

Staff Report

June 1, 2006

TO: City Council

VIA: Donna Silva, Parks & Community Services Director

FROM: Michelle Wierschem, Community Services Superintendent

SUBJECT: Recreation and Park Commission Minutes, May 18, 2006

Recommendation

Receive the minutes (**Attachment A**) as information with the following exceptions:

1. Approve repair of the light controller at the Skateboard Park as follows
 - a. Repair is contingent upon Measure G passing, if Measure G does not pass then the consideration of repair should come back to the Commission for further deliberation.
 - b. Once repaired, if the controller becomes vandalized again in less than one year not to repair the controller.

2. Receive information on the Toad Hollow Dog Park from a user survey and approve the following considerations for development of a Dog Park Master Plan:
 - a. Amenities to be included in the Dog Park Master Plan: Staff recommends the following six amenities be incorporated into the development of a master plan for the Toad Hollow Dog Park:
 1. More trees
 2. Permanent benches
 3. A walking path around the perimeter
 4. A small dog area
 5. More trash cans
 6. A bulletin board

 - b. Communication and signage. Staff recommends the following changes in order to improve communication and signage:
 - An e-mail subscription list for Dog Park users
 - A Dog Park status telephone hotline
 - Open/Closed flag

- Increased signage for dog park rules
 - Add a “Toad Hollow Dog Park” sign at 2nd Street
- c. Additional potential master plan amenities: Staff recommends discussing with Davis Dog Owners Group (DDOG) inclusion of a wash station and equipment for dogs as part of the development of a master plan.
3. Approve the following approach, methodology and sequence of facilities reviewed for the Facilities Fee Study:
- a. Approve the approach of basing cost recovery and use on **User Group Classification and Type of Use**.
 - b. Approve the methodology of cost analysis to be done using the **fixed and variable cost model, usable hours and common area cost allocation on size of reservable area**.
 - c. Approve the **timing** of review of facilities by type
 - i. Fields and Picnic Areas—expected to be completed by January 31, 2007
 - ii. Pools—expected to be completed by March 31, 2007
 - iii. Indoor Facilities—expected to be completed by December 1, 2007.
 - iv. Theatres—expected to be completed by December 1, 2007
 - d. Approve appointment of Recreation and Park Commission subcommittee members Charles Russell and Cyril Juanitas to work with staff in determining **user group classification options** to present to the Commission.

Fiscal Impact

1. The estimated cost to repair the lighting controller is \$3,000 which would come out of the Vandalism/Repair Budget in Parks Division.
2. Master plan development
The fiscal impact of the development of a master plan will be the staff time needed to meet with user groups and develop the master plan. The fiscal impact and financing of the implementation of a master plan will return to the Commission at the time the master plan is presented.

Communication/Signage

Staff time will be needed to implement the e-mail subscription list and the telephone hotline. Implementation of the recommendation to install signage will require minimal resources.

3. The primary purpose of cost recovery studies is to develop equitable and reasonable fees for programs and facilities within the city. The Council and Commission worked with staff to recommend new fees for city recreation programs in 2005-2006. The recreation fee cost recovery will result in \$100,000 less in city subsidy for recreation programs than in previous years.

It is similarly possible that the facility fee study may result in further reductions of General Fund subsidy for facilities. The potential increased revenues are hard to quantify at the initiation of this study. The costs inherent in the study: staff time for research, to prepare reports and to analyze costs will be completed internally using already budgeted resources.

Council Goal(s)

The recommendations #1-4 help achieve Council goal number 4; to provide a comprehensive parks and recreation system, with both passive and active features, that addresses the needs of resident youth and adults, as well as income-generating elements for visitors.

1. Repair of the light controller at the Skateboard Park increases the amount of access youth have to this active amenity in Community Park.
2. Development of a master plan for the dog park ensures that the park is comprehensively and adequately meeting the needs of the Community for this type of park.
3. Council Goal #1—Fiscal Stability includes Goal 1.3: Conduct a systematic review of all fees and rates charged by the city to identify subsidies and most appropriate fee structures. The first portion of this systematic review—recreation fees cost recovery—has been completed and the facility study is the next component of the fee studies.

