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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Downtown San Jose and the Guadalupe River Park (GRP) will undergo major changes within the next decade, including the redevelopment of the Diridon Station, the BART expansion into downtown, and the construction of the Google Downtown West Campus. In addition to significant changes to the physical landscape of downtown, the COVID-19 pandemic ushered in permanent social and economic changes that will impact future use of the Guadalupe River Park and its surrounding area.

During a period of significant change, it is easy to overlook existing civic assets like the GRP. The GRP must develop alongside the rest of downtown or risk disinvestment and isolation. With sustained focus and support, the Guadalupe River Park could play an essential role in the changing landscape of downtown San Jose by providing open space amenities that connect the City’s diverse residents.

Building off the initial phase of research completed in the Fall of 2020, 16 graduate students in San Jose State’s Regional and Urban Planning Department, in partnership with the Guadalupe River Park Conservancy, completed the second phase of a three-year initiative spearheaded by Reimagining the Civic Commons (RCC). The second phase of research evaluated the value of investing in GRP using intercept surveys and direct observations to collect the second round of data for RCC’s four goals (Environmental Sustainability, Civic Engagement, Value Creation, and Socioeconomic Mixing). In addition, findings from 2020 were compared to findings from 2022 to identify any trends or changes within GRP.

KEY FINDINGS OF THIS REPORT INCLUDE

- The Guadalupe River Park draws visitors from outside of San Jose, with nearly a quarter of those interviewed not living in San Jose.
- Youth aged 18 and under, particularly teens, were one of the most underrepresented groups of park users.
- The number of park users between 2020 and 2022 who drove to the Park increased by over ten percent, and the number of respondents using non-vehicle modes of travel decreased by 15 percent.
- The number of respondents from 2020 to 2022 who had volunteered at the Park rose by nine percent.
- Mirroring findings from 2020, park users generally felt safe during the day, while perceptions of safety were significantly low at night.
- Many respondents attributed safety issues in the Park to the unhoused.
The Guadalupe River Park & Gardens is an urban park situated along the Guadalupe River, spanning 2.6 linear miles north to south from Highway 880 to Highway 280 (SPUR, 2022). The Guadalupe River Park (GRP) was designed to facilitate flood mitigation while serving as a public space. GRP offers hiking and biking trails, public art, landmarks, and wildlife. Due to its central location, GRP connects several communities. The Guadalupe Gardens within the Park consist of the San Jose Heritage Rose Garden, the Historic Orchard, the Community Garden, and the Rotary Play Garden. Due to its prime location and available open space, along with its enviable central San Jose location, the Guadalupe River Park & Gardens has the potential to be transformed into a San Jose spectacle.

The Guadalupe River has continuously played a significant role in developing the Santa Clara Valley, a well-protected valley that lies between the Santa Cruz and Diablo Mountain Ranges. The first documented inhabitants of the Santa Clara Valley and of the area surrounding the Guadalupe River were the Tamien Ohlone people, with archaeological evidence of their presence dating back as far as 8000 BC (NPS, 2018). The Muwekma Tribe of the Ohlone people occupied the land immediately adjacent to the River, establishing settlements and using the fertile areas surrounding the River for agriculture. From the time of the Spanish arrival to present-day San Jose, the Muwekma Tribe had developed a rich culture and identity, with the River serving as a focal point of Muwekma life for thousands of years. Today, the land around the Park is the unceded land of the Muwekma Ohlone.

Spain began to explore California around 1769 and established a string of missions up and down California’s west coast by 1777. San Jose was California’s first town, planned around Pueblo de San Jose de Guadalupe in late 1777 (City of San Jose, 2002). The Pueblo was erected east of the Guadalupe River, between present-day Hedding and Hobson Streets (City of San Jose, 2002). Once San Jose was established, Mexican and Spanish farmers came to the area; however, it proved difficult as the River periodically flooded. Though the River flooded frequently, the Santa Clara Valley quickly developed into a highly productive agricultural area, producing an abundance of fruit and seed-based products from the valley’s orchards over the next 100 years. By 1900, San Jose had become a bustling, developed city. Its economy, however, still primarily relied on the agricultural products grown in the Santa Clara Valley.
The first notable efforts to address river flooding in San Jose occurred after World War II, following a series of major floods in the 1940s and 1950s, with floods in 1955 and 1958 being particularly destructive (City of San Jose, 2002). One significant change that particularly impacted the River was the completion of Norman Y. Mineta International Airport in the late 1940s, which placed the River directly in the airport’s flight path. The Army Corps of Engineers planned for flood prevention as early as the 1940s. In 1963, the first City measure to pay for flood protection and infrastructure for downtown San Jose was passed, with efforts focusing on building channel modifications, bank stabilization, river-bottom stabilization, and the construction of levees (City of San Jose, 2002). Unfortunately, floods continued to plague downtown San Jose despite mitigation efforts. By the 1990s, the City was rethinking the River’s role in downtown and pursued solutions with a series of master plans to create infrastructure to control flooding while doubling as a linear river park (City of San Jose, 2002).

