PARK CATEGORY

The need for park land can be broken down by category to analyze the current and future needs for specific types of parks within Napa. The analysis conducted for this plan, and summarized in this chapter, identifies the amount of park land in each category that would need to be added to meet the needs of the community for open spaces and to provide space for the types of recreation facilities to be added to the system.

Mini Parks

New parks will be required to fulfill park access needs, and while mini parks may not be ideal, it is likely that at least one additional mini park will be needed. Mini parks can provide an area with the most basic park resources but are limited in meeting all of a neighborhood’s park needs due to their small size. To provide the best local park access, opportunity areas should be filled in with mini parks only if larger park sites cannot be identified.

It is also important to consider that areas currently providing park access by mini parks may still require additional recreation facilities locally that cannot be accommodated in these very small sites. It is possible that better park service could be provided in some locations at one larger site that replaces or augments two (or more) mini parks.

Parks departments locally and across the country are reconsidering the mini-park with turf because these small spaces can represent a disproportionate maintenance burden on the responsible agency. For this reason, many agencies are looking at ways to redesign these spaces to be more resource efficient and require less maintenance or to not develop them at all. Napa’s mini parks could be a place to experiment with a variety of the native and drought-tolerant plantings that residents expressed interest in seeing more of throughout the park system.

Neighborhood Parks

14 new neighborhood parks are needed to meet the local access goals of this analysis. Assuming new sites average approximately four acres to accommodate the mix of facilities desired; the ultimate need would equal 56 new acres of neighborhood park land. Neighborhood parks are the basic unit of local park access in Napa. The majority of the park opportunity areas are likely to be filled in with neighborhood parks to
close access gaps in the system. Within the opportunity areas identified on Map 2, a potential need for 17 new local park sites was identified. Of these, three are likely to be served by other park types, one of these areas is currently served by private park land, at least one will likely be a mini park and one could potentially be a community park.

There is a strong desire to improve existing parks in Napa, to add facilities to increase the interest in some underused parks and to take the pressure off of some parks that are at or beyond their capacity for use.

The communities compared to Napa during this process had considerably more neighborhood park land per population. In many park systems, neighborhood parks are host to a variety of activities, including formal and informal recreation. In recognizing changing demographics, departments are developing features in parks that provide recreational and educational opportunities for residents of all ages, rather than a focus on playgrounds.

Communities with growth limitations, either physical or political, are looking at ways to intensify the use of existing land, including park land by adding facilities. Napa’s newly updated Housing Element of the General Plan calls for increased housing densities in several areas of the City and calls out the need for parks nearby these denser residential areas. The intensification of park land is not limited to neighborhood parks, as other park types and other public properties are increasingly expected to serve the role of neighborhood parks as well.

Community Parks

The community places a high value on the activities and variety that a community park can offer. To create a more distributed system, rather than adding larger-scale facilities to neighborhood parks that do not have the supporting facilities, two additional community parks should be added. Considering the limited availability of land, these sites are likely to be limited in size. However, based on preliminary review of potential public lands that could be repurposed, 45 acres of total new community park land between two sites is possible.

While community park features can be considered to serve the entire City, encouraging driving alternatives to community park features requires some distribution of these parks across the city. Kennedy Park is the community’s signature facility and provides a wide array of community park features. It is in a geographically separated area of the city that will
require most park users who are looking to picnic or play sports to drive there. With Las Flores in the north, Century Oaks in the west, Fuller in the south and Kennedy Park further south and east of the river, the areas of the city that are most noticeably lacking a convenient community park are central Napa and east of the Napa River.

Community parks are an important part of community identity. Park agencies are finding ways to customize the look, feel and recreation opportunities of the larger parks in their systems to portray important characteristics of their communities.

Napa has a higher level of service for community parks than comparable communities. However, nearly all of this land is concentrated in one site: Kennedy Park. As in Napa, community parks are typically the site of clusters of competitive sport facilities and larger group gathering sites, due to the need for similar support facilities such as parking and restrooms. Gathering these types of facilities makes the best use of maintenance resources and maximizes the investment in these amenities. The draw these facilities have from across communities makes them important destinations for all modes of transportation and can be hubs of connectivity in the public transit and trail systems.

Civic Spaces
Civic spaces are often located on an opportunity basis and connected to planning and development goals of a downtown or similar area. These spaces are important to the experience of Napa’s downtown and should be encouraged when they are created to address specific goals, such as the improvement of the pedestrian environment or providing places for community events.

Napa has considerably more land turned over to civic space than comparable communities. Most of this land has been reclaimed from public rights-of-way in the core of downtown. As downtown development activities continue, an awareness of public support for these spaces and coordination between the various city departments may foster an array of exciting opportunities. Other developing commercial areas may benefit from civic spaces as part of an improved pedestrian environment, particularly where residential and commercial uses mix closely.

Napa residents of all ages value the downtown spaces for casual gathering space and for hosting some of the most popular events in the city. Civic
spaces are recognized as an important visitor amenity as well. The downtown parks offer a unique opportunity to show off the community’s commitment to its history and connection to the Napa River.

As American downtowns continue to enjoy resurgence, the development of captivating and comfortable civic spaces becomes not only an interesting amenity, but a necessity. Current planning efforts such as the Downtown Specific Plan, Soscol Gateway projects and the Napa River Bypass project create opportunities to improve existing spaces and refocus the use of these spaces.

**Special Use Areas**

In some cases the City will not be able to accommodate the needed facilities within existing park sites or the facilities may function best as a stand-alone site. To address the specific land needs of certain facilities, the City should be prepared to add land for special uses to the park system between now and 2030. As a guideline, five additional acres is a reasonable expectation.

Increasingly, special use sites are seen as a fall-back option for locating community facilities, second to placing them in an appropriately scaled park of a different type. Multiple uses on one site reduces the investment necessary in supporting facilities and increases the passive security of having users on-site more often. The unique role of this park classification makes comparisons to other communities less useful. Large special use facilities, such as 18-hole golf courses change the level of service dramatically.

An example of a future special use site would be a stand-alone skate park facility. Currently, no centrally located park has capacity for a full-scale skate park to be added, and the community parks with enough size are not easily accessible without a car. The position of skate parks in many park systems has been shifting from a special-use facility, often isolated from other parks and facilities, to one of a variety of large sport facilities that are included in special use sport complexes or community parks. This recognition of skateboarding as a sport creates a positive environment that can reduce vandalism and other anti-social behavior often associated with isolated skate facilities. Other considerations, such as visibility and accessibility, on foot or by transit, are also critical to the success of skate facilities.
**Natural Areas and Open Spaces**

While some protected natural areas exist within and around the city, and the agricultural reserve protects other scenic views and the character of the area, many residents of Napa do not have many close-to-home opportunities to engage and interact with nature. Natural areas and open spaces are most often located based on opportune sites and the preservation of key natural resources. The results of this type of acquisition in Napa have created a system with the key City-owned natural areas at the south, east and west edges of the city. To maintain the current level of service, the City will need to add 64 acres of natural and open space areas to the inventory by 2030. In addition, natural spaces are needed within parks of other types to increase the local access.

Napa residents are very supportive of the existing array of natural areas and open spaces. The existing lands require additional facilities to support and encourage increased use, including developed trails and trail signage and additional parking and restrooms.

Most of the comparable communities have integrated large amounts of open space into their park systems. As a largely developed and growth constrained community, Napa is in a different situation. In addition to some significant natural lands in the park system, Napa residents enjoy scenic, natural surroundings beyond the city limits. Although not officially a part of the park system, the City owns large reservoir sites outside of the city limits that serve major open space functions in addition to protecting and providing water to residents. Lake Hennessey and the Millikan Reservoir include, between them, nearly 4,600 acres of land. Other agencies, such as the flood control district and the County Regional Park and Open Space District, own and maintain natural areas that are adjacent to (or close by) Napa that expand the access to natural areas for residents. Sites such as the South Napa Wetlands across the Napa River from Kennedy Park increase residents’ access to natural spaces and support important wildlife habitats.
Summary of Park Land Need

Much of Napa’s park land needs are driven by the neighborhood and community parks that will provide local access to residents. The current need (what would be required to meet the level of service (LOS) standard at the current population) is almost entirely neighborhood parks to fill gaps in service. In the future, other park types will also be needed to accommodate larger and special facilities. Table 5.3 summarizes the park land needs by park category.

Table 5.3: Summary of Park Needs by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>LOS Standard</th>
<th>Current Need</th>
<th>Future Need</th>
<th>2030 System Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini Parks</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>133.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>233.7</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>278.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Areas</td>
<td>178.1</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>183.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Parkland</td>
<td>494.7</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>601.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas and Open Space</td>
<td>325.8</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>389.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parkland</td>
<td>820.5</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>171.2</td>
<td>991.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTDOOR SPORT FACILITIES

Providing a place to play in competitive and individual sports is one of the major functions of contemporary park systems. Many sports facilities require a large amount of space in addition to specific development standards and maintenance to ensure safety of the participants and other park users.

The high development cost of sport facilities increases the importance of accurately understanding the actual needs of the community in a way that can be quantified. For major team sports, the Park and Facilities Master Plan utilized a supply and demand model developed around the information gathered from Napa sports groups. The supply and demand analysis provides a broad, system-wide look at the capacity of sport fields and the use by the full range of community groups. On the supply side, the analysis begins with a count of available playing fields, based on the information collected from the City and the Napa School District. The total supply of fields assumes the maximum use of these fields after school hours and including both weekend days. Demand for the use of these fields is determined based on the current number of teams and their practice and game schedules for school, community and city sports leagues. The quantitative analysis is supplemented by the community input and observations of the planning team.