Background and Analysis

1. Almost two years ago a Council subcommittee was appointed to discuss various options for dealing with the vandalism issues occurring at the Skateboard Park. After exploring a variety of options not limited to, but including closure of the park, the following was approved by Council.
 1. Continue to operate the Skateboard Park
 2. Repair vandalism only if it creates a safety problem.
 3. Continue to staff the facility to allow beginning skateboarders to skate without interference from older, more advanced skaters.

A variety of other measures have also been taken to reduce opportunities for vandalism such as removal of the entrance gate to allow 24 hour access and allowing the light controller to be accessed and activate the lights 24 hours, seven days per week. These measures along with the removal of the kiosk have greatly reduced incidents of vandalism. There has only been one other incident of vandalism in June of 2005. Because the repair of the safety controller does not create a safety issue and due to the magnitude of cost, this request for repair is before the Council for approval to repair the controller. The Recreation and Park Commission are concerned about the outcome of Measure G and potential impacts on the City budget. Therefore the Commission is recommending that repair of the light controller be contingent upon passage of Measure G. Should Measure G fail, the Commission would like the matter to return to the Commission for further discussion.

Staff believes this to be an isolated incident and not the start of another series of vandalism incidents at the Skateboard Park. Should the controller be vandalized again in less than a year after repair, staff would not seek to repair the controller and would continue to observe the direction given by Council; thus making the Skateboard Park a day use only facility.

2. The Toad Hollow Dog Park opened for use in March of 2005. Since then the park has been one of our most popular facilities. The facility is located on Second Street in the stormwater detention basin on the portion of the property that was formerly a soccer field.

In order to prepare the area for use as a dog park, amenities such as fencing, trash containers and trees were placed on the property.

When the City Council approved the area to be used as a dog park it was agreed that a staff report detailing the operations and experiences with the area would be written after one year. Staff has also met with Davis Dog Owners Group (DDOG) representatives to discuss potential amenities to be included in a master plan for the facility.

In order to adequately report on the usage of the dog park and potential additional amenities to be included in a master plan, staff developed a dog park user survey. Dog park users were surveyed for their input on such things as potential amenities to be included in the master plan, experiences at the dog park, suggested changes, frequency of use, communication methods and travel distances/methods to get to the park. This staff report will provide a synopsis of the results of the survey and recommend some ways to implement some of the suggestions. A copy of the actual survey is in **Attachment B** of this report. The survey was provided both on-line and as a hard copy at the dog park entrance. An analysis of all survey responses was also completed by staff and is provided for your information as well.

Three hundred and eighty eight surveys were completed by users. This was a very good response and some excellent input was received. Not all respondents answered every question, so the survey analysis attachment shows fewer than 388 answers to many of the questions.

The survey results showed that 71.5 % of respondents have used the park more than 10 times and that the majority (88.6 %) are Davis residents. Most users travel to the park via car. This percentage varies from 66.7 % for those traveling less than 1 mile to 98.10 % for those traveling 2-3 miles.

Many Dog Park users, 68.2 %, are familiar with other off-leash areas in Davis with 61.1% of those using those other areas at some time. Most respondents indicated that their overall experience at Toad Hollow was average or better.

Specific questions were asked relating to additional amenities to be included in a master plan, methods of communicating to the public regarding closures and adequacy of signage. There was also an open-ended question soliciting comments that would better assist the City in better serving the users of the facility.

Amenities to include in the master plan

The master plan question on the survey listed 6 amenities. They are listed below in order of importance per the survey.

1. More trees
2. Permanent benches
3. A walking path around the perimeter
4. A small dog area
5. More trash cans
6. A bulletin board

It is staff's recommendation to work with DDOG and other interested residents to complete a master plan based upon the requests listed above and bring that information to the Recreation and Parks Commission for consideration. Staff believes that the six amenities listed should be included in the master plan. Additionally, the Commission is recommending consideration of indicating that the master plan is for Toad Hollow Park, adding a cement entrance to the park and a cement pad for seasonal placement of a portable toilet.