Source: https://www.mercurynews.com/2017/02/22/historic-photos-floods-have-ravaged-san-jose-region-for-years/
GUADALUPE RIVER PARK CONSERVANCY

The Guadalupe River Park Conservancy (GRPC), led by Executive Director Jason Su, collaborates with different stakeholders to develop, activate, and enhance the Guadalupe River Park and Gardens through various programs and initiatives. The GRPC’s mission is to “provide community leadership for the development and active use of the Guadalupe River Park & Gardens through education, advocacy, and stewardship.” (GRPC, 2022)

The GRPC offers various public programs and events for individuals and families of all ages and backgrounds, including the Water Festival, Adopt a Rose, Pumpkins in the Park, and Window on the River Park. Volunteer and educational opportunities include community workdays, education volunteers, corporate group workdays, and independent opportunities such as the Trail Ambassador Program. In addition, GRPC is working on numerous projects and initiatives to “support the health and stewardship of our river, make the park and trail more welcoming and inviting, and support community development while uplifting our neighbors and our city.” (GRPC, 2022)

Reimagining the Civic Commons (RCC) is a non-profit organization with a mission to transform shared civic assets, such as open green spaces, to foster engagement, equity, environmental sustainability, and economic development in cities across the United States (RCC, 2020). As RCC Director Bridget Marquis notes, RCC is “a national initiative seeking to demonstrate that transformative public spaces can connect people of all backgrounds, cultivate trust, and create more resilient communities.” To revitalize and reconnect communities, RCC outlined a plan that revises how communities design, manage, and operate shared community assets (RCC, 2020). RCC has developed four primary outcomes that cities across the United States should pursue: civic engagement, environmental sustainability, socioeconomic mixing, and value creation. Each outcome also has at least three “signals” and subsequent metrics to quantify and analyze the outcome that pertains to that signal (RCC, 2020). RCC signals generally refer to identifiable characteristics of a community that can be directly measured. Each of these outcomes is briefly summarized below.
Civic Engagement refers to creating a sense of community that invites people of various backgrounds into public life as active community members willing to shape their city’s future (RCC, 2020). Common signals for Civic Engagement include public life, stewardship, advocacy, and trust (RCC, 2020).

Value Creation refers to encouraging investments in neighborhoods to increase their vitality and vibrancy for residents (RCC, 2020). Common signals for Value Creation include safety, retail activity, real estate value, and affordability (RCC, 2020).

Environmental Sustainability refers to cities increasing the number of environmentally friendly places that are easily accessible by walking, biking, or using public transit (RCC, 2020). Common signals for Environmental Sustainability include access to nature, ecological indicators, walkability, and bikeability (RCC, 2020).

Socioeconomic Mixing refers to creating public places for all members of varying backgrounds and incomes to share everyday experiences and opportunities (RCC, 2020). Common signals for Socioeconomic Mixing include neighborhood diversity, reputation, social capital, and on-site mixing between people of different backgrounds (RCC, 2020).

Value Creation refers to encouraging investments in neighborhoods to increase their vitality and vibrancy for residents (RCC, 2020). Common signals for Value Creation include safety, retail activity, real estate value, and affordability (RCC, 2020).
According to the City of San Jose’s 2019 Homeless Census & Survey Report, San Jose has 6,097 unhoused residents. (City of San Jose, 2019) GRP serves as a home for hundreds of these unhoused residents. The unhoused population is the most talked-about issue relating to the Park. The current narrative that most park users believe is that the unhoused are dangerous and are the reason for trash and river pollution. Without understanding the stories behind unhoused residents, it is easy to assume that the less desirable conditions in the Park are entirely to blame on the unhoused population. Every unhoused resident has their own unique story and reason for being homeless. These reasons include mental health issues caused by traumatic experiences or injuries, drug and alcohol addiction, inequalities leading to an unfair chance at life, or simply trying to survive in an area where housing prices are the highest in the nation. Becoming unhoused has higher odds than most would think.

Currently, the City of San Jose Housing Department works to provide resources to the homeless population residing in the Park. City of San Jose Senior Development Officer Vanessa Beretta provided background information on San Jose’s homeless population and the resources provided by the City of San Jose’s Housing Department. In San Jose, there are 6,097 unhoused individuals (City of San Jose, 2019) and 9,706 unhoused individuals throughout Santa Clara County (County of Santa Clara, 2019). 5,117 of the 6,097 unhoused individuals are unsheltered, meaning they do not have access to temporary housing (City of San Jose, 2019).

The City of San Jose currently has six staff members on its homeless response team and receives most of its funding from the U.S. Department of Housing. According to Vanessa, COVID-19 has resulted in significant funding and limited staff to implement programs. The City of San Jose’s Homeless Response Team (HRT) currently prioritizes permanent housing as its primary goal. Additionally, the City is constructing permanent housing in the form of tiny homes with five existing tiny home sites and has also been planning safe parking zones for unhoused residents with vehicles. The City attempted to offer secure overnight parking in city-owned lots, but this program was abandoned due to negative feedback from the public.