The level of service figures presented include the existing level of service, calculated as the number of residents per facility and a level of service guideline. The guideline has been developed from the number of facilities that are currently needed to meet demand, based on organized play and providing informal use. This measurement can help to evaluate how the community is doing in meeting needs as population changes. This guideline is meant to inform rather than prescribe how many facilities should be provided. A summary of the current and future outdoor sport facility needs is provided in Table 5.4, on the next page.
Table 5.4: Summary of Outdoor Sport Facility Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Existing Facilities</th>
<th>Existing Level of Service</th>
<th>Level of Service Guideline</th>
<th>Current Need</th>
<th>Future Need</th>
<th>Total Facilities 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIAMOND FIELDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Baseball</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1/8,567</td>
<td>1/7,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Baseball</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/19,276</td>
<td>1/25,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Softball</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/19,276</td>
<td>1/7,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Softball</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1/9,638</td>
<td>1/8,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECTANGULAR FIELDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer/Football/Lacrosse</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1/2,268</td>
<td>1/2,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKATE/BMX FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/77,106</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Needs could be met in one or two facilities</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX Dirt Track</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/77,106</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>One facility is adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIAMOND FIELDS**

In order to accurately reflect the usage of diamond fields in Napa, the analysis has been broken down to consider five types of fields that are developed within Napa. These include baseball and softball fields designed specifically for two levels of play, junior (ages 12 and under) and senior (ages 13 and up). The final type of diamond shaped field is the multipurpose backstop used for informal play in many parks and school sites.

**Junior Baseball**

Nine fields are currently developed for junior baseball play in parks and on School District sites. The three City-owned fields at Garfield Park are supplemented by 2 youth fields at each of the three middle schools. These fields provide a total supply of 135 game or practice time slots per week. The total demand for practices and games generated by the 60 teams of the Napa Little League and Napa Babe Ruth/Cal Ripken league is 153 time slots.

This analysis indicates a deficit of 18 time slots (which works out to slightly more than 1 additional field worth of time). The ability of the City to maximize the use of field space is currently constrained by the exclusive use agreement for the fields at Garfield Park, which are only available for organized play through the Napa Little League.
community also needs some capacity available for non-programmed play, such as casual pick-up games. To meet the current needs of junior baseball in Napa, the community is short 2 junior baseball fields. This need is currently being absorbed by practices on less developed fields, reserving developed fields primarily for game play. Input from the community has indicated maintenance issues with School District-owned fields that limit playing time there.

Adding the two needed fields to the existing 9 and dividing by the current population results in a level of service guideline of 1 field per 7,000 residents. By applying this guideline to the projected population the need for additional facilities can be projected. Based on the 2030 population, a total of 13 fields, or four additional facilities, will be needed.

**Senior Baseball**

The City currently provides one stadium field, including lights to extend the hours of play, at Kennedy Park. In addition, the Napa Valley Unified School District has three baseball fields with the longer basepaths, and outfields for play at this level. These four fields provide a total supply of 87 practice and game time slots. Two leagues, the Napa Babe Ruth/Cal Ripkin league and the high school baseball teams together generate a demand for 61 time slots. Napa Valley College also maintains a baseball field with lights but this facility is not generally available for community play.

The supply for field time in senior level baseball exceeds the current demand by 26 time slots per week. The excess supply is equal to the capacity of one field with lights. Casual play on these fields is not typically feasible due to the high maintenance standards and casual use is more common in softball and junior baseball. Therefore, no additional capacity needs to be added for general community use.

Removing one surplus field from the count, not necessarily from the physical inventory, allows a level of service guideline to be derived that reflects the current needs. This guideline equals 1 field per 25,700 residents. Based on this guideline the current inventory of senior baseball fields should be adequate to serve the current and future populations of Napa at current levels of play.
Junior Softball

City has had a larger role in providing softball fields within the community. At the junior softball level, the City owns one field with lights at Kiwanis Park and has assisted in developing four fields at the Napa Valley Language Academy. Two leagues make up the primary users of these fields. Napa Valley Girls Fast Pitch is the exclusive user of the Kiwanis Park field which is set up specifically for fast pitch play. Napa Junior Girls Softball uses the four field complex at Napa Valley Language Academy for their games. The use information for these leagues was estimated based on the experience of Park and Recreation Resources Staff. The five junior softball fields generate a capacity of 82 practice or game time slots per week. The two leagues using them generate a demand of 173 time slots.

Each league far exceeds the capacity of the fields dedicated to them. In total, the excess demand equals 91 time slots, equivalent to 6 additional fields. Casual use in softball is often at the senior level, and there is very little or no impact on these fields resulting from casual play. Much of the excess demand is currently being absorbed in reduced practice schedules and practicing at multi-purpose fields.

Adding six junior softball fields to the existing 5 allows a level of service guideline to be set that reflects the current needs. The level of service guideline based on a current need for 11 fields equals 1 field per 7,000 residents. This guideline applied to the future population indicates a future need for 13 junior softball fields.

Senior Softball

At the senior level, the City of Napa has 2 developed softball fields, each with lights, located at Kennedy Park. The Napa Valley Unified School District also has 5 additional fields at Silverado Middle School, Napa High School and Vintage High School. Napa Valley College also maintains a senior softball field with lights. The total number of time slots available between these 8 fields is 141 practices or games. The three senior level softball leagues (Napa Valley Express Girls Softball, Park and Recreation Services Adult Softball and the Napa Valley School District teams) generate a demand for 143 time slots.

The current demand generated by organized senior softball leagues is roughly equal to the supply. However, softball is a popular casual sport,
particularly amongst adults, and fields can also be used for other casual sports such as kickball. Softball fields are also popular when they are located near group picnic facilities. Tournament softball is very popular and is best supported by groupings of fields in one location. Additional developed fields should be added to the system to support casual play and expand access as population grows.

Adding one additional field to create capacity for unscheduled uses would establish a level of service guideline of 1 senior level softball field per 8,500 residents. Applying this guideline to the future population results in a future need for 3 more fields for a total of 11 senior softball fields.

**Multi-use Backstops**

The final type of diamond field is the multi-use backstop. This type of facility is appropriate to informally used fields and is often placed at the edges of informal rectangular fields to maximize flexibility. These fields can help to support casual play and lower divisions of junior baseball, especially T-ball. With over 40 teams playing T-ball and coach-pitch junior baseball, many of the multi-use backstops available at parks and school sites are used. However, some of these fields also offer the potential for upgrading as the Community considers how to meet the need for more developed types of diamond fields. It is important to maintain informal fields with backstops for casual play but no guideline is proposed for this facility.

**RECTANGULAR FIELDS**

One of the most flexible, but also space consuming facilities within most park systems, a turf field of approximately 130 yards by 80 yards can accommodate many sports and informal uses. The primary organized sports using rectangular fields in Napa include soccer, football and lacrosse. However, these fields can also be used for other games including rugby, Ultimate Frisbee and any number of other sports.

Currently, the Napa Valley Unified School District is the provider of formal rectangular fields. With 29 general purpose fields located at all levels of schools in Napa and five additional new artificial turf fields, the School District supports most of the formal and informal soccer, football, lacrosse and other sports played in the community. The supply of playable field space has limitations based on the entire inventory being located on school property. Further, semi-organized groups have taken up playing on
turf areas within parks that are not developed or maintained for this level of use. While the current supply of fields has the potential to provide 680 practice and game time slots, the condition, public access and level of development of many of these fields should discount this amount.

Seven different leagues are active users of rectangular fields in Napa, representing football, soccer and lacrosse. The leagues that provided data for this analysis include:

- Napa Sport Soccer Club
- Napa Youth Soccer League
- Napa Junior Lacrosse Club
- Napa Parks and Recreation Flag Football
- Napa Saints Youth Football
- Napa Raiders Youth Football
- Napa Valley Unified School District Football
- Napa Valley Unified School District Soccer

The reported use of fields generates a total demand for 729 time slots. In addition, other soccer organizations such as the Napa Valley Soccer Club and Napa Valley Soccer League operate in Napa and the surrounding area, generating additional demand.

The current demand for field space exceeds demand by 49 time slots. This is equal to approximately 2 fields of additional space to meet the current reported demand. Meeting all of the demand for soccer, football, lacrosse and other sports that can use this type of field means more than having enough time slots for organized play. Additional field capacity will be required to support emerging sports and casual use. Five additional fields would free up capacity at the schools and improve playability for all leagues.

Establishing a level of service guideline to account for five more fields would result in one field per 2,000 residents. Applying this guideline to the 2030 population results in a need for a total of 46 fields. This is 12 more than in the current inventory. Recognizing that not all of the current fields in the inventory provide the assumed capacity for play, the needed number of fields represents fully developed fields. In some cases, the capacity of existing fields could be increased through new fields or field upgrades.
SKATEBOARDING AND BMX FACILITIES

Napa needs a community-scale skate park to replace the existing facility that will have to be relocated to allow for replacement of parking removed by the Napa River bypass project. Different styles of skating could be accommodated in one location, or two unique types of parks could be developed in separate locations. In addition, the community could support additional skate spots to provide local opportunities to practice.

The current skate park site offers a central location that is close to downtown. However, in addition to the inevitable demolition, the existing Napa Skate Park is also in need of replacement due to shifts in the prominent styles of skateboarding. The permanent, concrete portion of the skate park is developed as a “snake-run” a type of park that has declined in popularity in recent years in favor of parks that provide plaza or street skating opportunities as well as the highly athletic bowl and ramp designs. The City has adjusted to this by adding modular ramps and features to the existing park. A comprehensive park developed today would typically include a plaza area with street skating elements along with a bowl area. These could be developed on one site or split up into two separate locations. Both types of areas can include a gradient of difficulty to allow younger or less experienced skaters a place to learn.