Communication & Signage

Last winter the Dog Park was closed for several extended periods due to excessive rain. Information regarding the closures was not easily available to the public, so a question regarding dissemination of information was asked on the survey. The potential communication methods included:

1. An e-mail subscription list to Dog Park users
2. A Dog Park status hotline
3. Other methods of communication

Those choosing the e-mail subscription method totaled 71.1%, while 48.7% chose the hotline method and 17.8 % offered other suggestions. It is clear that the percentages are more than 100% for the communication questions, so clearly some respondents chose more than one communication method. Other suggested methods of communication included notices in the Davis Enterprise and Woodland Democrat, improved signage at the park entrance, and use of a flag that can be seen at a distance.

Staff recommends the e-mail subscription list, telephone hotline and open/closed flag. Staff will work on the hotline and e-mail subscription list as soon as possible, but it may take some time due to competing priorities; however, it will all be in place by the winter of 06-07 when closures are more likely to occur. Newspaper and City website information are not timely enough for closures and there can be delays in providing information via those forms of communication, while the hotline and e-mail list can be updated daily.

Staff will also work on placing more signage in various sections of the park to provide the most important information such as the requirement to pick up after your dog and that owners should remove aggressive dogs from the park immediately. Adding a sign to the entrance at 2nd street will help users locate the park.

Additional Survey Comments

The additional comments section elicited many comments. The following 12 items were mentioned by at least 5 respondents.

- 1. Drinking fountain for dogs** – Many respondents asked for an additional drinking fountain.

Staff believes that one fountain in a 2.5 acre area is adequate. There were also comments that the existing fountain was broken much of the time. Staff response is that the fountain was turned off due to possibility of frost or actual frost damage to the valves.

- 2. Add Small Dog Area** –This was mentioned 40.9% of those taking the survey as a master plan need, and was the second most requested amenity in the additional comment section.

Staff recommends adding this amenity to the master plan.

- 3. Increase/improve waste disposal** –Some feel that there is a need for more bag dispensers and more waste receptacles.

Staff will review the trash can distribution and number of cans and move cans or increase the number as required by use. Staff feels that the bag receptacles and volunteers bag provision is adequate.

- 4. Add restrooms**- Sixteen respondents asked for restrooms. Restrooms are not provided in any 2.5 acre park in the city and cannot be constructed in what is basically a floodwater detention basin.
- 5. Add shade trees**

Staff recommends adding the amenity to the master plan

- 6. Rules-**Some feel that rules need to be posted in more places and be more visible. There is also a feeling that enforcement is an issue.

Staff recommends additional signage and contacting Yolo County Animal Control regarding enforcement.

7. Add lights

This can't be done as the area is a detention basin and the EIR for the area allows for dawn to dusk operation only.

8. Add wash station for dogs

Staff recommends further discussion of this item with DDOG.

9. Add walking path

Staff recommends adding this amenity to the master plan.

10. Add wading pool/water feature

Staff does not recommend this feature as pools require a great deal of maintenance and sanitation measures.

- 11. Add equipment for dogs-**These comments suggest obstacle course style equipment, boulders etc.

Staff recommends further discussion of this item with DDOG.

12. Improved Drainage

This is very expensive and difficult as the area is a detention basin and is lower than the surrounding land. The soil is very heavy as well because much of the lighter topsoil has been removed.

There were a number of items listed fewer than 5 times and included such items as increasing parking spaces, mosquito control, and adding a second entrance. Those items are listed on the attachment as additional items wanted/suggestions. In summing up the survey process, staff believes that it was a valuable process and provided good feedback regarding potential amenities to be included in the master plan. Staff believes that Toad Hollow Dog Park is a success and that most users are appreciative and have a positive impression of the maintenance and experience.

3. A comprehensive study of recreation fee cost recovery was completed in 2005. The outcomes of the study included
 1. A Recreation Activities Cost Recovery Policy
 2. Projected reduction in General Fund subsidy of recreation programs
 3. A work plan to evaluate the impact of the new fees in general programs
 4. A plan to evaluate specific recreation programs failing to meet cost recovery goals

A similar study on operational and maintenance cost recovery for City facilities is also needed. Council has been informed that the facility study would take place after the study on recreation programs.

There are several important differences between the recreation cost recovery study and the facilities cost recovery study. First, there are various types of facilities that need review. The city has five major categories of facilities: fields, picnic areas, pools, indoor facilities and a theatre. Due to the fact that facilities have unique market niches and serve groups specific to the facility being used, the study is being grouped by similar facility type. The evaluation of costs and cost recovery goals may vary based on the type of facility.

