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## Introduction

A Complete Parks system is a system of parks that (1) provides all residents with easy access to a great park that fulfills each community’s needs for nature, open space, and recreational activities, recognizing that there is no one-size-fits-all solution; (2) closes the gaps in parks access and quality by improving parks in neglected places and increasing park area for groups with the least access and the greatest need; and (3) supports health and health equity by creating the conditions for all people to attain their full health potential. The following *Complete Parks Model Resolution*provides sample language that a city or county government can use to commit to creating a Complete Parks system.

The *Complete Parks Model Resolution* establishes a local jurisdiction’s commitment to developing the 7 elements of a safe, connected, and healthy parks system described in the [*Complete Parks Playbook*](http://changelabsolutions.org/publications/complete-parks) and can be used in conjunction with ChangeLab Solutions’ [*Complete Parks Indicators*](http://changelabsolutions.org/publications/complete-parks-indicators) or on its own. The *Complete Parks Model Resolution* is intended for local government staff and community advocates who want to improve parks in their neighborhood and raise the profile of parks as a priority local issue, as well as for government staff across sectors.

## What is a resolution?

A resolution is a policy that is adopted by a legislative body, such as a city council or county board of commissioners. Resolutions are generally used to

* Set official government policy;
* Direct internal government operations;
* Establish a task force or committee to study an issue and propose next steps;
* Accomplish short-term tasks;
* Issue commendations; or
* Identify and suggest desirable actions that businesses and other nongovernmental organizations can pursue to improve the community.

While resolutions do not become part of a municipal code, they do set official government policy. By articulating policy goals for staff across city or county departments, resolutions can lead to substantive changes in a range of government processes that are affected by the policy. A resolution with clear, specific steps can direct government agencies, departments, or officials to address all 7 Complete Parks elements and create a more equitable parks system within a given time period. A resolution can also establish a lead entity responsible for implementing the Complete Parks system and make that entity accountable to the legislative body (eg, the city council) that adopted the resolution.

## Why adopt a Complete Parks resolution?

A Complete Parks resolution is a valuable resource for local policymakers and agency staff who wish to increase multisector collaboration across local government, improve community engagement, and ensure that all communities benefit from parks and recreation.

This model resolution provides a clear framework and process for cities and counties to develop a comprehensive and actionable plan that incorporates the 7 elements of a Complete Parks system. The ultimate goal of this Complete Parks plan is to create an equitable parks system. A Complete Parks system prioritizes parks infrastructure and programming in underserved areas of the jurisdiction that lack adequate parks and green spaces.

Because the process outlined in this Complete Parks resolution is defined by meaningful, ongoing community engagement, this model resolution is also valuable for community advocates and organizers seeking commitment and action by local government to create safe, connected, healthy, and equitable parks systems and neighborhoods in partnership with communities. Their involvement helps ensure that low-income and underserved communities and populations have influence on decisions about how their parks are designed and maintained and the types of programs and activities that best suit the communities’ needs.

Specifically, this model resolution

* Enumerates the clear health, environmental, social, and economic benefits of having a robust and equitable parks system;
* Formally commits a city or county to improving its parks system in a manner that improves community health and reduces health inequities;
* Establishes a Complete Parks commission and identifies a lead agency or office to oversee a parks system assessment and to develop and implement a Complete Parks plan within a set timeframe;
* Endorses a comprehensive community engagement process as well as representation of relevant neighborhoods, groups, and public agencies on the Complete Parks commission; and
* Requires the Complete Parks commission to identify benchmarks for implementation of the Complete Parks plan, submit regular reports on short-term and long-term implementation to the legislative body, regularly evaluate the status of the jurisdiction’s parks system, and report on progress toward full implementation and on evaluation results.

In addition, this model resolution is designed to align with existing grant programs of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, which have previously prioritized funding for the creation and expansion of safe neighborhood parks in park-poor neighborhoods.[[1]](#endnote-2)

Creating a Complete Parks plan through the process set forth in this resolution can set clear guidelines for how to apply for and manage grant funding by assessing a jurisdiction’s park needs and developing and implementing park improvement plans in a community-driven, equitable way.