Replacing this park in the downtown area presents a challenge that may require very creative thinking to overcome the high cost of property. The central location provides easy access for participants that often travel on foot, by skateboard or by bike. If the skate park is moved to a more remote location, such as Kennedy Park, extra consideration should be given to the distribution of other skateboarding opportunities and transportation to the Kennedy Park site.

The one existing BMX dirt track facility is adequate for Napa, however, the size, location and configuration of the facility could be modified based on park space needs.

AQUATICS AND WATER PLAY

The City of Napa and the Napa Valley Unified School District have worked in partnership to provide pool space for students and residents. The School District has recently completed the construction effort on the latest of the new pool facilities funded under the most recent capital measure. With the new pool at Harvest Middle School the School District
now operates five pools. The type of facilities provided for the schools are different than those city agencies are now building, but the new facilities provide important resources to the community.

**SWIMMING POOLS**

Because of the School District facilities, Napa has more pools than a typical community of this size. How well these facilities meet community needs is largely based on the amount of public access. The level of summer access provided by Napa Parks and Recreation Services provides the opportunity for swim lessons and other recreation programming. The number of facilities operated in summer months for these programs will need to be balanced between convenient access and the cost of operating multiple sites. Community swimming teams have also had access to the pool at Napa Valley College for practice and competition, which has met the remaining community needs.

**WATER PLAY**

Additional need for aquatics that is focused on water play is not met by existing facilities. The need for these types of facilities is more local and should be incorporated into a larger number of more distributed sites. Seven spray features or interactive fountains distributed across the community would provide a reasonable level of access for water play.

**OUTDOOR FACILITIES AND PARK AMENITIES**

In addition to the facilities noted previously, several other types of facilities should be provided in the City of Napa to increase the variety of recreation opportunities available to city residents. Specific facility needs are driven by the activities that Napa residents indicated they would most like to see included or expanded in the park system.

**GROUP PICNIC AREAS**

Group picnic areas are the large reservable facilities that support gatherings of 25 or more people. These picnic areas are popular and well-used. However, group picnicking at sites that are not developed to support large gatherings indicates that the existing group picnic areas are not adequate to the needs of Napa residents. Public input findings indicate a desire for improved picnic areas including developed shade structures, wash basins, drinking fountains and restrooms. The development of additional reservable picnic areas will increase availability of picnic areas.
and reduce the pressure on neighborhood sites currently hosting gatherings that are beyond the capacity of the facilities.

**DOG PARKS**

Napa’s off-leash dog areas in Alston and Shurtleff Parks provide more area for exercising and socializing dogs than most communities. Improvements to existing sites could increase their usefulness, by providing separate areas for different sizes of dogs and facilities to make the areas comfortable for owners, but additional dog park sites are not currently needed. However, an off-leash area could be a feature of a future community park.

The public has varying understandings of the rules for on-leash dogs in parks and the public would benefit from educational outreach about current rules.

**COMMUNITY GARDENS**

Napa needs to add community gardens as a feature in selected existing parks or at special use sites as appropriate. A building trend towards adding community garden sites to park systems has accelerated in recent years as food security and quality awareness has increased. As an emerging trend, the need for these facilities is based on community desire to add this as an option to the park system. The appropriate number of sites and size of facilities will need to be explored by a pilot project.

**OUTDOOR PERFORMANCE SPACE/AMPHITHEATRES**

The need for performance spaces should be driven by programming. Spreading events across the park system is a good way to draw people into parks, but until there is an established need for fixed amphitheaters, temporary stages can be used in a variety of park settings. It is important to ensure that parks have adequate supporting facilities prior to the introduction of a performance space designed to draw people from other parts of the city.

**RIVER ACCESS**

Water bodies such as the Napa River present potential trail corridors. These “water trails” can include interpretive materials about the importance of the river and provide appropriate access to sensitive lands.
The Napa River Parkway Master Plan identifies six potential hand boat launch locations and 10 potential dock locations. A map of the downtown portion of this master plan is provided in Appendix D for reference.

Providing access to major natural assets is a key strategy of many park systems to encourage stewardship of resources. Access to the Napa River is important to residents who participated in the planning process. The needs identified in the earlier planning process remain important to this community.

**TRAILS**

Napa and the region, including the County Park and Open Space District, continues to plan for the regional connections that will link communities not only within Napa County, but also to communities beyond the county. Connections are also planned to connect to, as well as within, regional open spaces. Based on the public input these efforts are valuable to Napa residents who see a need for these connections.

Trails connecting neighborhoods, linking parks, schools and destinations such as downtown are also needed at a local level. The largely built-out city and the cost of land acquisition limit the outright purchase of trail corridors in many parts of the city. As trail and bikeway planning continues, Napa needs to identify the small neighborhood level connections that will increase access to important destinations, thereby raising the value of the existing and future park system.

At the same time, the City needs to continue to add recreational trail loops within park sites, as is appropriate to create opportunities for the highly valued trail activities. These trails are needed where they can be conveniently accessed as well as where they would provide opportunities to enjoy natural features of the city’s parks.
INDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

Napa both provides indoor facilities and partners with the Napa Valley Unified School District to use other public buildings. Generally, the community’s need for indoor recreation space is driven by the type and quantity of programming that can be supported. The need for additional indoor space also takes into account the shifting availability and access to school facilities and providing opportunities throughout the day and evening hours.

The need for community center space is both dependent on and partially determines the amount of recreation programming available. Napa has actively expanded programming options into every space available, especially focusing on opportunities for youth. Public input indicates that the next area to expand should be adult-focused opportunities, particularly those that increase health and wellness. The current and projected size of Napa, both in geographic size and in population, could be served primarily through one central community center and the continued use of schools and other public facilities. Community centers thrive when they are in the most accessible location. A central location served by transit and connected to community trails and pedestrian friendly streets will reduce the need for auto-oriented transportation.

MULTI-GENERATIONAL SPACE

Nationally, the trend in providing indoor recreation space is to include a wide variety of flexible spaces in multi-generational community and recreation centers that provide a broader range of services. Park agencies are finding that many of the activities that are designed to serve younger residents are also appealing to the more active senior population. Additionally, the gathering spaces that are a key part of most senior center programs are more effective at building community when they attract users from all age groups. Flexible social gathering spaces can be programmed to also provide time that is more specifically for senior interests without reserving large amounts of space on a full-time basis.

One of the strongest trends throughout the United States, California and the region is the aging of our population. The growing older adult demographic of 50+ includes a multi-generational group that can include individuals still in the workforce, young retirees and the elderly. The
needs of each of these sub-groups can vary, and a one size fits all approach is not appropriate. Program schedules and types of activities should be evaluated in order to address the needs of all of these groups.

**CLASSROOM SPACE**

Much of the community’s need for classroom space can be met within the existing school buildings, especially those programs that are targeted to youth. However, the community still needs several additional flexible classroom spaces provided in conjunction with other indoor facilities. These rooms need to have flexible seating and table options as well as appropriate power and technology to support a wide range of uses from arts and crafts to computer classes and tax preparation assistance. Adequate storage is an important feature to minimize the turn-around time to another use and maximize the flexibility of the space space.

In addition to centralized flexible classroom space, two other types of classrooms are specifically needed in Napa. Preschool programming has been a growing need within the system for several years and requires a specific type of classroom with strict facility standards. Preschool classrooms should be considered in the expansion of any existing City facility as current demand warrants, and could be considered for a central facility as well.

The final type of classroom needed in Napa is the on-site classroom. In certain situations having a self-contained classroom building at a park site is valuable for programming that is site-specific. This type of space should be very limited in the system and only developed to achieve strategic purposes. Of particular interest are sites that could be used for nature education tied to the Napa River and wetlands.

**INDOOR COURTS/GYMNASIUMS**

As with most indoor spaces, due to the cost of developing the facility, each indoor court/gymnasium should be designed for multiple uses and single-purpose facilities should be considered only as a last option. Good examples of multi-purpose gyms are those designed for high schools which support volleyball, basketball and other court sports in several configurations. While the community has recently invested in a number of new school gyms that will increase the amount of playable court space, an additional gym, or pair of gyms, is needed to support programming during day-time hours and at other times that school facilities are not available.
FITNESS/DANCE STUDIO SPACE

The community needs at least two high-quality indoor fitness/dance studio spaces. One of the most valuable programming spaces in many indoor facilities, studio space with cushioned wood flooring can support many different activities. Classes from yoga to ballet as well as nearly any group fitness activity make use of this type of space for classes at all age levels. Due to the wide appeal of these spaces and the potential for all-day programming, these spaces should be included as part of a centralized multi-purpose recreation center.

COMMUNITY GATHERING SPACE

The need for community gathering spaces can be separated into small and large-scale gatherings. At the small-scale, the indoor facilities in the Napa park system should include social gathering spaces that provide a comfortable place to read a book, display or view art, or even host a small music event. Many recreation centers developed in recent years include a coffee shop-like lobby area that serves this purpose. Providing food and beverage service, while not required, is additional incentive for users to stay and would produce a small revenue stream for the facility. These spaces need multiple types of seating, some tables appropriate for meeting over or sharing a game, and should be up front and visible from the main entrance and the main desk of the facility. The space also needs adequate space to accommodate a presentation, small art display or music performance, adding flexibility into the programming to attract users from all age and interest groups.