While conducting intercept surveys, several of the park users interviewed were unhoused residents. Many unhoused residents were ex-military, educated, and pleasant to interact with. One memorable account was from an unhoused resident and ex-Navy SEAL. He explained that he was injured while serving and proceeded to show off the scar on his head where he had experienced severe trauma. After being discharged, he had no recollection of his past life, including his name and memories with his family. When asked about improvements to the Park, he hoped 24-hour restrooms would be provided in the future and lighting throughout the Park would be improved for safety. Since living in the Park, he has been able to rediscover himself and even met his current wife in the process. He hopes for another shot at life and to find work that will allow him to move into some form of housing. When asked about picking up trash within the Park, he mentioned that he picks up hundreds of pounds of trash per week throughout the Park and would be open to being paid for his efforts.
Establishing rapport with the community is another priority for HRT through outreach teams that engage with the public to support future decision-making. HRT also works with various other organizations, such as the Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (PATH), HomeFirst, Caltrans, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District. In addition, BeautifySJ is a branch of the City that manages “Cash for Trash,” a program that incentivizes cleanliness. (City of San Jose, 2020) HRT continues to work to address homelessness in San Jose but requires assistance in the form of additional support staff to increase capacity for improvements.

Located next to San Jose City Hall, the Recovery Café “is a healing community for those who have been traumatized by addiction, homelessness, and mental health challenges.” (Recovery Cafe San Jose, 2022) Todashi Oguchi is the Director of Programs and Community Outreach at the Café. He describes it as a long-term support facility that meets its members where they are in life. Todashi explained that the building was formerly a church and then transformed into a Café setting. According to Todashi, there are currently 36 Cafes open in the US, and they are open Monday through Friday from 10 am to 4 pm. The Café is utilized for job skill training purposes and creates a comfortable, homelike place for participants to occupy. The cafe walls display portraits of all the participants and a brief history of their lives.

The Café offers meals and job skill training, including barista, culinary, nutrition, peer connector training, and professional development. Participants also learn coping skills and get paid for working at the café. Additionally, participants learn how to prepare meals mainly from local produce, and the café teaches members how to grow their food. Obtaining food supplies is made possible through partnerships the Café has established with local farms.

Recovery sessions last eight weeks and include yoga, anger management, self-discovery art, mindfulness, and writing activities. The Café is also partnered with the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI). Participants who have completed the recovery session program have been hired as staff members at the Café, where they inspire and assist their peers on the road to recovery.

Source: https://greatnonprofits.org/org/recovery-cafe-san-jose-inc
CHAPTER 3

FIRST PHASE OF RESEARCH: FALL 2020

OVERVIEW

The Fall 2020 class had two main objectives. According to the Fall 2020 class’s report, the first objective was to complete the first phase of a three-year study to assess Guadalupe River Park (GRP) as a civic asset. The student team used Reimagining the Civic Commons (RCC) data collection methodology. The student team used two tools from the RCC toolbox, including direct observations and intercept surveys. The second objective of the student team was to establish a baseline to measure the impact of future park investments. The student team collected data on park user interactions and the physical conditions and demographics within the Park and surrounding neighborhoods.

Photo Credit: URBP 295 Studio, Fall 2020
SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY/ PURPOSE

The Spring 2022 and Fall 2020 class research projects were driven by the mission of RCC, which involved using systematic research, data collection, and evaluation to demonstrate the social and economic impact of investing in civic assets. To accomplish this, RCC has created a consistent methodology for partner organizations, like the Guadalupe River Park Conservancy (GRPC), to collect data that assess civic assets, like the Guadalupe River Park (GRP), in select cities. Over time, it accomplishes two objectives by pursuing identified opportunities and increasing investment in urban civic assets. First, tracking an asset’s progress allows stakeholders to study the impact of investment (or lack of investment) in a public asset over time. Second, engaging more cities to be part of RCC’s initiative creates a bank of knowledge, called a “Learning Network” by RCC, of different strategies for diverse types of assets that can be used by other cities trying to invest in their civic assets. Ultimately, the research conducted as part of the RCC Initiative measures the social and economic impact of investment in civic assets on people.

PARTNERSHIPS

The Guadalupe River Park Conservancy formed a partnership with Reimagining the Civic Commons and CommUniverCity to complete data collection and analysis as part of the RCC initiative.

CommUniverCity is a multisector partnership between San José State University, the City of San José, and underserved communities in Central San José. Its mission is to improve community connections, health, and education in low-income neighborhoods in central San José (CommUniverCity, 2022). CommUniverCity’s role in this project was to support the graduate students’ fieldwork.
A graduate urban planning student team undertook the first phase of studying the Park in the Fall 2020 semester. The course was co-taught by the Conservancy’s Executive Director Jason Su and Rick Kos, AICP. The students were challenged to collect data from Guadalupe Park users and position their findings within the four RCC goals described earlier. Following are some of the key findings from this baseline analysis:

- Most park visitors came once a day to several times per week, visited during the late afternoon or early evening hours, typically stayed thirty minutes or more, and were identified as male.

- Trash, general river cleanliness, and conditions created by the unhoused population living in the Park were cited as top concerns to survey respondents.

- Points of access to the Park remain unclear, roads accessing the Park are auto-centric, and bicycle facilities within the Park are severely lacking.

- The Park lacks practical wayfinding features, a sense of identity, and sufficient interactive features for rest and socializing.