## Who are the stakeholders in a Complete Parks resolution?

Here is a list of stakeholders that might be interested in pursuing adoption of a Complete Parks resolution to improve their community’s health and environmental, social, and economic well-being:

* Elected leaders and officials
* Parks and recreation departments, planning departments, public health departments, public safety departments, and transportation and public works departments
* Advocates; local public health and environmental health organizations; and community, neighborhood, and social service providers
* Community, economic, and workforce development agencies; public housing authorities and nonprofit and private developers; and school organizations and educational institutions

## Using this model resolution

This model resolution demonstrates a jurisdiction’s commitment to providing residents with the many health, social, economic, environmental, and other benefits of parks. The resolution establishes a jurisdictional commitment to adopting and implementing a Complete Parks plan by (1) making parks a policy priority throughout municipal departments and (2) devoting resources and staff to development and implementation of a Complete Parks plan and, ultimately, a Complete Parks system as described in this policy. This model resolution can and should be tailored to fit the specific needs of a jurisdiction or a particular community.

The language provided in brackets explains the type of information that needs to be inserted in the ordinance (in italic type) or provides different options or ranges (in roman type)—e.g., [*local colors*] or [black/white] or [24-36]. The Comment boxes provide additional information and explanation, and should be deleted before the policy is adopted. One purpose of including a variety of options is to stimulate broad thinking about the types of provisions a community might wish to explore, even beyond those described in the model. In considering which options to choose, drafters should balance park benefits against practical political considerations in their jurisdiction. We encourage you to visit our website for more [Complete Parks resources](http://changelabsolutions.org/publications/complete-parks).

## Conclusion

All people, no matter where they live, should benefit from a park where they can connect with neighbors, nature, and activities that matter to them. Realizing the full range of benefits of a Complete Parks system is a long-term proposition that requires ongoing commitment from every part of local government as well as community advocates and residents. By recognizing shared goals, collaborating well, and coordinating their efforts, public agencies can work with communities to ensure that public policies and resources work toward the creation of a Complete Parks system. This model resolution is intended to aid that process by equipping local governments with a tool to record their commitment to creating a Complete Parks system and providing community advocates with model language they can propose for policymakers and elected officials to use to improve parks through an equitable, community-driven process.

## COMPLETE PARKS MODEL RESOLUTION (WITH EXPLANATORY COMMENTS)

Resolution No. [\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_]

**A RESOLUTION OF THE [CITY COUNCIL/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS] OF THE [*JURISDICTION*] ADOPTING A COMPLETE PARKS POLICY**

**PREAMBLE**

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** The “Whereas” clauses below explain the underlying reasons for adopting this resolution and a Complete Parks Policy, providing the legal rationale for the local council or board to take legislative action. In addition, these statements can serve as useful talking points for policymakers and other stakeholders. These clauses can be amended as desired to fit the particular circumstances of your jurisdiction. The footnotes, which provide an evidentiary basis for the clauses, should be deleted from the final version. |

**WHEREAS,** parks can create more vibrant, healthy, safe, and equitable communities by improving physical health and mental health; providing environmental benefits; increasing social and economic opportunities; and promoting community cohesion;

**WHEREAS,** a Complete Parks System is a system of parks that

* Provides all residents with easy access to a great park that fulfills each community’s needs for nature, open space, and recreational activities, recognizing that there is no one-size-fits-all solution;
* Closes the gaps in parks access and quality by improving parks in neglected places and increasing park area for groups with the least access and the greatest need; and
* Supports health and health equity by incorporating holistic health into how parks are distributed, operated, and used by people and communities;

**WHEREAS,** research has repeatedly found that parks improve residents’ mental and physical health as evidenced by the following:

* Residents who live within walking distance or have easy access to a park are more likely to use parks, have higher physical activity levels, and are less likely to be obese than those who live farther away;[[2]](#endnote-3)
* Residents who maintain an active lifestyle suffer fewer chronic diseases and benefit from reduced mortality risks;[[3]](#endnote-4)
* Parks improve mental health by facilitating connections among friends, family, neighbors, and other social networks that can provide emotional support;[[4]](#endnote-5),[[5]](#endnote-6)
* Parks improve mental health by providing natural settings and green spaces for exercise,[[6]](#endnote-7) quiet reflection, and relaxation;[[7]](#endnote-8)

**WHEREAS,** research has repeatedly found that parks provide numerous environmental benefits, as evidenced by the following:

* Park plants and vegetation absorb air pollutants[[8]](#endnote-9) and help reduce air temperatures and the harmful effects of urban heat islands;[[9]](#endnote-10)
* Parks absorb rainwater, improve water filtration systems, and assist in storm water management;8
* Parks and recreation facilities can improve a community’s ability to withstand and recover from natural disasters by doubling as flood control areas, mitigating pollution from storm water runoff, lessening heating effects in urban areas, and serving as emergency centers and staging areas during excessive heating or cooling events or during natural disasters or other community emergencies;[[10]](#endnote-11)

**WHEREAS,** parks create opportunities for neighbors and families to interact and build community ties, which leads to greater civic engagement and volunteerism;[[11]](#endnote-12),[[12]](#endnote-13)

**WHEREAS,** investments in park facilities and park programming can increase park and neighborhood safety by providing healthy and positive activities that deter antisocial behavior, improving community cohesiveness, and encouraging greater use;[[13]](#endnote-14)

**WHEREAS,**parks that provide a range of amenities and features and are well maintained, accessible, aesthetically pleasing, and safe are used at higher rates, which in turn maximizes potential health and other benefits for residents;[[14]](#endnote-15)

**WHEREAS,** parks provide significant economic benefits as evidenced by the following:

* Parks generate additional economic activity, attracting homeowners, providing jobs, and increasing property values and tax revenues;[[15]](#endnote-16),[[16]](#endnote-17)
* Local parks and recreation generated over $15 billion in economic transactions, 118,677 jobs, and roughly $6.5 billion in salaries, wages, and benefits in California in 2015;[[17]](#endnote-18)
* Park improvements can lead to increases in property value for nearby property owners;[[18]](#endnote-19),[[19]](#endnote-20)

**WHEREAS,**increases in property value for nearby property owners as a result of park improvements can lead to gentrification;[[20]](#endnote-21),[[21]](#endnote-22)

**WHEREAS,** local governments should be sensitive to and proactive in addressing concerns that park improvements may contribute to gentrification and subsequent displacement of existing residents, undermining their ability to enjoy park improvements designed for their benefit;

**WHEREAS,**there is a need for the benefits of parks to be distributed equitably throughout the community as evidenced by the following:

* Residents from low-income areas,[[22]](#endnote-23) disadvantaged communities,[[23]](#endnote-24) and communities of color typically have less access than their white and high-income counterparts to high-quality public parks, and the parks they do have access to often are smaller, are less well maintained, and offer fewer amenities;4,[[24]](#endnote-25),[[25]](#endnote-26)
* Children of color living in poverty are much less likely to have access to public parks or school playing fields than white children and children from higher-income families;[[26]](#endnote-27)

**WHEREAS,** a Complete Parks System is marked by a collaborative approach between government sectors to improve all aspects of park facilities and programs and to prioritize equity and community engagement in doing so;

**WHEREAS,** policies implemented by municipal and county departments and agencies outside the traditional parks and recreation sector can significantly affect the development of a Complete Parks System, including policies related to health, housing, land use, transportation, public safety, education, sustainability, climate change, air and water quality, criminal justice, and economic development;

**WHEREAS,** park improvements can lead to better collaboration between government agencies and better relations between government agencies and communities, as evidenced by the following:

* Community involvement in park assessments, planning, and management leads to improved decisionmaking as well as greater community investment in and use of parks;[[27]](#endnote-28)
* Collaboration between and among municipal and county departments and agencies can lead to improved decisionmaking and outcomes, as well as greater efficiency in providing government services;[[28]](#endnote-29)