The large-scale gathering space is generally a rental and event space suitable for gatherings of 200 or more people. If located and designed appropriately, these facilities can be substantial revenue generators to support park and recreation activities. The building should include high-quality facilities that include a kitchen (at least a catering and ideally a full service kitchen), restrooms and dressing areas to support a wide variety of uses. These spaces are developed in park systems on an opportunity basis. Napa should have at least one such large community gathering space available for community events and rentals. The location of this type of facility is absolutely essential in determining the demand for rentals. Due to the scenic value of the Napa River and views around the community there are potentially multiple opportunities for such a facility.
The community needs identified in this analysis are the basis for a series of recommended improvements to the community’s park and recreation system. As noted at the beginning of this chapter, some of these needs may not be met by the City of Napa. The next chapter details the projects recommended by this plan. From this set of recommendations priorities can be set and a manageable package of projects will be proposed for the next round of community park and recreation improvements in Napa.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

With the community needs identified, the planning team has made a series of recommendations to guide the Park and Recreation Services Department in developing new park sites and adding recreation facilities to the system. These recommendations start with a general description of the park system as envisioned by the community for the year 2030. Following this park system concept are the system-wide recommendations that will, over time, result in the park system as envisioned.

PARK SYSTEM CONCEPT

In the year 2025, Napa’s park system will be a mix of local parks providing close-to-home recreation opportunities and specialized sites that create space for larger, unique resources that serve the entire city. Local parks will be only a short walk from each residence and will be connected by safe sidewalks, the growing Napa trail system and mass transit options. These parks will not only be close but will include a variety of activities that encourage and support active lifestyles.

John F. Kennedy Park is a signature facility in the Napa park system, providing even more places for the entire community to gather, play and compete. In addition, other community parks will provide similar recreation opportunities across the city. New high-quality sports fields will complement the community’s investment in school athletic facilities and will build in capacity for casual, recreational and competitive sports.

The community’s indoor recreation facilities will be expanded and upgraded to provide flexible spaces for generations of Napa residents to engage in evolving recreation programming. Key to expanding programming opportunities is the redevelopment of the City’s primary recreation facility into a modern multi-generational community center. Other indoor facilities will provide specialized programming space including a signature rental facility for banquets, events and meetings overlooking the Napa River.

Enhancements to the major natural area parks improves access to nature within the city and regional trail links provide connections to the nearby natural and agricultural lands that define so much of the local identity. In addition, natural elements are integrated into parks at all scales to make the parks more environmentally sensitive and informative.
PARK SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to achieve this park system as envisioned, there are a number of major areas where improvements should be addressed. The major recommendations of this plan are broken down into the following categories:

- Park land;
- Outdoor sport facilities;
- Indoor recreation facilities;
- Aquatics and water play;
- Outdoor facilities and park amenities; and
- Trails.
- Non-capital projects

At the next level of detail this chapter also addresses the specific parks and projects.

PARK LAND

One of the major challenges of this plan is to improve residents’ access to parks. Layers of development in Napa have resulted in the uneven distribution of sites. The historic core of the city was served primarily by Fuller Park, a traditional “City Park” type of facility. However, as residential development expanded from this core, many neighborhoods were created with no land set aside for park use. Closer to the edges of the city, where homes and neighborhoods are relatively newer, awareness of the value of park land resulted in a more regular distribution of park sites. Community park sites were located where larger sites were available, notably south of the city in the floodplain.

With development constraints in place to protect the surrounding agricultural land, the cost of land within the city limits is high, where land is available at all. Adding new park sites will require flexibility and advance planning. The key park land recommendations are illustrated on Map 3: Park Land Concept, on the next page. Specific recommendations for park land are discussed below.
INSERT MAP 3: PARK LAND CONCEPT
BACK OF MAP 3: PARK LAND CONCEPT
Increased Local Park Access

Each residence in Napa should be within ½ mile travel distance of a local park. The local park access analysis identified opportunity areas for expanding the local park access for residential areas of the city. Considering the natural and transportation related barriers, approximately fourteen local parks will need to be added to meet the ½ mile objective.

Due to the existing and future residential density the priority for land acquisition should be the central and south opportunity areas on both sides of Highway 29. Within this area one community park and two targeted school park opportunities exist (indicated on Map 3). Even after these projects are completed, many areas will remain outside of the ½ mile target.

Due to the scarcity of land in these opportunity areas and throughout Napa, the City will need to monitor major development projects and the local real estate market to locate park sites to serve residents within the opportunity areas. Large development or redevelopment projects will create some possibility of public open spaces and recreation facilities. It will be important to maximize the benefits of this type of project to provide park access to all neighbors.

The addition of new local parks will not only enhance the park system for the nearby residents. By adding capacity to the overall system, new parks will relieve pressure on Napa’s existing parks and spread the benefit of these new sites across the entire city.

The South Jefferson property presents the most obvious opportunity to increase local park access, being located immediately south of the southern opportunity area and already in City ownership. The development of this property should address local park needs of the surrounding community. Meeting the local park needs should also take into account the unique natural setting of the site as a gateway to the South Napa Wetlands. Play features at this site should be nature-themed and include educational elements connected to the surrounding environment.

Another City-owned property with potential to increase local park access is the undeveloped half of the Garfield Park site. While not in the central or southern opportunity areas, this undeveloped property is the best chance
to enhance park access to the residents south, west and east of the site. The teaching farm and the creek adjacent to this site provide some tie-in possibilities. The parking and facilities required for the youth baseball complex on the east side of the site create the potential for a site that could draw from beyond the immediate neighborhood. The restrooms and parking in place at this location may need to be reconfigured or replaced to serve the larger park. The existence of these facilities will make the fully developed Garfield Park a good potential site for an interactive water feature.

**Targeted School Parks**

Napa has proven the potential of school sites to provide local park amenities, even during school hours, with the Playground Fantastico Park adjacent to Harvest Middle School. Many communities have explored the potential of school parks, providing local park amenities on existing public land at school sites. Most school parks are limited by the closed campus policies that prohibit general public use during school hours. Napa should consider developing additional separated school parks in the general model of Playground Fantastico to provide all day access for neighborhood users.

Within the identified local park access opportunity areas, two school sites stand out as potential school parks that could increase the local park access in the key central and south opportunity areas. Irene Snow Elementary and West Park Elementary are well-positioned within the opportunity areas and have adequate land to accommodate a small area that could be available for play during the school day.

These two sites should be specifically discussed with Napa Valley School District as a part of the ongoing shared use agreement negotiations.

**Two Additional Community Parks**

The City should add two community parks to spread out the geographic distribution of larger parks in the system. The two sites should generally be located in central Napa and east Napa as indicated on Map 3: Park Land Concept.

One of the parks targeted to provide local park access in central Napa should be a larger park with space to accommodate some community scale facilities. One potential location for a new community park would be an integrated site that includes some of the existing School District facilities
north of Napa High School fronting along Pueblo Avenue. If the existing bus yards could be relocated efficiently, this site would offer the potential to combine a smaller City park site with existing sport facilities to create a community scale park. If this site does not prove feasible, a large site in central Napa may be difficult to obtain but opportunities should be explored as they arise.

The second area in need of a community park is east of the Napa River. The large site opportunity in this area is the Napa Valley Expo property. Although not in City ownership, the Expo site is publicly owned and could potentially be acquired if the current operations were relocated. Even a portion of this 36-acre site would be adequate to provide some community-scale facilities such as large-scale play areas, sports fields, community gardens, water features or indoor facilities.

OUTDOOR SPORT FACILITIES

Outdoor sport facilities are a major element of the recreation opportunities provided in Napa but are not provided entirely by the City. Sport fields and other outdoor sports facilities are among the most land intensive and most expensive to maintain elements in the park system. In order to meet community needs for competitive and individual sports, Napa will need to make efficient use of both existing fields and the limited space available to develop new fields.

Maximized Sport Fields

The City of Napa should strive to ensure that the existing sports facilities throughout the city are used to their highest potential. This includes helping to preserve the community’s investment in competitive fields and maximizing the use of all sports fields by promoting tight scheduling and the open use of fields.

The majority of the existing competitive quality fields are on School District sites. The funding for these facilities represents a community investment in sports that was intended to benefit the entire city. However, because these facilities are on School District property, the maintenance of the fields draws from limited school budgets. As the School District is forced by fiscal pressures to focus in on its core teaching and learning mission, resources for maintaining and reinvesting in these fields have become extremely limited. As part of the shared use agreement negotiations, the City should focus on a division of maintenance, scheduling, capital investment and, potentially, ownership that preserves
this community investment for school use, competitive sports and recreational use by the community. Improvements to school fields and grounds should be considered by the City where unique opportunities exist to meet community needs. The softball complex developed at the Napa Valley Language Academy is a good example of successful improvements to sports facilities on school property.

The City should also maximize use of all existing fields in the City inventory. This includes the reevaluation of exclusive use agreements with community sports leagues. With limited land available, it is not possible to provide facilities for each sport group to operate and maintain independently. Instead, the limited public land resources should be managed by the City for maximum public benefit. Currently, several facilities are developed on City properties that are reserved for the use of one user group, in exchange for maintenance. To the extent that new fields are needed, particularly for competitive play, the City should examine these arrangements to establish if additional capacity could be gained through central scheduling of fields.

**New Recreational Fields**

To balance the load of competitive sports fields between the School District and the City, new sports fields should be added to appropriate existing and future park sites. Ideally, sports fields will be added in clusters to ensure that the investment in support facilities, restrooms, concession buildings and parking can be shared by multiple fields.

The ideal location for new competitive sports fields is at Kennedy Park, where many of the supporting facilities are already in place. The analysis of recreational fields identifies the current need for soccer fields and youth baseball and softball fields. Kennedy Park offers adequate space to develop a cluster of soccer fields that could be used in multiple configurations. As the largest developed park in the Napa system, space at Kennedy Park should be carefully planned to identify the locations for future and potentially redeveloped, or relocated, facilities. A new site master plan for Kennedy Park will ensure that the necessary facilities have adequate space and can be built over time in the most cost effective phasing possible. Other community parks, including proposed parks, should also be considered for sports field development. This scale of park should already be developed to support the larger number of users that competitive sports require.
The City should also develop and maintain recreational fields, suitable for casual baseball, softball or soccer, at other parks with adequate space and supporting facilities to support casual play. These recreational fields would be managed and maintained to allow safe play but not be set up for permanent or even regular seasonal use by an organized league. Recreational fields should not be reserved, but would be available for informal practice.