The second major difference in the studies is that the Philosophy of Fees and Charges used in the recreation study may not translate well to the facility cost recovery study. While the City has a Philosophy of Fees and Charges it does not provide enough information or structure to fully assess cost. Therefore, in order for staff to provide beneficial information on how much of the operating and maintenance costs that the current fees are covering, more specific cost recovery goals and definition of costs are needed. Staff has identified a multi-step process for formulation of a Facilities Cost Recovery Policy and cost recovery goals. Below is an overview of the multi-step approach:

Approach

The following is a summary of each of the four steps used in the approach for the facility fee study:

1. **Identify, define and prioritize User Group Classifications:** It is recommended that cost recovery goals be organized by user groups. Examples of these type of classifications are non-profit organizations, performing arts groups, private individuals and groups, commercial groups, etc. In other jurisdictions, these classifications range from very few (1-2) to many (15-20). Staff requests a commission subcommittee to work with staff on the user group definitions and classifications. It should be noted that careful consideration needs to be given to the number of User Group Classes used to determine fees and priority of use should be kept low. Too many User Group Classes can lead to a policy that is not user friendly and can lead to processing errors and make it difficult to market rental of the facility.

2. **Designate priority use of facility purpose for fee and use policies:** It is important to the successful and equitable operation of facilities that priorities for use are developed for both fees and for scheduling use of the facilities. Fees could, for example, be assessed differently based on resident status. This step is vital to balancing cost recovery with intended utilization of the facility for community use. Usually commercial or private use of a facility can bring in more revenue, but could possibly eliminate use by non profit groups. Based on the purpose and priority use of the facility loss of non-profit rentals may not be problematic and for others facilities such as athletic fields, it clearly would pose an issue.
3. **Analyze use of facility, cost and market rate:** The expected fee recovery for a facility could vary based on the use of the facility, the inherent expense in operation of the facility, and the market for the facility. These factors will be analyzed as part of the facilities cost recovery study.
4. **Determine cost recovery and priority use by user group/use:** The final step in the facility cost recovery study will include determining cost recovery levels by user and recommend fees to achieve appropriate level of cost recovery for each facility.

During the facility cost recovery study, steps 2, 3 and 4 will be repeated as needed for each facility to determine the appropriate level of cost recovery.

Methodology

Attachment C is also helpful in envisioning how cost recovery could vary with regard to the amount of operating and maintenance costs the fee is designed to cover. The sample chart includes the varying application of variable and fixed costs. Staff recommends using this cost model as it is consistent with the recreation program fee study and much of the facility cost information and methodology can be utilized for this study. The variable costs will reflect what it cost to operate a facility from the reservation to the actual use. This cost will vary with the number of hours of use. Fixed costs will reflect the maintenance costs of the facility which would exists with or with out the facility having been rented. The increase in maintenance cost requires a large threshold of use to significantly impact the maintenance costs. Below is a chart showing types of cost items and what would be considered variable vs. fixed:

Variable Facility Costs	Facility Attendants, Lifeguards, Theater Technicians, Park Staff Preparation of Picnic Area, Field Preparation, Field Lighting,
Fixed Facility Costs	Custodial Service and Supplies, Building Repair, Building Equipment Maintenance and Replacement, Utilities, Facility Management Staff

Variable cost will be calculated on the actual cost per hour. The cost allocation for fixed costs to areas of use for each facility will be based on the size of the area of use.

Complicating the application of fixed costs is the notion of usable hours. While facilities could conceivably be used twenty four hours per day, few of the facilities are available for use at all times. Instead, each facility has a limited number of usable hours. The fixed costs should be applied across the usable hours, not just divided by a 24-hour day. It is recommended that “usable hours” be utilized to determine a cost per hour for each rentable area.

Common areas of each facility also need to be divided using a set formula. It is recommended that the cost for common areas be allocated based on the size of the reservable area for each facility.