**WHEREAS**, by adopting a Complete Parks Policy, the [City/County] recognizes that all [City/County] departments and agencies have a role to play in achieving a Complete Parks System;

**WHEREAS**, creating a Complete Parks System requires valuing everyone equally, in part through focused and ongoing societal efforts to address avoidable inequalities, historical and contemporary injustices, and health and health care disparities;[[29]](#endnote-30)

**WHEREAS,** this Resolution reflects the community engagement and collaboration of [*Name(s) of Local Community/Advocacy Group(s)*], and the [*Jurisdiction*] acknowledges [its/their] hard work and effort in advancing this Resolution;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the [City Council*/Local Legislative Body*] of [*Jurisdiction*], State of [\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_], as follows:**

1. That the [*Jurisdiction*] adopts the Complete Parks Policy attached hereto as Exhibit A and made part of this Resolution, effective immediately;
2. That the next substantive revision of the [*Jurisdiction*]’s General Plan and any elements thereof (e.g., Housing Element or Circulation Element) [and *additional relevant long-term municipal planning documents—e.g., Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Plan, or Transit Plan*]shall expressly support the Complete Parks Policy and eliminate any conflicts with the policies set forth in the Complete Parks Policy.

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This provision ensures that when jurisdictions undertake the next update of their general plan (or any part of the general plan) or other long-range plans that could affect the Complete Parks Policy, the updated plan will reflect and support the goals of the Complete Parks Policy. |

The [City/County] Clerk shall certify the adoption of this Resolution by the [City Council*/Local Legislative Body*].

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of the [*Jurisdiction*], State of [­­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_], on [*Date*], 20[\_\_], by the following vote: [\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_].

Attachment: Exhibit A

## EXHIBIT A

## COMPLETE PARKS POLICY OF [*JURISDICTION*]

### PURPOSE

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This section establishes and explains the goals of the policy. Should any issue arise as to the meaning of a particular provision of the policy, this section can guide its interpretation. |

The purpose of this Policy is to demonstrate [*Jurisdiction’s*] commitment to providing all residents with the many health, social, economic, environmental, and other benefits of parks by (1) making parks a policy priority throughout all agency departments, and (2) devoting financial and personnel resources to the development and implementation of a Complete Parks Plan and, ultimately, a Complete Parks System as described in this Policy.

### DEFINITIONS

1. “Complete Parks Plan” means a comprehensive plan, developed pursuant to the process set forth in Section F below, for achieving a Complete Parks System.
2. “Complete Parks System” means a system of parks that (1) provides all residents with easy access to a great park that fulfills each community’s needs for nature, open space, and recreational activities, recognizing that there is no one-size-fits-all solution; (2) closes the gaps in parks access and quality by improving parks in neglected places and increasing park area for groups with the least access and the greatest need; and (3) supports health and health equity by creating the conditions for all people to attain their full health potential.
3. “Park” means an accessible outdoor space intended for public use. Leisure, social, and physical activities are common in parks, which may also be used in other ways determined by the community. Parks can be publicly or privately owned land and take many forms, such as plazas, fields, or parklets.

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This definition includes privately owned land that is open to the public for recreational use for free as such land serves the same public purpose regardless of ownership. Such public use of private land can be achieved through shared use agreements—also called joint use or community use agreements—whereby schools or other public agencies, or sometimes private or nonprofit organizations, agree to open or broaden access to their facilities for community use. Shared use can take place on a formal basis (based on a written, legal document) or on an informal basis (based on historical practice) and can be an effective tool in under-resourced neighborhoods where a lack of funding prevents the development of new recreational spaces. For more information on the wide-ranging benefits of shared use, see ChangeLab Solutions’ [shared use resources](http://www.changelabsolutions.org/unlocking-possibilities) or the [Joint Use Statewide Task Force’s](http://www.jointuse.org/) website. |

1. “Park-Poor Area” means either (1) any area with a radius of a half mile that has a ratio of less than 3 acres of park space per 1,000 residents, according to the California State Parks Community Fact Finder (“Community Fact Finder”) or (2) any area with a radius of a half mile that has a median income of less than 80 percent of California’s median income ($47,331 in 2010), according to the Community Fact Finder.