- Perceptions of safety both within the Park and surrounding neighborhood result in users generally feeling safe during the day with a sharp decline in safety perceptions at night.

- A large majority of respondents indicated they supported improvement efforts for the Park.

Based on their findings, the student team prepared opportunities and several short- and long-term strategies for improvements to GRP. The recommended opportunities focus on attracting additional visitors to the Park, retaining existing visitors, and providing suggestions for amenities.

Photo Credit: URBP 295 Studio, Spring 2022
SUMMARY OF FALL 2020 OPPORTUNITIES

In the final report produced in Fall 2020, the capstone studio class proposed three opportunities, each with accompanying strategies and corresponding timeframes for implementation. This section briefly summarizes the recommended opportunities and various strategies to provide further context for the findings and conclusions of this report.

Opportunity 1: Restoring the Park’s Natural Spaces

The first strategy refers to the general removal of trash around the park. This short-term strategy suggested several simple measures, including “Hot Spot Identification,” adding maintenance staff, and waste receptacles (URBP 295 Fall 2020 Report, 2020). The long-term strategy referred to engaging and coexisting with the unhoused residing within the Park, as some view as the primary contributors to the trash problem. The second strategy focused on preventing the accumulation of trash through education campaigns and increasing the Conservancy’s role as park steward by having them act as the primary point of contact instead of the City to remove junk and bulk trash. The final strategy recommended in this section seeks to explore how users can become more active in the management and upkeep of the Park. The primary suggestion made in this section highlights engaging with the unhoused populations as “public park rangers” that could oversee stewardship efforts such as trash collection and general park maintenance.

Opportunity 2: Improving Equitable Transportation Access

The second opportunity presented by the Fall 2020 class sought to address how the Park could improve its accessibility for bikers and other park users who opt to use alternative modes of transportation to the Park. The first strategy recommended ways to improve bicycle access by adding more protected and designated bike lanes. This opportunity also indicated that the addition of bike racks would be beneficial to communicate that the Park is meant to serve as a thoroughfare and as a destination (URBP 295 Fall 2020 Report, 2020). The second strategy is to evaluate zoning changes around the Park to maximize access for potential future residents by creating more walkable and multi-modal transit-friendly communities. The final strategy presented refers to wayfinding and addressing how park users navigate through GRP.

Opportunity 3: Providing Opportunities for Social Gatherings

The third opportunity recommended by the Fall 2020 class aimed to highlight how the Conservancy could improve the opportunity for social gatherings within the Park. The first strategy suggests that the Conservancy should seek to expand the use of functional art to draw visitors as a program in collaboration with local artists or art programs. The short-term priorities focused on marketing potential new seating designs through temporary exhibits. The long-term strategies include installation and maintenance plan for new murals or art pieces.
OVERVIEW OF SPRING 2022 STUDY

The Spring 2022 Class was assigned to build on the work of the Fall 2020 class. First, the Spring 2022 Class completed a second round of data collection for each of Reimagining the Civic Commons’ (RCC) four goals using the same methodology designed by RCC of intercept surveys and direct observations. The Spring 2022 Class did not re-collect data on the surrounding neighborhoods’ physical conditions and demographics. Second, the Spring 2022 class analyzed the data collected to identify key themes and trends that were either similar or different from themes and trends identified by the Fall 2020 class. Finally, by comparing this year’s findings to the Fall 2020 class findings, the Spring 2022 Class found opportunities to enhance the Park that are not currently being pursued, identified continuing strengths within the Park, and highlighted new issues that emerged between 2020 and today.
DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

PARK WALKING TOURS

Before diving into data collection, two walking tours led by Sarah Dreitlein, Civic Engagement Manager for the Conservancy, oriented the Spring 2022 class to Guadalupe River Park (GRP). She noted recent and proposed developments both within the park and adjacent to it. The first tour began at the parking lot located at the northwest corner of Woz Way and Almaden Boulevard, which marks the southernmost portion of the Park. From this point, Sarah led the class north through the park along the river to Arena Green East, where the class met with the City of San Jose’s Senior Development Officer, Vanessa Beretta, and learned about the City’s Homeless Response Team and the various programs they manage.

The second walking tour started at the carousel located in the Arena Green West and then traveled north to the Visitor & Education Center, where Executive Director Jason Su introduced himself and spoke about the goals for this project. After this meeting, Sarah led the class through the Guadalupe Gardens north to Hedding Street (the “North 40” area), then back to the Rotary PlayGarden, where the tour ended.
Figure 1: Map of Study Areas
DATA COLLECTION: DIRECT OBSERVATIONS

“Point in Time” counts were conducted at the four study areas within GRP. (See Figure 1) Data collection teams recorded data manually by completing user count worksheets provided by Interface Studio, an RCC project consultant. The worksheets were available for data collection teams in paper hard copy format or through a smartphone-based app called Survey123. Teams first recorded the time, day of the week, date, weather, and temperature before conducting user counts. Next, teams walked through an assigned section of the Park tallying park users, female park guests, park users within six feet of each other, visitors participating in active recreation or exercising, approximate ages, and the race of each park user.