**New Napa Skate Park**

Napa should actively plan for a new permanent community-scale skateboard facility to replace and update the existing facility which will have to be relocated to accommodate the construction of parking facilities displaced by the river bypass project. The best mix of timeliness, accessibility and design would include two facilities catering to two different styles of skating. One facility would be located within the river bypass channel in downtown and feature street or plaza elements. These elements would either be designed to not obstruct the function of the bypass channel or could be removed during floods. The second skate park facility would be a ramp or bowl-focused facility located where adequate parking and restroom facilities exist. The location of Kennedy Park is ideal as it includes parking, restroom facilities and other recreation amenities. This site however does have significant access constraints for skateboarders wishing to travel to the park on their skateboard.

If other sites meeting the general criteria become available, the City should weigh the potential land costs if those sites are not owned by the City.

With major changes coming to the skateboarding facilities within Napa, it is important to have some flexibility in meeting the community’s needs. Community input demonstrated a strong support for a skate park and provided insight into the preferred location for a new facility. Users of the existing park are very interested in a central location that is easily accessible by foot from many parts of the city, with a particular interest in being near downtown. Regardless of the site location decisions, the following site criteria will help to identify and design a successful skate park site:

- Highly visible to park users and the general public;
- Accessible on foot, by bicycle, skateboard or public transit;
- Convenient access to restrooms, water and, ideally, food and beverage businesses;
- Reasonable sound buffer area to nearby residents (sound can also be reduced using concrete ramps and features rather than modular ones); and
- Designed in consultation with local skaters and freestyle cyclists.

The most promising potential site to meet these criteria is within the bypass channel. However, building a permanent, in-ground skate park within the bypass channel presents some unique design and engineering challenges. Above ground or removable features present fewer issues. Also, the shifting time-table for construction of the bypass could result in an extended period of time with no skate park available if this were to be the only facility. A second facility should be located within Kennedy Park according to the results of the proposed site master planning process. This facility could include types of features that are not technically feasible in the bypass channel, such as bowls and larger ramp features. This facility also offers greater control over when the new facility is developed, because the land is already in City ownership. Due to Kennedy Park’s location, improved public transportation will be very important to the success and accessibility of the site. While the recommended sites provide a balance of availability and ideal location between them, other sites should be considered if they can also meet the criteria and needs of this user group. Once a site has been selected, local skaters should be involved in the design process to ensure that the new facility meets user needs.

Opportunities for skateboarding and freestyle biking should also be provided in other parks and public facilities in both formal and informal ways. An example of a formal “skate spot” would be a modular ramp added to an existing neighborhood park for local skaters to practice on. An informal site might be a reinforced concrete table or ledge designed with the appropriate pathway run-in. Wherever possible, skate facilities should be designed to be shared with cyclists and other wheeled equipment (such as inline skates and scooters).

**BMX Facility**

The existing partnership between the department and North Bay BMX is strong and provides benefits for many residents. As part of the proposed Kennedy Park Master Plan, the location and size of the BMX track should be analyzed against other needed facilities for limited space within the park. This may result in the relocation, expanding or reconfiguring the existing track.
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INDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

Napa should develop a mix of indoor facilities to serve specific purposes in the park system. The primary indoor facility should be a multi-purpose and multi-generational community center located centrally to provide the best access for all users. Indoor spaces are typically the most expensive and highly valued facilities in the system. However, the costs can be balanced by the revenue streams that can be generated by these facilities. Each facility element should be carefully considered during design to balance the mix of facilities against the revenue potential of programming and rentals that can be accommodated. Each facility should also be designed to take advantage of cost saving green technologies, particularly water efficient systems and daylighting. Finally, to be sure that the park system improves its accessibility, all new facilities should be designed with universal accessibility in mind. The indoor facilities should be enjoyable by all residents regardless of their physical abilities or age. The four recommended City indoor facilities are explained below and potential locations are indicated on Map 4: Major Recreation Facilities Concept on page 75.

Develop a Multi-Generational Community Center

The City should consider development of a multi-generational community center to serve as the central home for recreation and senior service programming in Napa. The ideal site would have the following attributes:

- Central location;
- High visibility;
- Connected to many modes of transportation including pedestrians, bicycles, transit and automobiles; and
- Adequate land for building footprint, outdoor areas and adequate parking.

The new center should include a mix of fitness/dance studios, a cardio/fitness center, classrooms, social gathering and food preparation/service. If adequate space can be developed, the City should also consider the inclusion of a full gymnasium and event space. It will be important to recognize that many, if not the majority, of users of this facility will be adults and youth, but building layout and design should appeal to and be welcoming of all age groups.

Considering the cost of acquiring adequate new land this plan recommends considering redeveloping the Napa Senior Center site as a
multi-generational recreation center. The location is ideal, as it is known, is on transit lines and is acceptable by foot and bike.

This site does have significant constraints stemming from the small size of the existing City owned parcel. It also has street visibility concerns. Also, the creek frontage, while adding a desirable natural element to the site also requires protective setbacks to preserve fish habitat, further limiting developable space.

To make the most use of the site, the new building could be stacked into multiple levels, potentially with structured or underground parking. The building could also take advantage of the natural views into the creek by placing classrooms and gathering spaces so that they enjoy the view.

If other sites meeting the general criteria become available, the City should weigh the potential costs of acquisition against the cost of adding to or redeveloping the existing site. Consideration should also be given to multiple center sites should that become the preferred option.

**Redeveloped Pelusi Center**

The City should redevelop the Pelusi Recreation Center site as a large community gathering and event space for rentals and programming. This facility should be scaled to host banquet style events for 200 or more people and be oriented on the site to take advantage of views of the river and golf course. This facility should be targeted at revenue generation through corporate events, weddings and family or cultural gatherings. The location of this site between the golf course and the Napa River, but set aside from the active elements at Kennedy Park makes this an ideal location.

**Expanded Las Flores Center**

The existing Las Flores Center should be maintained and refocused on child care and family programming. Following the completion of the central community center, some of the need for general programming at this location may disappear. However, the demand for child care services and preschool classes is likely to remain. This facility is appropriately sized to support these uses, as well as programs appealing to the immediate neighborhood and parents of children attending classes at the center. The City should expand Las Flores Center to accommodate additional programming, including child care and fitness classes. As part
of this expansion, restroom facilities should be added that can be accessed from the outside of the building to serve the park.

**Explore the Possibility of a Recreation Building at South Jefferson Park**

As part of the design and development of the South Jefferson property, the City could consider a small recreation building with one or two classrooms to support nature themed classes and activities at this site. This facility could include restroom facilities accessible from the outside to serve the park users as well as the building. The decision about whether or not to include a structure as part of this park should be a part of the site master plan discussion.

**AQUATICS/WATER PLAY**

Napa Valley Unified School District provides five outdoor swimming pools that are made available for programming use through the City’s Park and Recreation Services Department during the summer months. This cooperative effort provides a substantial amount of pool facilities to the community and Napa’s students. Napa Valley College maintains a pool for the use of their students that is also serving as the home pool for a local swimming club but is not generally available to the community. The School District pools provide good geographic coverage of the city, the design of each pool tank limits the uses largely to competitive, instructional and some basic recreational swim use. Napa has the opportunity to expand on this base of pool access to provide a variety of aquatics and water play opportunities.

**Utilize School Pools for Programming**

The City should continue to program school district pools to provide swimming lessons, recreational and therapeutic swimming opportunities. Although the School District now operates five swimming pools at the middle and high schools in the community, not all of these are needed to provide adequate opportunity for these programs. The three pools Napa Parks and Recreation has operated in the most recent summers (Napa High School, Harvest Middle School and Redwood Middle School) provide adequate geographic spread and variety of facilities for the programming needs. The number of facilities that are needed should be flexible to address changes in demand for aquatics programming.
Add Water Play Sites

To expand the opportunities for water play, the City should add five interactive water features or water playgrounds to existing park sites. The addition of these very popular features will likely draw additional users to the selected sites, therefore each site should be scaled appropriately to support this destination amenity. The six proposed sites for water features are:

- Las Flores Park;
- Garfield Park (as part of an expanded park);
- O’Brien Park
- Dwight Murray Plaza;
- Kennedy Park;
- Century Oaks Park.

These sites are also indicated on Map 4: Major Recreation Facilities Concept on page 71. In addition, the proposed community parks should be considered for additional water play features during their master planning processes.

OUTDOOR FACILITIES AND PARK AMENITIES

In addition to the major facilities recommendations, there are a series of smaller, but still important, facilities that will need to be added to the park system. Improvements to existing parks should be used as an opportunity to enhance the accessibility of parks.

Permanent Restrooms

The City should develop permanent restrooms at park sites designed to draw users from beyond the neighborhood. While several of Napa’s parks already have permanent restroom facilities, other parks have been provided temporary facilities (which are less than ideal from an aesthetic and operational standpoint) or have no restrooms available at all. Some of the restrooms that exist in the system are only available at certain times because of their inclusion in facilities with specific operating hours that are less than the park hours. New or redesigned permanent restroom facilities should be added to the following sites:

- Las Flores Park;
- Century Oaks Park;
- Veteran’s Park;
- Westwood Hills Regional Park;
• Alston Park;
• Garfield Park (as part of a unified larger park);
• O’Brien Park;
• Dry Creek Park; and
• South Jefferson Park (subject to site master plan).