Sequence of Facilities Studied

Staff is recommending the following sequence of review:

1. Fields/ Picnic Areas: Athletic fields and picnic areas share maintenance costs due to the fact that many athletic fields are located in parks with reservable picnic areas. Fields are being recommended to go first given recent issues surrounding rental and use of fields for practices by user groups.
2. Pools: Pool use and cost was recommended as coming next given that the exploration of adding an aquatic facility at Walnut Community Park continues. It is important to address cost recovery issues surrounding pool use to better plan for a future aquatic facility.
3. Indoor Facilities (except theaters): This includes all general rental facilities such as the Senior Center, Veteran’s Memorial Center, Chestnut Roundhouse and similar general use facilities.
4. Theaters: This study will be solely for the Veteran’s Memorial Theater.

While Indoor Facilities and the Theatre are both a source of significant maintenance and operating costs, and while they could potentially be an important source of revenue, the issues related to cost recovery at these facilities can wait until the review of fields and pools is completed. It is envisioned that both the Indoor Facilities and the Theatre will be completed in 2007-2008. There was not any specific reason to place them in #3 and #4 sequences for review and they will likely be analyzed at the same time.

Subcommittee

In an effort to identify the definitions and priority of use for User Group Classifications the Commission appointed two subcommittee members, Charles Russell and Cyril Juanitas to work with staff to prepare User Group Classes for the Commission’s review in July. The subcommittee will provide feedback on various options for user groups classifications.

Staff and the Recreation and Park Commission recommend that Council approve the facility fee study approach, methodology, sequence of facilities reviewed and use of Recreation and Park Subcommittee to work with staff in identifying user group classifications.

**Recreation and Park Commission Minutes
Davis Joint Unified School District
526 B Street
East Conference Room
Thursday, May 18, 2006**

Commission Members Present: Michael Bartolic, Michael Beckman, John Dixon (Vice-Chair), Lorraine Hwang, Cyril Juanitas, Charlie Russell (Chair), Susan Sabatier

Commission Members Absent: Lamar Heystek

Council Liaison Present: None

Staff Present: Jerilyn Cochran, Connie Foppiano, Pat Riley, Michelle Wierschem

Others Present: Janet Sitts, Pamela Alder, Jeff Dubchansky, Nicole Slaton, Christina Hooke

Chairperson Charlie Russell called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

1. **Approval of the Agenda**
The agenda was approved by consensus.
2. **Minutes of the April 20, 2006 Meeting**
The minutes were approved by consensus.
3. **Commissioner Comments**
Charlie Russell expressed his apologies for not following meeting protocol for the meeting in April.

John Dixon would like to know if the attendance by Council liaisons is optional or required. Staff will consult with the City Clerk on this matter.

4. **Presentation of Grant to Commission by GSSA for Playfields Park**
Jeff Dubchansky with the Greater Sacramento Softball Association, GSSA presented the Commission Chair with a check in the amount of \$1,000 for infield supplies for Playfields Park softball fields.

Action: Michael Bartolic moved and Cyril Juanitas seconded the motion directing staff to contact the Davis Enterprise in order to recognize and thank Greater Sacramento Softball Association for their contribution.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. **Public Communications**

None

6. **Written Communications**

Email from David Murphy, DJUSD Superintendent discussing plans for replacement of Nugget Fields at Harper Junior High School.

7. **Informational Item on Family Fun Days at Arroyo Pool**

Connie Foppiano, Community Services Manager presented a staff report on the history of the Family Fun Days event and plans to assess the event.

This item was informational only.

8. **Vandalism of Skateboard Park Light Controller**

Staff presented options for repair of the light controller for the lights at the Skateboard Park in Community Park.

Action: Michael Bartolic moved and Cyril Juanitas seconded the motion to defer repair of the controller until after the Measure G vote, and then to explore the following options and return to the Commission:

1. Repair Controller as is with out adding any other features or functions
2. Determine the cost of adding a motion sensor to activate lights
3. Calculate the cost of leaving the lights on during the dark hours of the day.

Return to the Commission with costs and pro's/con's.

1st Substitute Motion: Lorraine Hwang motioned and Susan Sabatier seconded the motion to defer repair until after measure G.

2nd Substitute Motion: Michael Bartolic moved and Lorraine Hwang seconded the motion to approve repair of the light controller contingent upon measure G passing. If measure G does not pass then the consideration of repair should come back to the Commission for further deliberation.

The motion passed unanimously.

Action: Susan Sabatier motioned and Michael Beckman seconded the motion to not repair the light controller again should it be vandalized again in less than one year after being repaired.