As part of the direct observation data collection method, passerby counts were collected in two areas within the Park: across the street from the Visitor & Education Center at the Coleman Avenue overpass and within the Park just north of Santa Clara Street next to the tennis courts. Passerby counts were conducted by tallying pedestrians, bikers, and cars who passed over an imaginary line along the trails. Park users were tallied for ten minutes and were counted twice if they crossed back over the line. The full version of this instrument can be found attached to this report in Appendix B.

INTERCEPT SURVEYS

Intercept surveys developed by Interface Studio were employed to catalog user location, frequency of visits, Civic Engagement, Socioeconomic Mixing, Environmental Sustainability, Value Creation, and demographics. Teams interviewed numerous park users within the four study areas of Guadalupe River Park. Surveys were available for data collection teams in paper hard copy format or virtually through Survey123. The full version of this instrument can be found attached to this report in Appendix A.

Photo Credit: URBP 295 Studio, Spring 2022
The CommunityCasting Podcast series can be found on SoundCloud and is the first podcast series produced by San Jose State’s Masters in Urban & Regional Planning graduate program. The goal of these podcasts was to encourage listeners to visit the Park and embrace its potential by highlighting the Park’s amenities and features. This series of four podcasts cover topics related to Guadalupe River Park and includes discussions with various stakeholders.

Link to podcast series:

Episode one involves discussing how to increase the number of park users and includes interviews with San Jose State University students, residents, and RCC Director Bridget Marquis.

Episode two covers the topic of art in the Park, featuring GRPC Civic Engagement Manager Sarah Dreitlein and local artist Roan Victor.
This episode is focused on sports facilities and park planning, featuring City of San Jose Parks Planner Zacharias Mendez.

This episode was recorded live at the "Spring on the Green" event held at Arena Green West across from SAP Center and includes interviews with park vendors.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS

Photo Credit: Guadalupe River Park Conservancy
As previously stated, the Reimagining the Civic Commons’ (RCC) initiative aims to improve civic infrastructure by realizing four outcomes: Environmental Sustainability, Civic Engagement, Value Creation, and Socioeconomic Mixing. This findings section will highlight the significant takeaways in each of these outcomes. The findings presented in this chapter are a culmination of survey data, outside sources, and community insights to determine the importance of the Park for San Jose residents. The charts, figures, and facts presented in this chapter are supplementary to the stories shared by park users of all backgrounds and lifestyles. These stories form the narrative of the present, adding to the rich history of the Guadalupe River Park (GRP) and setting the foundation for its future.

Initial analysis of survey respondent data suggests that the GRP is transforming into a point of interest across the Bay Area. Nearly a quarter of surveyed park users reported not being from San Jose. Figure 2 shows survey respondent zip codes, revealing that the draw of the GRP extends out to Stockton and Santa Cruz.
Surrounded by the sights and sounds of a busy downtown, the GRP plays a pivotal role in the environmental health of Downtown San Jose by acting to offset carbon emissions and bring ecological benefits into a dense urban environment. The primary signals that RCC refers to for this particular outcome is access to nature, ecological indicators, and walkability/bikeability. In the conversations with park users, many referred to the natural spaces as a primary draw for the Park. Dense urban areas like San Jose are significant contributors to climate change where population and high per-capita income combine to develop carbon-dependent lifestyles (Matthew, 2009). Open green spaces like GRP serve an essential role in offsetting the environmental impacts of the downtown core and providing nearby residents relief from dense urban settings.
The primary environmental benefit of the Guadalupe River Park stems from the number of biological resources found in the Park, particularly the Park’s trees. Trees improve air quality, moderate heat islands, encourage habitat development, and play a role in watershed protection (Seamans, 2012). Trees are a common sight in the GRP and are the main feature in the Park’s Historic Orchard, serving an essential role as a carbon sink. Utilizing i-Tree’s tree canopy assessment tools, the GRP sequesters 80.7 tons of CO2 equivalent a year, equating to a value capture of $3,756 (USDA Forest Service, 2011). These values are low compared to urban parks found elsewhere in the City, pointing to the need for more focused tree planting efforts in the GRP. The Guadalupe River Conservancy has begun implementing tree replanting programs, including revitalizing the Historic Orchard (Guadalupe River Park Conservancy, 2022).
RCC relies on accessibility metrics to evaluate Environmental Sustainability. These include residential proximity to park space, travel behaviors, and citywide investments to increase access to nature. The Trust for Public Land’s ParkScore index evaluates municipal park systems across various measures, including access. In 2021, San Jose ranked 26th in park access, while neighboring San Francisco ranked 7th among the 100 most populated cities in the United States that the organization monitors (Trust For Public Land, 2022).