These restrooms should be developed in combination with other facilities at each park. The preference should be to redesign an existing restroom to serve park users during all park hours. The restroom proposed to serve Veteran’s Park should be located north of the site on vacant property where portable restrooms are currently located during events.

The City should also consider additional restrooms where no alternative facilities exist.

**Social Gathering Areas**

Developing additional social gathering areas throughout the park system will provide residents and visitors with spaces for engagement and activity. Spaces should be developed with appropriate shading, and a mix of flexible and fixed seating to support casual mingling and interaction for Napa residents of all ages.

**Additional Park Amenities**

Additional park amenities such as bike racks, drinking fountains and benches are important to the function of parks of all types. The City should develop a set of design guidelines that identify all of the features that should be considered standard in both new and existing parks by type.

**Community Gardens**

Where possible, the City should foster partnerships with existing groups to develop community gardens in appropriate locations throughout Napa. Potential sites should be evaluated based on proximity to other community resources, access to water and other site-specific considerations.
**Group Picnic Areas**

The City should develop additional reservable group picnic areas at strategic locations in town. Reservable picnic areas should be able to support groups of 25 to as many as 100 people depending on the park size. Specific locations targeted include:

- Las Flores Park;
- Kennedy Park;
- Century Oaks Park; and
- O’Brien Park.

These sites are also indicated on Map 4: Major Recreation Facilities Concept on page 71. Sites have been selected based on their size and designation as community serving facilities. New community parks should also include additional group picnic areas. Supporting amenities such as parking and restrooms should be in place or developed concurrently with the group picnic areas.

**Dogs in Parks**

Napa’s park system provides significant access opportunities for dogs. The City should improve this park system component through strategic investment in existing dog parks at Alston and Shurtleff Parks that serve the eastern and western portions of Napa. The City should consider including an additional off-leash dog area in a new Community Park to be developed in central Napa. Furthermore, the City should develop an informational brochure to clarify rules about dogs in parks, specifically:

**Municipal Code Sections 6.04.170 and 12.36.190**

Dogs are allowed in any city park, as long as the dog is controlled on a leash not to exceed six feet in length. Section 6.04.170 sets forth certain exceptions to this requirement, and specifically authorizes the City Council to designate off-leash areas within parks by resolution. Dogs are only allowed off leash at Alston, Shurtleff and some of the undeveloped areas at Kennedy Park. Dogs, whether leashed or not, would be prohibited in any playground or tot lot.
River Access
The City should continue to develop trail access, hand boat launches, boat and fishing docks as identified in the Napa River Parkway Master Plan whenever possible. All public river access points should be clearly identified. Map 4: Major Recreation Facility Concept indicates several areas where river access is proposed in the Napa River Parkway Master Plan.

Access to Nature
Integrate natural elements into all park types and further develop access to existing natural sites such as the South Jefferson property and the Napa River. The further development of trail systems, support facilities and maps for Westwood Hills, Alston and Timberhill Park will increase local nature access for Napa Residents.

To further increase nature access opportunities, the City should continue to explore the potential for developing formal access points to the Milliken Ridge and Lake Hennessey Watershed areas for limited recreational opportunities in partnership with the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District.

TRAILS
The community should improve connections to existing parks and community facilities using adopted trail plans and the Napa River Parkway Master Plan as guides. Maps 3 and 4 illustrate the park system concepts and include the major planned off-street trails. These approximate trail alignments are provided to facilitate linking the trail routes to existing and planned park sites. The official City trail and bikeway maps are contained within the General Plan and should be referred to for the currently planned alignments. Appendix D provides reference copies of the current General Plan trail and bikeway maps current as of the publishing of this plan.

Developing a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan that specifically addresses the overlap of recreation and transportation, focusing on safety and accessibility would contribute to providing recreation opportunities and improving access to existing parks and facilities throughout Napa. Such a plan would also be able to provide guidance on trail specific issues such as specifying the side of a street or natural feature (such as a creek) that a pathway would follow. As the City continues to plan and implement
trail segments, park and recreation sites should be considered an important origin and destination within the system. The City should also continue to expand regional trail access through ongoing planning and coordination with Napa County and regional trail groups. New and existing parks should be connected to nearby trail systems to provide easy pedestrian and cycling access to these sites.

PARK SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the park system recommendations presented in this chapter, this plan includes a site profile for each of the 57 developed park sites in the Napa park system as well as several parks that are planned for publicly owned lands. These profiles are included in Appendix A following the system inventory. Each profile includes a map and aerial image of the site (with the property boundary highlighted) along with other available images and a summary of the existing facilities and amenities. The park-specific recommendations also reflect the findings of the City’s ADA Transition Plan to increase accessibility in Napa’s parks. The final piece of information provided is the role of the site within the park system and any specific improvements recommended as a result of the system-wide recommendations above or observations during the planning process. These park profiles are intended to help guide planning for specific parks and provide the public with information targeted to the parks they are most interested in, such as the park nearest to their home.

The park profiles reflect some of the additional ideas collected in the public involvement process that did not rise to the system-wide level of recommendation, i.e., Frisbee Golf. In addition to the ideas reflected in this plan there will continue to be new ideas for the specific type of facilities to add in a particular park. These ideas can be addressed in the ongoing community discussions at Park and Recreation Advisory Commission meetings and during site master planning for major park projects.

NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

There are also a number of projects that emerged from the planning analysis that do not involve the acquisition of park land or construction of new or renovated facilities. However, these non-capital projects will have major impacts on the facilities that are available for use to the community in the coming years.
Create a Capital Reinvestment Fund

The City should create a reinvestment fund to support ongoing capital reinvestment for the existing and proposed facilities and amenities in the system, including:

- Playgrounds
- Water features
- Sport fields
- Restrooms
- Picnic Shelters

The annual amount to contribute to this fund should be based on the replacement cost and lifecycle of each facility in the City inventory. The reinvestment fund will ensure that all constructed facilities are maintained to an acceptable standard and that investments are preserved over time.

Continue to Develop School District Partnership

Continue to develop and formalize the partnership with Napa Valley Unified School District. The City is in the process of updating the shared-use agreement with the School District which will have lasting impacts on the operations and quality of recreation facilities within Napa. Three areas of particular importance are:

- Facility scheduling;
- Maintenance cost sharing, and
- Planning for facility reinvestment.

The City should work with the School District to establish a system for facility scheduling that provides one point of access to the community facilities available at schools and within the City system. The sharing of community facilities will result in maintenance needs that will need to be divided between the School District and the City based on use and available specialized staff and equipment. To ensure that the community investment in competitive level sports fields is maintained, the City and School District should develop a plan for the eventual replacement of the artificial turf installed as part of the recent bond projects.

Create a Park Brochure

The City of Napa provides residents with a mix of unique and exciting park features, accessible by bike and foot. The City should develop a compelling, graphically appealing park system brochure and map that encourages park use and knowledge of the various park system assets. The
format of this brochure and map should be designed to be easily updated to add in new sites and facilities as they are added to the system.

The City should plan to produce these maps and distribute them to all Napa residents. The paper map should provide an attractive and useful way to identify park facilities, trails and attractions to visitors. These maps could be made available to hotels and other tourist oriented businesses as well as at City facilities. In addition, multi-purpose online maps should be made available allowing citizens and visitors to print the information they are most interested in. Ideally this system would allow users to customize maps with bike routes, park sites and amenity information.
VII. IMPLEMENTATION

The recommendations for parks and facilities in Napa includes projects that will need to be rolled out over a long period of time, including land acquisition for which it will be difficult to assign a timeline. In order to ensure that this plan results in actions that improve the community’s park and recreation opportunities, the City must decide on a first step, namely, a sub-set of the recommended projects that can be begin in the short term. This chapter provides decision making tools and other criteria to help identify the projects that will have the biggest impact in the community. The following sections describe how Napa can prioritize and fund the recommended projects.

DECISION MAKING TOOLS

PLANNING FRAMEWORK

In order to create a basis for prioritizing projects, public input and analysis of the park system has been used to synthesize a series of planning principles. The guiding principles for parks and facilities in Napa include:

- **Fun**: Create places and programs that foster creative, spontaneous and fun activities for all Napa residents.

- **Accessibility**: Create a universally accessible park system that provides convenient recreational opportunities for Napa residents of all ages and abilities.

- **Diversity**: Support and encourage the diverse recreational needs of Napa residents, of all ages and recreational interests, through dynamic and varied programming, park, natural areas and facility development.

- **Education**: Provide places for residents to learn about and enhance cultural and natural features of Napa as well their own physical abilities in both independent and group play.

- **Economic Sustainability**: Ensure that new and renovated park facilities will be available to future generations of residents by adequately planning for efficiency, funding, ongoing maintenance and potential revenue streams.

- **Environmental Sustainability**: Encourage a connection to nature through planning, design, development and programming that ensures
an ongoing mutually supportive relationship between Napa residents and their environment.

- **Quality**: Develop and maintain high-quality, user-friendly parks and facilities.

- **Health and Wellness**: Promote regular physical activity through facilities that support year-round recreation activities, active transportation and casual and organized sports.

- **Sense of Place**: Celebrate Napa’s natural setting, superb climate and connection to the river to build a strong community spirit for residents and visitors.

These principles will guide decision making about the set of projects identified in this plan as well as new ideas that emerge during this plan’s implementation. The Park and Recreation Commission and City Staff can apply these principles to determine how well a project fits into the community’s priorities, providing direction for moving forward with improvements. Ultimate the decision about what projects to move forward will be the decision of the City Council.