Motion passed 4 votes to 3 votes

Ayes: Michael Beckman, Cyril Juanitas, Charlie Russell, Susan Sabatier

Nays: Michael Bartolic, John Dixon, Lorraine Hwang

9. Dog Park Survey Analysis and Recommendations

Staff presented results of the Dog Park Survey and recommendations regarding amenities and signage to include in Dog Park Master Plan.

Action: Susan Sabatier motioned and Lorraine Hwang seconded the motion to accept staff's recommendations and consider Commission comments in development of the master plan:

- Amenities to be included in the Dog Park Master Plan: Staff recommends the following six amenities be incorporated into the development of a master plan for the Toad Hollow Dog Park:
 1. More trees
 2. Permanent benches
 3. A walking path around the perimeter
 4. A small dog area
 5. More trash cans
 6. A bulletin board
- Communication and signage. Staff recommends the following changes in order to improve communication and signage:
 - An e-mail subscription list for Dog Park users
 - A Dog Park status telephone hotline
 - Open/Closed flag
 - Increased signage for dog park rules
 - Add a "Toad Hollow Dog Park" sign at 2nd Street
- Additional potential master plan amenities: Staff recommends discussing with Davis Dog Owners Group (DDOG) inclusion of a wash station and equipment for dogs as part of the development of a master plan.

Commission comments:

1. Clarify this is the "Toad Hollow Park" master plan.
2. Consider adding a cement entrance to the dog park.
3. Consider adding a cement pad for placement of a portable toilet.

The motion passed unanimously.

10. Facility Fee and Use Study Overview

Staff presented the approach, methodology and sequence of facilities to be reviewed for the Facility Fee and Use Study and recommended appointment of a subcommittee to work with staff on forming User Group Classes.

Action: Cyril Juanitas moved and John Dixon seconded the motion to accept staff recommendations:

1. Approve the approach of basing cost recovery and use on **User Group Classification and Type of Use.**
2. Approve the methodology of cost analysis to be done using the **fixed and variable cost model, usable hours and common area cost allocation on size of reservable area.**

3. Approve the **timing** of review of facilities by type
 - a. Fields and Picnic Areas—expected to be completed by January 31, 2007
 - b. Pools—expected to be completed by March 31, 2007
 - c. Indoor Facilities—expected to be completed by December 1, 2007.
 - d. Theatres—expected to be completed by December 1, 2007
4. Appoint a subcommittee to work with staff in determining **user group classification options** to present to the Commission.

The motion passed unanimously.

11. Informational Update on Park Tax

Jerilyn Cochran, Deputy Director Parks & Community Services updated the Commission on the latest developments with Measure G, the Parks Tax.

This item was informational only.

13. Verbal Updates

- Liaison Reports- Michael Bartolic reported that the Open Space Commission has been focusing on an easement for 160-200 acres of Swainson's Hawk habitat. Additionally, the Open Space Commission is interested in getting an update on the Howatt Ranch Sport Complex project.
- Parks and Community Services Staff
 - Announced that the computer system that supports RecTrac online registration is being upgraded to enhance performance of the system during peak periods of registration.
 - City staff has been serving on the School District's Wellness Committee in formation of the District's Wellness Policy and support concepts of the policy in recreation programming.
 - Expected construction timeline for construction of the East Mace Ranch Neighborhood Park was provided to the Commission.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Russell at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Michelle Wierschem
Community Services Superintendent

Toad Hollow Dog Park Survey

[Exit this survey >>](#)

The purpose of this survey is to determine how many people are utilizing the Dog Park, when it is used and if any additional features are needed. The information from the survey will be used to formulate a Dog Park Master Plan for the City. The survey results will also help point to features that may be included in future dog park projects. The survey has 17 questions and will take less than 5 minutes to complete. Thank you for assisting the Parks and Community Services department with improving services provided to residents.