According to the park user travel data recorded in 2020, park user travel mode choice is trending towards unsustainable transportation modes such as driving. Figure 3 indicates that the Park has begun to evolve into a regionally-known open space, attracting residents from across the Bay Area, which may be why more park users are driving to GRP. Alternative transportation methods, including walking and public transit, decreased between 2020 and 2022 while the number of park users driving increased. The number of bike users slightly increased, however. Figures 4 and 5 show park users’ mode of travel distribution based on intercept survey results. For both San Jose and non-San Jose visitors, driving is the preferred method of transportation, followed by walking. The number of park users driving is slightly higher for non-San Jose visitors. This slight difference can also likely be attributed to the longer driving distances required for non-San Jose residents. Overall, public transit usage to access GRP is low across both groups.
Improving the diversity of travel modes presents a significant opportunity to promote environmental sustainability in GRP. The park itself is biologically productive and should continue to reduce the city’s greenhouse gas emissions through carbon sequestration. However, the reliance on personal automobiles to reach the park challenges the environmental goals of the Park and the City. There is sufficient infrastructure for sustainable transportation within and around the Park boundaries to support alternative modes of transportation. This infrastructure includes amenities like trails to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The issue appears to lie in the park-to-city interface, an overreliance on the automobile, and a lack of public transit participation. This issue is increasingly concerning considering the park’s location within a dense urban environment of Downtown San Jose.

Further investment into sustainable transportation can translate to behavioral changes, as seen in the increased amount of park users biking in the park. San Jose aims to have bicycle mode shares reach 15 percent by 2040 by constructing protected intersections, painting bike lanes, and installing bollards to separate bike and vehicle traffic. Alongside other alternative transportation methods, the Guadalupe River Park could become a central piece to the environmental sustainability in San Jose.
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

RCC GOAL: *Build a sense of community that brings people of all backgrounds back into public life as stewards and advocates shaping their city’s future.*

The strength of a public asset like Guadalupe River Park relies on civic engagement from its surrounding community and key stakeholders. The Civic Engagement metric quantifies the quality of public life in an urban space, visitor frequency, degree of trust, and public perception of civic assets. The GRP holds tremendous potential as a community node for civic engagement and as a civic asset around which the residents of San Jose can create a sense of community.

**PUBLIC LIFE**

Visitorship statistics are key in evaluating the civic health of Guadalupe River Park. Observation conditions have changed considerably over the past two years because of the pandemic and may continue to do so over the next decade as cities progress into a post-pandemic world. Due to these circumstances, it is imperative to examine direct observation data as snapshots in time instead of attempting to establish one year as a baseline. Compared to data collected in 2020, hourly average visitorship to the GRP has decreased, as seen in Figure 6. This decrease is most likely due to schools and places of employment reopening as pandemic-related restrictions eased in later years.

Looking exclusively at current visitorship trends in 2022 in Figure 7, the GRP experiences higher visitors on weekends than weekdays, driven primarily by parents bringing their children to play at the Rotary PlayGarden. On weekdays, park visitors rise sharply between 11 am to 1 pm, mainly consisting of downtown employees taking a walk on their lunch breaks.

Intercept survey respondents were asked how long they typically spend at the Park. As shown in Figure 8, most survey respondents spent 30 minutes to an hour visiting the GRP. These two measures portray two distinct community interactions with the Park. First, the Guadalupe River Park is a weekend getaway
for families with children; second, the Guadalupe River Park is a place for a workday break into nature. These interactions show the versatility of GRP’s appeal to the public. It also shows gaps in park programming and amenities in maintaining consistent visitorship of different groups over time.

More frequent and prolonged visits to Guadalupe River Park could translate to more exposure to the Park, resulting in higher levels of stewardship to support the space. Intercept survey results support this hypothesis, as seen in Figure 9. Specific details of individual park visits, such as reasons for visiting the GRP, are discussed in the Value Creation section of this report.
Survey participants were asked questions to measure their level of civic engagement in GRP, including whether they have picked up litter in the Park, posted on social media or talked to friends about the Park, donated in support of the Park, contacted a government or elected official about the Park, attended a community meeting regarding the Park, volunteered time at or for the Park, or have become a member of an advocacy or stewardship group that supports the Park. Out of 130 survey participants, 66 percent reported participating in at least one of the activities. A specific breakdown of these responses is displayed in Figure 10.

Picking up litter and posting on social media or talking with friends about the Park are the most popular forms of civic engagement. Contacting government or elected officials, attending community meetings, making a donation, and becoming advocates of the Park were the least popular forms of civic engagement among park users. These findings are consistent with the original study conducted in 2020 as shown in Figure 11 (URBP 295 Fall 2020 Report, 2020). There are a few noticeable trends which include sharp decreases in contacting government or elected officials and donating in support of the Park. However, volunteering in the Park rose by nine percent. These shifts could be attributed to pandemic conditions, such as government offices and services closing to the general public, unemployment affecting the economic stability of residents, and work-from-home conditions allowing people to spend more time outdoors and volunteer their free time.
Civic Engagement emerged as a central theme in podcasts recorded by the Spring 2022 class and in speaking with park users. In the podcast “Art in the Park,” Sarah Dreitlein and Roan Victor talked about the Guadalupe River Art Walk. The Guadalupe River Art Walk initiative has resulted in pieces that increase the vibrancy of the Park. According to Roan Victor, the first artist to paint a mural for the Guadalupe River Art walk, her inspiration for her “Flow of Life” mural was “the relationship between humans and nature.” Roan explained, “as we take, we also want to give” (Victor, 2022). Her painting was her way of inspiring park users to value the nature and wildlife within the Park. Roan also hopes that her mural promotes stewardship of the Park.