**CAPITAL COST MODEL**

Along with the priorities of the community, the cost to develop a project should factor into the discussion of how and when projects move forward. The costs presented for capital projects in this plan are based on current construction costs for similar parks in California, as well as the experience of the planning team. It is premature to generate an exact cost for each project, since no specific plans have been developed. As a result, the costs presented in this chapter should be viewed as preliminary project budgets rather than as cost estimates. For clarity, we refer to these cost figures as planning costs. As the projects move forward, site designs will result in more accurate cost figures. It is particularly difficult to assign a dollar value to indoor facilities and projects resulting from proposed design or master planning efforts due to the large variability in the details of the project. In these cases, the project team has provided a place-holder that recognizes the magnitude of these projects.
The total planning costs for all capital projects recommended in this Park and Facilities Master Plan, as well as costs for each park in the system, are rolled-up using a capital cost model. This model identifies the categories of improvements needed within the system. For the City of Napa, the categories of projects include:

- Site Acquisition
- Site Master Plan
- Site Design
- Site Development
- Site Improvement
- Playground Small
- Playground Large
- Group Picnic Area
- Restroom
- Water Play Feature
- Baseball Fields
- Baseball (With Turf and Lights)
- Softball Fields
- Softball (With Turf and Lights)
- Soccer Fields
- Soccer Fields (With Turf and Lights)

Each of these projects is assigned a planning cost that reflects the anticipated cost to complete the project. For each park, the improvements indicated will add the assigned planning cost to the total. There are a number of recommended projects that are outside of these categories and are accounted for in the model using an “other project” category, along with a description and planning cost. The usefulness of this model extends beyond the initial estimation of planning costs at the time of completing this plan. The model is designed so that the basic assumptions can be modified to reflect changes in the cost of developing a particular project, the cost of land or the type of improvements that are anticipated for a site. The complete cost model has been provided to City of Napa staff for future use, and the details of improvement selections, costs and assumptions are provided as Appendix B: Capital Cost Model.

With the planning costs for improvements to each existing park in place, the model totals the improvements recommended across the entire existing system. Table 7.1 presents the total planning cost for existing projects,
along with breakdowns based on population and number of park sites. The total is then divided across the 15 years of the planning horizon.

Table 7.1
Capital Costs of Recommended Projects: Existing Park System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PLANNING COSTS</td>
<td>$53,001,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per year of planning horizon</td>
<td>$3,533,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital cost per park site</td>
<td>$883,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital cost per resident</td>
<td>$687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 60 park sites includes developing 3 undeveloped City-owned sites
2 2008 existing population used throughout the plan: 77,106

In addition, the basic set of improvements recommended for new parks can be totaled up to create a budget for the acquisition, design and development of a typical neighborhood and community park. The numbers of neighborhood and community park sites needed to meet the needs identified in Chapter five, along with an additional site for the new skate park, are summarized in Table 7.2, below.

Table 7.2
Capital Costs of Proposed Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Cost: New Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>$3,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Neighborhood Parks Needed</td>
<td>x14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Neighborhood Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,750,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Cost: New Community Park</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Community Parks Needed</td>
<td>x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Community Parks</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxbow Commons Bypass</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Special Use Park</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,250,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL: PROPOSED PARKS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of neighborhood and community parks added to the park system is separated from improvements to the existing park system because the timing and total cost is subject to the availability of land and may be met in different ways, including improvements to school or other public sites.
Adding the improvements to existing parks and the total for proposed parks results in a total cost of capital projects recommended in this plan. This total is detailed in Table 7.3.

### Table 7.3
**Total Capital Costs:**
**Park and Facilities Master Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Park Sites $53,001,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Neighborhood Parks $43,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Community Parks $32,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Special Use Park $1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PLANNING COST</strong> $130,001,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total planning cost of capital projects recommended in this plan is just short of $130 million, which works out to an investment of just under $1,700 per current resident or $1,400 per resident at the planning horizon population. It is important to note that the addition of facilities and new park sites will have direct impacts on the required amount of maintenance funding to support the park system into the future.

**OTHER DECISION CRITERIA**

The principles and cost model provide a useful way to look at the entire system as well as improvements at individual parks. In addition to these tools, there are a number of other decision criteria that can be brought into play in the prioritization process.

**REINVESTMENT**

The total cost of implementing the recommendations of the Park and Facilities Master Plan covers all of the projects that are anticipated over the next 15 years of park system development and reinvestment. Included in the capital costs are replacements of all of the existing play areas. Like many cities, Napa has, in the past, focused capital improvements in new park sites where impact fees can clearly be tied to the growth of the local park needs. The result is a backlog of facility reinvestment that is indicated by, but not confined to, the pressing need to replace so many playgrounds. In the current year, funding is available for two playground replacements. However, there are 10 additional playgrounds that are 20 years or more old.
With a life-cycle of 10-15 years, even those play areas that are most recently replaced will need to be upgraded within the planning horizon. In order to prepare for this repeating cost, the plan recommends creating a capital reinvestment fund to save for the capital needs of facilities in the future. The City has already taken the first step in this direction for playgrounds. Park and Recreation Services has already identified and prioritized the replacement of existing play structures in parks based on their age and overall condition. The City should continue by funding the replacement of all playgrounds clearly beyond the functional life of a capital reinvestment fund for each playground added or replaced in the system. The amount of these contributions can be simply determined by taking the amount necessary to replace the facility divided by the number of years remaining in its life-cycle.

The City should also budget reinvestment contributions for other critical facilities within the park system. In some cases, these could simply be an annual allocation, such as an amount intended to replace the 10 oldest park benches in the system. However, in the case of other major facilities, more specific contributions should be made and tracked. The plan recommends a number of new facilities, such as water play features, that will have a defined life-cycle much like playgrounds. The development of these facilities should trigger an additional contribution to the reinvestment fund. This commitment will ensure the long-term sustainability of the park system.

**FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES**

Project cost can be a discriminator for timing and deciding on projects, but this approach should be tempered with a clear understanding of the funding potential of a specific project. In particular, some projects may be much easier to fund, in spite of their large price tags, due to relative popularity or the ability to off-set the cost through revenue generation. The latter is especially true of indoor recreation facilities, which create additional opportunities for Park and Recreation Services to offer programs that can cover their share of the operation and even generate some additional resources to support other recreation opportunities. Facilities designed specifically for revenue generation, such as large group gathering spaces, can also be used for community programming, doubling up the benefit to the park system.

Other funding opportunities may not be emerge until long after the completion of this plan. A key example of this is the donation of land as a...
part of a large development project or as a bequest from an estate. One of the major limiting factors and largest costs of providing new parks is finding appropriate land. With this cost removed or decreased, a project may be moved up on the project list. Other examples include grant programs. When projects are identified in the Park and Facilities Master Plan, and when the opportunity to apply for a new source of funding emerges, the community can evaluate how the project that fits with the funding priorities is needed by the community.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

In order to sustain the parks within the existing system and expand the recreation opportunities in the community, the City must always be aware of the ongoing cost of each acre of park land. In order to better understand the maintenance of the existing park system, Park and Recreation Services has divided parks based on the level of effort they require at their current level of development. The natural areas and open spaces, while making up much of the acreage of the park system, represent approximately 25% of the overall level of maintenance effort. The remaining 75% is unevenly distributed amongst the developed park types, with some requiring a higher level of intensity due to higher use and additional facilities. Other sites require little more than trash collection and occasional repairs. The maintenance staff is currently in the process of adjusting the maintenance expectations to adjust for the differing needs of parks within the system. However, for the purpose of recognizing the basic cost of each acre of park land maintained, the average is adequate, with an understanding that some parks in the system will need more and others less.

Based on the average of the last three year’s actual expenditures on park maintenance\(^1\) and the developed and natural area acreages in the system, the City has been spending approximately:

- \$3,700/acre per year on developed parks and
- \$1,500/acre per year on natural areas and open spaces.

In order to simply keep up with the current level of maintenance, the City will need to add at least this much to the park maintenance budget for each new park added to the system. However, the current level of development in Napa parks has allowed the community to get by on very little in comparison to other park systems. Many communities regularly spend

\(^1\) 2008/09, 2007/08 and 2006/07 with Tree Services subtracted from the actual budget figures based on the proportion of the current budget spent on these services.
anywhere from $5,000 to $10,000 per acre for more heavily developed parks. New facilities, particularly developed sports fields, will add considerable new and expanded tasks. Furthermore, as the parks are activated with new uses, basic maintenance will need to be enhanced as well.

The most recent year includes a portion of the maintenance cost of Veterans Park (which is probably one of the most expensive parks per acre to maintain due to heavy use). No additional funding was allocated to maintain this site. In fact, the year that this park came online, the overall budget for parks maintenance was reduced by $130,000. With no new resources, maintenance of this new park site will reduce the overall level of maintenance at Napa parks. The new budget adds funding to park maintenance, with most of the increases in services, some of which will offset staff time needed for standard maintenance tasks. New resources will continue to be important in operations and maintenance as entire new parks such as Trancas Crossing, the Oxbow Preserve and new facilities recommended in this plan are added to the maintenance load. The City should plan for operations resources along with each new major facility or park added to the system.

Designing, developing and managing existing and new parks for maintenance efficiency will become even more important as the system grows. Many park agencies are rethinking the design of new parks and the redesign of existing parks to include maintenance efficient features and making decisions such as limiting the use of turf to cut down on ongoing maintenance costs. The approach is not to eliminate grass from the park system but to use it strategically in park design rather than simply as the ground cover of choice. In many cases, a more natural, even native, environment can also provide a new type of play and learning opportunity while at the same time saving valuable maintenance resources. Other improvements will offer opportunities to improve maintenance efficiency through updating features such as irrigation systems and planting beds.