1. How many times have you used the Toad Hollow Dog Park?

- Once
- Twice
- Three to five times
- Six to ten times
- If more than ten times, please specify

2. If you are a regular user of the park, how often do you visit?

- More than once per day
- Daily
- 2-3 times per week
- Once per week
- Less than once per week
- I am not currently a regular user of the park

3. How many dogs do you normally bring to the park?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- Other (please specify)

4. Do you see the need for a separate "small" dogs area?

- Yes No

5. What time of day are you usually at the park?

Time of day: :

6. What mode of transportation do you use when traveling to the park?

- Walk
- Car
- Bike
- Other, please specify _____

7. How far do you typically travel?

- Less than 1 Mile
- About 1 Mile
- About 2-3 Miles
- If more than 3 miles, please specify approximate distance in miles: _____

8. Are you a Davis resident?

- Yes
- No, please specify the city in which you live _____

9. Are you familiar with the other off-leash areas in Davis?

- Yes No

10. If familiar with the other off-leash areas, do you use them?

- Yes No

11. Which other off-leash areas do you use? (Check all that apply)

- Aspen Greenbelt
- Community Park
- Pioneer Park
- Slide Hill Park
- Sycamore Park
- Walnut Park
- I do not currently use any of the other off-leash areas

12. How often do you use the other off-leash areas?

- More than once per day
- Daily
- 2-3 times per week
- Once per week
- Less than once per week

I do not currently use any of the other off-leash areas

[Next >>](#)

Toad Hollow Dog Park Survey

[Exit this survey >>](#)

13. On a scale of 1-5 (1 being the best experience and 5 the worst) rate your overall experience at the Toad Hollow Dog Park.

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. The city of Davis is currently working on a Master Plan for the Toad Hollow Dog Park. A Master Plan describes the need for community amenities and develops the timing and priority of proposed elements in City facilities. The following 6 items might be included in this Master Plan. Please rate these items in order of importance to you. Number 1 will be the most important and number 6 will be the least important.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Walking path around inner perimeter of the park fence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bulletin board	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Permanent benches	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More trees	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Separate small dog area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More trash cans	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. The current on-site signage and city of Davis website (www.cityofdavis.org) offer information about when the park is closed due to high water or maintenance activities. Is this information adequate to inform you of these closures?

Yes

No

16. If you answered no, which of these additional notification methods would you suggest to better inform the public of closures?

- An e-mail subscription list to dog park users
- A dog park status telephone hotline
- Other (please specify)

17. Do you have any additional comments that would assist the City in better serving the users of this facility?

Thank You for participating in the survey. The results of the survey will be posted on the city of Davis website (www.cityofdavis.org) in April 2006.

[<< Prev](#) [Done >>](#)

Example- Not Actual Proposed Cost Recovery

Level of Cost Recovery on which Facility Use Fee is Based

Attachment C

Priority of Use	User Group Class	Type of Use	COST										
			Athletic Fields Variable	Athletic Fields Fixed	Picnic Areas Variable	Picnic Areas Fixed	Pools Variable	Pools Fixed	General Rental Facilities Variable	General Rental Facilities Fixed	Theaters Variable	Theaters Fixed	
1	City	City Sponsored Use	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	School District	School Sponsored Use	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	Other Public Agencies	Non Revenue Generating	50%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	25%	0%	100%	0%	
4	Other Public Agencies	Revenue Generating	100%	0%	50%	0%	100%	25%	100%	50%	100%	50%	
5	Non-Profit Resident	Non Revenue Generating	5%	105%	50%	0%	100%	100%	50%	150%	50%	50%	
6	Non-Profit Resident	Revenue Generating	50%	150%	50%	0%	100%	100%	100%	200%	100%	100%	
7	Non-Profit, Non-Resident	Non Revenue Generating	75%	175%	75%	0%	100%	100%	100%	200%	100%	100%	
8	Non-Profit, Non-Resident	Revenue Generating	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	100%	100%	200%	100%	100%	
9	Private User, Resident	Non Revenue Generating	100%	50%	100%	50%	100%	25%	100%	90%	100%	50%	
10	Private User, Resident	Revenue Generating	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%	
11	Private User, Non-Resident	Non Revenue Generating	100%	100%	100%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
12	Private User, Non-Resident	Revenue Generating	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	
13	Commercial, Resident	Non Revenue Generating	100%	75%	100%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
14	Commercial, Resident	Revenue Generating	100%	75%	100%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
15	Commercial, Non-Resident	Non Revenue Generating	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%	
16	Commercial, Non-Resident	Revenue Generating	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	100%	