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This definition conforms to the language and requirements of existing grant programs of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, which prioritize funding for projects supporting local parks in Park-Poor Areas.[[30]](#endnote-31)  Communities can use mapping and demographic data from the California [Community Fact Finder](http://www.parksforcalifornia.org/communities) to calculate the park acreage and median income of areas with a radius of a half mile. For more information, see the [Community Fact Finder information page](https://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=26166). |

1. “Resolution” means the Complete Parks Resolution passed by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of the [*Jurisdiction*], State of [­­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_], on [*Date*], 20[\_\_].

### ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMPLETE PARKS COMMISSION

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** The purpose of this section is to create a new public body that has sufficient authority, resources, and accountability to effectively establish a Complete Parks System as envisioned by this policy. The Commission, as designated below, does not include members from the jurisdiction’s legislative body. However, this section could be amended to include representation from the jurisdiction’s legislative body, provided such representation does not constitute a quorum of the legislative body. |

1. A Complete Parks Commission (“Commission”) is established for the purpose of implementing the Resolution and this Policy and shall comprise the following members:

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This model policy uses the term “Commission” to emphasize the importance of the undertaking and the fact that the Commission is intended to be an ongoing entity with long-term responsibilities. Communities, however, may choose to use a different term that is consistent with local custom, such as “Task Force,” “Committee,” or “Working Group.” |

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** In the event that a jurisdiction has an existing parks commission, a provision should be added that either dissolves that commission or absorbs it into the newly created Complete Parks Commission. |

1. The Director (or designee) of the Department of Parks and Recreation, who shall serve as Chair;
2. The Director (or a designated senior staff member) of the following [departments/agencies]: Public Health, Planning, Transportation, Public Works, Police, Fire or Public Safety, and [*add any additional relevant department or agency*];

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** The Complete Parks framework uses an interdepartmental approach similar to [Health in All Policies](http://changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/From-Start-to-Finish_HIAP_Guide-FINAL-20150729_1_0.pdf) for the creation and operation of the Complete Parks Commission. While management of parks usually falls under the immediate jurisdiction of the Parks and Recreation department, virtually every municipal department has responsibilities that can affect the design, development, renovation, maintenance, safety, quality, or accessibility of public parks. Thus, it is important to include all of the departments listed above in order to ensure that this policy is fully and effectively implemented. Communities may want to include additional relevant departments, such as Senior/Elder Services, Community or Human Services, Economic Development, Finance, Library, or Housing. However, the advantages of broader departmental participation may need to be balanced against the potential for inefficiencies if the Commission has a large number of members. |

1. [*If applicable, people whose primary role is to coordinate efforts across departments at the city, county, or regional level, such as a* Bicycle *and/or* Pedestrian[Coordinator/Manager]];

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** Many jurisdictions employ a staff person who is responsible for helping to implement plans and policies relating to the various Complete Parks elements. While such staff members are typically referred to as coordinators, they may have other titles. Bicycle or pedestrian coordinators, for example, can substantially assist with issues relating to access to parks and walking or biking activities within a park. Other types of coordinators can advance other elements and promote collaboration across sectors. |

1. A School District Liaison;

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** As noted above in Section B, many municipalities have augmented their park offerings by entering into shared use or joint use agreements with schools. Including a liaison from the school district, if the school district can make such a person available, would facilitate such collaboration. |

1. County or Special District Liaisons;

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** County health, parks, or social service departments or agencies, as well as special districts (e.g., a regional parks district or water resources district) may also be able to contribute to the work of the Commission. Including a county and/or special district liaison, if available, would facilitate such collaboration. |

1. Community representatives, who shall comprise at least 25 percent of the total number of Commissioners. Community representatives shall reflect the [City/County]’s geographic, ethnic, racial, socioeconomic, gender, and age diversity, with priority placed on including representatives from Park-Poor Areas. The community representatives shall be appointed by the [City Council/Mayor/Board of Supervisors] prior to the first meeting and shall serve staggered, renewable two-year terms.