*Percentages add up to over 100% because survey participants were allowed to select more than one activity.*
**RCC GOAL:** *Build a sense of community that brings people of all backgrounds back into public life as stewards and advocates shaping their city’s future.*

Traditional definitions of value creation refer to capturing and enticing investments. Rather than emphasizing monetary profit, Value Creation, as defined by RCC, prioritizes equity and encourages additional investments in civic assets so that they are better places for the community. According to RCC, Value Creation is measured by neighborhood perception and safety alongside traditional measures such as real estate affordability and retail activity (RCC, 2018).

**REAL ESTATE VALUE AND AFFORDABILITY**

Table 1 shows changes in real estate prices utilizing data from the American Community Survey’s (ACS) five-year estimates. The Fall 2020 class set the boundaries of their analysis to census tracts 5002, 5003, 5006, and 5008, which correspond to the tracts containing the Guadalupe River Park (see Figure 12). Compared to the 2014-2018 ACS tables shown in Table 1, there have been increases in median home values and gross rent since the 2020 report. Homes surrounding the Guadalupe River Park have a median home value of $923,130, with 36.7 percent of these units being owner-occupied. Renters pay an average of $2,505 gross rent, with 37 percent of renters paying 30 percent or more of their household income towards rent (shown in Table 1 as “cost-burdened renters”). The only decrease from 2020 to 2022 was in the percentage of cost-burdened renters. Renter data suggests, however, that rising rent prices have not increased the percentage of cost-burdened renters. Although the rents and home values in the neighborhoods surrounding GRP have continued to rise, census results indicate the rents and home values adjacent to the Park are below that of the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara metropolitan statistical area (American Community Survey, 2020).
While the data collected in the intercept surveys did not provide insight into real estate value and affordability, as many park users were not comfortable sharing their household income, the intercept survey results show that respondents feel the Guadalupe River Park could be a catalyst for value creation. 83 percent of survey respondents perceive the Park as having a somewhat or very positive impact on the neighborhood. Shopping plazas surround the GRP, regional destinations like the SAP Center, and cultural enclaves like Little Italy, but these economic drivers do not drive the inherent value of the Park. Park improvements should aim to capture the value added by the proposed economic development surrounding the Park.

Park users’ anecdotal responses while completing their surveys reflect the finding that park users believe GRP has the potential for greater value creation. Many park users stated there is inherent value in the Park in its current state, while acknowledging there is also room for improvement. Without prompt, several respondents shared their favorite park activities. One park user stated that they loved the natural lighting at the section of the Park near the GRP Visitor Center and that they enjoyed walking in this area. Multiple park users shared that nature and fresh air that the Park provided offered them the mental break they needed from their daily jobs. Others enjoyed personal hobbies such as searching for treasure using metal detectors, practicing photography, and birdwatching. Many park users shared that they love to exercise in the Park and play sports at the available sports courts. In addition, park users explained that they enjoy park vendors and events held in certain sections of the Park. Enhancing and building upon these experiences will boost the Park’s worth in the eyes of the public and foster a greater sense of community investment in the Park.
Under RCC’s goal of Value Creation, safety is a signal that helps establish the value associated with the GRP. With its many fields, playgrounds, and sports facilities, and proximity to existing and future commercial developments, GRP provides ample opportunities for new value creation; however, without a strong sense of safety, potential park users are hesitant to visit. Figures 13 and 14 show intercept survey results regarding daytime and nighttime perceptions of safety in GRP.

According to CrimeMapping.com, between November 11, 2021, and May 9, 2022, 462 crimes were recorded within a half-mile radius of the Guadalupe River Park (CrimeMapping, 2022). The most reported crimes were vandalism, vehicle break-ins, and assault. The presence of the unhoused in the Guadalupe River Park is a commonly cited issue in terms of safety by park users. It is essential to consider that perception of safety does not equate to actual risk or danger. A comprehensive and equitable approach is needed to responsibly improve both the perception of safety and the actual safety in GRP for all park users, including the unhoused.
From 2020 to 2022, the perception of daytime safety increased from 86.9 percent to 94 percent, while the perception of nighttime safety decreased from 55.3 percent to 37 percent. The 2020 survey included a follow-up question to identify specific elements that caused negative perceptions of safety, and a significant number of survey respondents answered “homelessness.” (URBP 295 Fall 2020 Report, 2020). The 2022 intercept survey did not include a similar follow-up question on safety. In 2022 however, “homelessness” is mentioned the most when asking park users what they would want to see improved in the Guadalupe River Park. Informal conversations with survey respondents during data collection also echo this finding. Survey respondents expressed that they felt safer in GRP during the day, with only six percent stating that they felt somewhat or very unsafe. The number of respondents who felt somewhat or very unsafe balloons to 64 percent at night. Breaking these figures down by gender, Figure 15 shows that more women report feeling unsafe at night compared to men, but the majority of both groups felt unsafe at night in GRP*.