CONSTRUCTION COST INCREASES

In long-term plans it is also important to understand the effect of time on the cost of implementing projects. The capital cost model provides a simple escalation factor to illustrate the rising cost of projects over time. Table 7.4 illustrates the effect that this cost escalation has on selected high-cost projects and the total cost of all improvements in existing parks.
Table 7.4
Capital Cost Escalation:
Selected Projects and Total Projects in Existing Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning Cost 2009</th>
<th>Planning Cost 2014</th>
<th>Planning Cost 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELECTED PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>$12,250,000</td>
<td>$14,890,000</td>
<td>$19,004,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park in Oxbow Commons</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$547,000</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>$3,125,000</td>
<td>$3,798,000</td>
<td>$4,848,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVEMENTS IN EXISTING PARKS</td>
<td>$53,001,000</td>
<td>$64,419,000</td>
<td>$82,224,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost escalation assumed in the capital cost model is compounded at 5% per year, to be consistent with the Capital Improvement Program estimates. This rate can be modified along with other assumptions in the model.

FUNDING

The scale and scope of improvements needed to create the park system envisioned by the community will require a sustained and substantial funding effort. Many of the recommended projects present excellent opportunities to build community support for such an effort. This section reviews the existing funding sources used for capital improvements and proposes additional funding sources to bridge the gap between what is available and what will be needed for the implementation of the plan recommendations.

EXISTING FUNDING SOURCES

Currently, the operating budget for parks and facilities in Napa is funded exclusively by the general fund. This includes maintenance and operations costs for the entire system. Capital projects are primarily funded by a combination of general fund contributions and park impact fees collected from property development.

The City’s impact fee ordinance separates the city into four quadrants and the funding collected into four corresponding funds. Impact fees collected from within one quadrant can be used for projects within that quadrant or,
at the City Council’s direction, for projects that benefit the entire city. The funds are further broken down into acquisition and development funds. This system has directed funding to the expansion of park resources within the local area where the funds were collected. However, the city and the community’s needs have changed. The needs and recommendations of this plan identify a wide variety of projects that serve the entire community. Also, in order to serve the local park needs of central Napa, parks will have to be located based on any opportunities that arise, and this requires flexibility in funding. In order to maximize the flexibility of funding, and the success of this plan, the City should consolidate the existing segregated impact fee funds into one multi-purpose fund. In order to change the collection and accounting of these fees, the City will have to amend policy PR-2.5 of the General Plan. The application of the principles developed during the Park and Facilities Master Plan will ensure the distribution of the benefit of these funds across the community.

Other funding sources available to the City for certain projects include redevelopment funding. Projects within established or future redevelopment areas could be financed against future tax income resulting from a revitalized project area. Similarly the Napa River Flood Control Project includes funds to replace enhance the recreation opportunities along near the river impacted by this major infrastructure project. Projects in the Oxbow Commons Bypass will largely be funded as part of this project. From time to time, additional capital funding for specific projects is provided by State and Federal grant programs. None of these sources of capital funding provide any ongoing maintenance funding for new facilities.

**PROPOSED FUNDING**

As noted above, the scope and scale of the recommended projects makes funding the plan on a pay-as-you-go basis impossible. There are a wide variety of potential funding sources that the City could pursue for funding park and recreation facilities. These include government and private grant programs and a variety of funding districts and bond authorizations. A descriptive list of potential funding sources is provided in Appendix C.

Project phasing will be critical to preparing for major projects and developing the public support necessary to pass a capital campaign. To provide the up-front funding for master planning and other preparatory projects, the City should draw on the existing impact fee funds and contribute additional capital funds from the general fund. If possible, the
funding should be used to match grant program funding, leveraging the existing money to extend as far as possible.

When the first phase of projects is underway, the City should consider the form of capital funding most appropriate to moving forward in the expansion of the park system. The most straight-forward method would be to refer a general obligation bond for voter authorization. This approach could provide the necessary capital funding and could free up general funds that were being used for park capital items for increases to the maintenance budget. An alternative approach would be to explore the creation of a city-wide landscape and lighting district. The landscape and lighting district offers a significant advantage over a general obligation bond levy in that the funding stream continues and can be split between capital and maintenance purposes as needed.

With the key first steps identified, the City of Napa can begin to move forward. As implementation of the plan progresses, the tools and criteria provided can help the City Council, the Park and Recreation Commission and City staff adjust the course to best fit the needs of the community.

**PROJECT PRIORITIZATION**

The total cost of the recommended projects exceeds the City’s ability to fund using the existing sources. The decision making tools and other decision criteria described above are provided to guide the decisions of the community, the City Council, the Park and Recreation Commission and City staff in making the difficult decisions about what projects to move forward with.

Based on the current situation, tools and criteria above, this plan recommends that the City of Napa should begin with a package of projects that combines preparation for future improvements with on-the-ground enhancements to existing parks. This will make up a first phase of implementation that builds support for major funding efforts that will take years to complete. A first step is to initiate the site master planning of several key park sites. These master plans will ensure that the improvements to Napa’s largest and most important sites can be phased in and will result in the facilities most needed by the community. Another of the high profile first projects should include adding at least three water features to existing parks. These facilities have the potential to generate a large amount of excitement about the existing parks. The City should also
begin to address playground reinvestment with the funds identified in the
current year’s budget and work to expand playground replacement to other
parts of the city. At the same time, it is crucial that the relationship
between the City and the School District continue to make the best use of
the substantial investment the community has made in recreation facilities.
These projects will move the City toward being ready to develop a number
of major projects, build excitement about the possibilities and prove the
commitment to long-term sustainability.

PHASING

This first thrust of projects could be completed over the next 3 years to set
the stage for a potential bond campaign to fund the second phase of
projects. The implementation of bond projects, and possibly multiple bond
measures, will take the full attention of City staff for the next 5 to 10 years
or more. Remaining projects form a third phase of project implementation
that will continue following the major capital campaign.

The first phase of projects will be the up-front investment that the City
needs to make prior to and during the run-up to a bond vote. In addition to
design and construction of new park features, this first phase includes the
critical partnership development work with the School District. Table 7.5
lists the major projects and extracts the planning cost for the key first
steps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master Plans: Kennedy Park, Fuller Park</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan: Multi-Generational Community Center</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Designs: Century Oaks, Las Flores, Garfield Park</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Replacements (4)¹</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park Design and Construction²</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Play Features (3)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Partnership³</td>
<td>NIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PLANNING COST: PHASE 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,725,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Buhman Park and Laurel Park playground replacements funded in current budget two
additional sites should be selected in other parts of Napa based on the playground
replacement priority list developed by Park and Recreation Services Staff.
² Planning cost figure is based on design of both Kennedy Park skate park and a plaza
type park intended for river bypass and first phase construction of one or the other
³ No capital cost, primarily staff time
The first phase balances important preparatory planning and actions. Some of these projects can be funded using already collected development fee funds and others, such as the bypass skate park and two of the playground replacements, have funding associated with them already. This package of projects sets up an opportunity to request authorization for bond funding from the residents of Napa.

The proposed second phase is made up of a mix of projects that will have wide appeal to the community. The exact mix of projects should be determined by campaign specific outreach and polling. Because the number or scale of facilities will be determined later, this phase does not include planning costs. This phase will likely be the largest single portion of the projects during plan implementation.

**Table 7.6**

**Proposed Second Phase of Projects:**
Park and Facilities Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Generation Community Center Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Fields at Kennedy Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Skate Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Replacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Garfield Park, South Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Picnic Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment of Pelusi Recreation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Play Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Neighborhood/Community Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phase could potentially be broken down into two or more bond measures. The total of the capital funding for this phase will likely be more than $25 million.
The third phase of projects represents the ongoing improvements and enhancements to the park system. The types of projects in this phase include:

- Playground replacements;
- New neighborhood parks;
- New community parks;
- Local park improvements; and
- Recreational fields.

All of the projects recommended in this plan are important and should continue to be considered, even if other projects are moved ahead in the initial prioritization process. There are many factors at play and as time passes, opportunities will arise that could shift these decisions. These tools are intended to provide flexibility to the plan to allow the City to adapt to changing situations while continuing to pursue the envisioned park system.
VIII. CONCLUSION

In many areas, from neighborhoods to the downtown core, the City of Napa is looking to intensify development as an alternative to growing outward. Within the park system, expanding the capacity of current parks and adding new parks within developed neighborhoods will be the new challenge. The Park and Facilities Master Plan is an important first step in the process of creating the park system that will best serve Napa into the future. The local park access analysis focuses the effort to add new parks to the system. Community input adds valuable information about how citizens of Napa view their city, and what is important to them. The ideas distilled from the impressive community involvement in this planning process have demonstrated a need for a more engaging, relevant park system. To make this happen, the community’s priorities have been converted into easy to use tools that will guide immediate and long-term improvements to parks and recreation opportunities in Napa.

During the Park and Facilities Master Plan Process, the City has created a great deal of public interest and momentum. The Plan lays out a process to build this drive into strong community support for improvements to the park system that will benefit generations of Napa residents. It is very important to continue the energy and community interest in parks and recreation beyond the adoption of this planning document. While the planning process has come to its completion, this process is only the beginning of the effort.

The path from the existing park system to the establishment of the full range of facilities envisioned by this community and recommended in this plan will take years to travel. The Park and Facilities Master Plan will provide a guide, but it is up to the community to see it through. Volunteerism, service on the Park and Recreation Commission and other citizen boards and task forces and collaboration with City staff and other public agencies will be critical. The ultimate result of the community’s efforts will be a park system that is a showcase of Napa’s commitment to natural beauty, health, sustainability and most of all, fun.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


The Napa County League of Governments (NCLOG). Principles for Creating a Healthy, Viable and Sustainable Napa County.


Napa Valley Unified School District. http://www2.nvusd.k12.ca.us