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** Community representatives are a critical component of the Commission because they are key to ensuring that the views of residents whom the parks are designed to serve are adequately represented. The community representatives may also be organizational representatives, including representatives of community development corporations, parent-teacher associations, neighborhood groups, farmers market initiatives, garden clubs, chambers of commerce, small business associations, etc. |

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** If possible, jurisdictions should consider whether to provide a stipend or honorarium for community representatives. Providing financial compensation not only signals the importance of the responsibility but also makes it easier for community members to participate and devote significant time to their responsibilities.  If evening meeting times will be important to securing participation of community representatives, an evening meeting time requirement can be added to section C(2) below. |

1. The Complete Parks Commission shall convene its first meeting no later than [30-45] days from the effective date of the Resolution and shall meet on a monthly basis for the first [12-24] months, and [every two months/quarterly] thereafter, until its purpose has been fulfilled and this Policy has been fully implemented. All meetings of the Complete Parks Commission shall be open to the public and shall comply with the requirements of the Brown Act (California Government Code Sections 54950 through 54959, inclusive).

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** Since the task of creating and implementing a Complete Parks Plan is envisioned as a long-term commitment, the Commission may wish to spend the first few meetings laying the foundation for its future work. General best practices include setting future meeting times and dates, adopting rules of order, establishing a system for recording and distributing minutes, establishing a timeline for the work of the Commission, and building stakeholder commitment. A reasonable timeline for the first year might look like this:   * Months 1-2: Create Commission, address logistical and organization issues, establish timeline, and assign general duties * Months 3-6: Complete preliminary assessment (Section E below) * Months 7-10: Complete development of the Complete Parks Plan (Section F below) * Months 11-12: Begin implementation of the Complete Parks Plan   Monthly meetings are suggested for the first 12-24 months (and bimonthly or quarterly meetings thereafter), given that the most intensive work of the Commission will take place during the first two years. Jurisdictions should choose meeting schedules that work for all Commissioners. |

### COMPLETE PARKS COMMISSION DUTIES AND AUTHORIZATION

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This section establishes the duties of the Commission and authorizes the expenditure of funds needed to fulfill those duties. |

1. Consistent with Sections E-I below, the Complete Parks Commission shall be responsible for the following tasks:
   1. Conducting a preliminary assessment of the existing parks system
   2. Developing a [*Jurisdiction*] Complete Parks Plan
   3. Ongoing implementation and oversight of the Plan
   4. Reporting
2. Consistent with the purpose of the Resolution and this Policy, the [city manager/county administrator] for [Jurisdiction] is authorized to expend funds on behalf of the Complete Parks Commission so that it may fulfill its duties as set forth in this section.

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This section does not appropriate any monies; rather, it authorizes the Commission to request and the jurisdiction to expend funds that may be necessary for the Commission to carry out its duties—e.g., assessments and community outreach. |

### PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This section directs the Commission to undertake an assessment of the jurisdiction’s existing park infrastructure, programming, and services. This assessment will enable the Commission to identify areas of greatest need and will serve as a guide for prioritizing where and how resources are directed. Some jurisdictions may have already done their own assessment of parks, in which case that assessment should be referred to and built upon. |

1. The Complete Parks Commission shall undertake a preliminary assessment of the existing parks system, using [*Complete Parks Indicators: A Systems Approach to Assessing Parks*](http://changelabsolutions.org/publications/complete-parks-indicators)(“Complete Parks Indicators”).

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** *Complete Parks Indicators,* a parks system assessment tool, was developed by ChangeLab Solutions specifically to be used with this model resolution and is available for download at no charge. This tool enables a jurisdiction to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of its current parks system, using the framework set forth in the [*Complete Parks Playbook*](http://www.changelabsolutions.org/publications/complete-parks)*.* A jurisdiction may, of course, choose to use a different assessment tool. Alternate tools should, at a minimum,   * Assess the quality of individual parks as well as the quality of the parks system as a whole; * Include data from community-based sources as well as local government agencies; * Be able to identify differences in park quality, investment, and activation across neighborhoods; * Enable a community to gauge its progress toward implementation of a Complete Parks System; and * Enable the commission to work toward an equitable distribution of parks-related resources. |

1. The preliminary assessment shall be completed no later than [nine] months from the effective date of the Resolution, and a summary report shall be presented by the Commission to the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] [and Office of the Mayor] at its next regularly scheduled meeting. A summary report shall be provided to all local government agencies and community-based groups that provided data or participated in the assessment. A copy of the summary report shall be made publicly available online.

### COMPLETE PARKS PLAN

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This section directs the Commission—with public participation—to create the Complete Parks Plan and identifies the key issues that the Plan must address. |

1. Within [18] months from the effective date of the Resolution, the Complete Parks Commission shall develop a Complete Parks Plan (“Plan”), submit it to the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] [and Office of the Mayor] for official adoption, and make it publicly available online.

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** Some jurisdictions may want to require that the Plan be submitted to the legislative body for formal adoption or approval. In some jurisdictions, this approach could further cement council or board support. In others, this step might create an unnecessary delay or obstacle, since in many respects, the Plan can be self-executing without further legislative action beyond adopting the initial resolution. |

1. The Complete Parks Commission shall conduct public outreach and obtain meaningful public input on the development of the Plan, including input from all Park-Poor Areas. Public input shall include, at a minimum, two well-publicized public forums, at least one of which shall occur in a Park-Poor Area.

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** Public participation is a cornerstone in developing a Complete Parks Plan that is responsive to community needs and thus generates public enthusiasm and buy-in. Public participation can be achieved through multiple approaches, including neighborhood public forums, charrettes, online and mail surveys, opportunities for online comment, or outreach to neighborhood groups, social clubs, or various religious groups. It is essential to gain participation from Park-Poor Areas and groups whose perspectives have not normally been incorporated in public planning or decisionmaking. Municipal departments with community liaisons or community-based services staff such as health educators should also be engaged in this effort. If desired, jurisdictions can specify additional requirements in regard to the scope of outreach or incentives designed to maximize public participation, such as providing child care, refreshments, or food at public forums. |

1. The Plan shall, at a minimum, include the following:
2. A vision statement of what a Complete Parks System would look like in [*Jurisdiction*]
3. [*Jurisdiction*]’s primary goals in creating a Complete Parks System (e.g., addressing health inequities, promoting health)
4. Identification of Park-Poor Areas
5. Short-term (within one year) and long-term (within five years) implementation steps in developing a Complete Parks System, identification of personnel responsible for implementation of each step, and a timeline for implementation that prioritizes Park-Poor Areas
6. A section specifically addressing future investment in Park-Poor Areas as well as measures to address concerns related to gentrification, displacement, and/or any other community issues raised during the public outreach process
7. A section exploring opportunities for partnership with other public or private entities
8. A section identifying potential funding sources and opportunities online

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** Jurisdictions may also consider requiring the Plan to emphasize collaboration across municipal sectors where possible and to include positive visuals such as photos of local people and places that align with the Plan’s vision and represent a diversity of residents. |

### ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION, EVALUATION, AND OVERSIGHT

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This section identifies the continuing responsibilities of the Commission once the Plan is complete. |

The Complete Parks Commission shall be responsible for ongoing implementation and oversight of the Plan, including

1. Implementation of all short-term (within one year) and long-term (within five years) steps identified in the Plan, prioritizing Park-Poor Areas;
2. Evaluations:
   1. The Commission shall, within [six] months of submitting the Complete Parks Plan for adoption pursuant to Section F(1) above, establish measurable benchmarks to demonstrate that (1) government is committed to improving and maintaining all seven elements of a Complete Parks System and (2) park investments are prioritized and implemented in Park-Poor Areas;
   2. The Commission shall, within [one year] of submitting the Complete Parks Plan for adoption pursuant to Section F(1) above, and annually thereafter, collect data for the purpose of evaluating progress made with respect to the benchmarks established in Section G(2)(a) above; and
   3. The benchmarks and data required in Sections G(2)(a) and G(2)(b) shall be made publicly available online;

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** Establishing specific benchmarks and consistent data collection practices greatly increases accountability and the jurisdiction’s ability to assess progress and compliance with the resolution. Requiring benchmarks for implementation of the Complete Parks Plan in Park-Poor Areas is particularly important given that such areas have been historically neglected. For more information on setting benchmarks and collecting data, see [*Complete Parks Indicators*](https://www.changelabsolutions.org/publications/complete-parks-indicators). |

1. Oversight of funding needs and strategies to obtain funding, prioritizing Park-Poor Areas;
2. Pursuit and oversight of any partnerships with other public or private entities undertaken pursuant to the Plan;
3. Reviewing, developing, and submitting recommendations, if any, to the [*Legislative Body*] for changes or additions to land use, zoning, or other municipal laws needed to ensure consistency with the Resolution and Policy;

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** The city attorney or legal counsel for the jurisdiction should review local zoning and other laws to identify any inconsistencies with this policy and any changes that might be needed to support the Plan. For example, zoning restrictions that make it difficult to expand parks might need to be amended; other zoning or subdivision laws might need to be strengthened by requiring new subdivisions to include safe access to new or existing parks. |

1. Amending the Plan when necessary to facilitate implementation of the Complete Parks System, and providing updated versions of the Plan online; and
2. Undertaking subsequent parks assessments and planning processes pursuant to Sections E and F above every ten years.

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** Depending on available resources and the rate of progress, some jurisdictions may want their Complete Parks Commission to undertake follow-up assessments on a more frequent basis. |

### REPORTING REQUIREMENTS TO [THE MAYOR AND] [COUNCIL/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS]

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This section requires the Commission to report on progress made to local lawmakers such as the mayor, the city council, or the board of supervisors. |

Within [24-36]months of the effective date of the Resolution and annually thereafter, the Chair of the Complete Parks Commission, in consultation with the Commissioners, shall submit to the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] [and the Office of the Mayor] and make publicly available online a written report on the progress made in implementing this Policy. The report shall be based on the benchmarks and data collected pursuant to Sections G(2)(a) and G(2)(b) of this Policy and shall include the following, at a minimum:

1. The status of development of the Plan and, once completed, an overview of progress toward full implementation of the Plan
2. The status of short- and long-term implementation steps set forth in the Plan, including specific highlighting of the status of all steps designed to address Park-Poor Areas
3. The status of identification and adequacy of funding sources or steps taken to address funding needs, as well as other resources or processes that support full implementation of the Plan
4. A review and recommendations, if any, for changes or additions to land use, zoning, or other municipal laws needed to ensure consistency with and support for the goals of this Policy
5. Identification of any amendments made to the Plan pursuant to Section G(6) above
6. Identification of any further actions needed from the [*Legislative Body*] to implement the Plan

### REPORTING TO THE COMMUNITY

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** This section requires the Commission to also report directly to the community in a public forum. |

Within 30 days of the submission of a report as set forth in Section H above, two or more members of the Commission shall report to the public in at least two public forums—at least one of which is in an area identified in the Plan as a Park-Poor Area—on the progress made in developing and implementing the Plan and shall provide an opportunity for in-person public comment in any identified Park-Poor Areas and other neighborhoods identified as priority places for park improvements.

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENT:** Reporting back to the community will keep community members involved and informed, help foster and maintain community support for the work of the Commission, and provide the Commission with important feedback as it moves forward. Consistent with best practices for community engagement, jurisdictions may also want to require incentives such as those described in the comment on Section F(2) or additional reporting sessions at the locations where outreach was conducted earlier in the process pursuant to Section F(2). |
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