Safety is necessary to create value in public spaces, a core tenant of RCC’s Value Creation goal. Survey results indicate many park users, both housed and unhoused, feel unsafe within GRP. One park user stated that he carries a knife with him because he fears being confronted by dangerous people while bicycling through the Park. Another park user stated that while walking by a homeless encampment, he was attacked by an individual wielding a baseball bat and running in his direction. Various unhoused residents stated that they felt threatened while living in the Park and that criminal activity is common. An unhoused resident shared that he has gone through hundreds of bicycles since he started living in the Park and that his bicycle is stolen on average once per month. Multiple unhoused residents shared that a satanic cult and various gangs live in the Park. Other safety concerns included lighting, as many park users stated they did not feel safe at night and not being able to see their surroundings. Another park user explained that she would never come to the Park after dark and that it would be “crazy for her to do so.” Addressing the issue of safety is essential toreviving the Park and increasing its value.

The Guadalupe River Park will naturally grow alongside San Jose as the downtown area receives exciting new development. Value creation is imperative for the long-term success of the Park, which will come as the user experience improves. For the Guadalupe River Park, this experience largely hinges on safety. However, as strategies and recommendations develop to best enhance the Park, equitable vigilance needs to be a part of the process to ensure the Park remains transparent in balancing the needs of the public sphere.

* Three survey respondents identified as “non-binary” but are not shown in the referenced figure due to low sample size.
Placemaking refers to the collaborative process of maximizing the shared value of the public realm by drawing on “the physical, cultural, and social identities that define a place and support its ongoing evolution.” (Project for Public Spaces, 2022) Parks are prime candidates for placemaking due to their ability to bring people together. According to a 2012 study, San Jose is the sixth most diverse metropolitan area in the country and the GRP is primed to serve as a space that fosters organic mixing, interaction, and exchange among community members of diverse backgrounds.

The reputation of a space like GRP plays a significant role in determining its ability to draw new users. Each park user’s individual experience at the Park influences the perception of the Park within the community. More positive experiences that community members share at GRP will result in a positive impression of the Park. However, if these positive experiences are not communicated to the larger community, then the reputation of the park will be dominated by the negative perceptions.

The results of the intercept survey that show the existing perception of GRP are seen in Figure 16, with 83 percent of respondents saying that the GRP positively impacts the neighborhood; this is a substantial increase from 2020. In 2020, only 56 percent of survey respondents believed that the Park positively impacted the neighborhood. (URBP 295 Fall 2020 Report, 2020). Survey respondents were also asked to evaluate the neighborhood’s changing conditions and predict the neighborhood’s future direction. Figure 17 shows that although 58 percent of respondents thought there was no improvement to the neighborhood in the past few years, park users remain optimistic for the future, with 67 percent of respondents expecting some degree of improvement.
"I like coming to the Rotary Playground because I know my daughter will be surrounded by other kids from diverse backgrounds."
- Rotary Playground user

The findings indicate that a growing segment of park users believe that the Park is a benefit to the surrounding community. These findings contradict some existing narratives about GRP, including ones that paint the Park in a strictly negative light. As the surrounding area continues to change and new housing developments bring in new residents, improving the public perception of the Park will be essential to drawing new users. Finding ways to promote the positive experiences and viewpoints captured in the intercept surveys will be vital in changing any existing negative perceptions about the Park and preventing these perceptions from hindering growth in usership.
Making the Guadalupe River Park a healthy civic commons relies on the organic growth of community interaction between individuals. The GRP offers opportunities for social interaction to thrive, from recreation facilities to natural amenities.

When surveying park users, students began to notice that many of those surveyed reported that the park has enabled them to meet new people. Survey results show that 22 percent of park users are non-San Jose residents. In addition, 55 percent of survey respondents reported meeting someone in the Park for the first time, increasing from only 33 percent in 2020 (URBP 295 Fall 2020 Report, 2020)*. These results indicate that Socioeconomic Mixing is growing in the Park as people return to public spaces.

A cursory analysis of Socioeconomic Mixing potential lies in the observation of the physical distance between park visitors. Across all sites, 25 percent of park users were seen within six feet of one another based on direct observations. When survey participants were asked if they had ever met anyone for the first time in the Guadalupe River Park, 55 percent responded yes. Meanwhile, in 2020, 26.5 percent of visitors were observed within six feet of one another, and only a third reported meeting someone for the first time. These numbers speak to the potential for increasing spontaneous, impromptu interactions among park users.

*The 2020 Capstone Studio class reported that 44 percent of respondents did not answer the question of if they had ever met someone for the first time in the Guadalupe River Park due to confusion with the question. Comparative analysis between 2020 and 2022 for this particular question is omitted.
The 2020 report theorizes that pandemic conditions could be influencing low rates of mixing; however, the consistent rates of park user proximity from 2020 to 2022 may point to other factors (URBP 295 Fall 2020 Report, 2020). Field notes from the 2022 direct observations mention lone joggers and bikers on trails and paths in the Park. Direct observations recorded 55 percent of visitors exercising in 2020 and 49 percent in 2022. These results indicate that individual activities appear popular among park users in certain areas. Families with children may be playing a significant role in visitorship differences, as Arena Green West has a small playground next to SAP Center, while the Gardens has the Rotary PlayGarden. Different park amenities appear to attract different types of visitors. Playgrounds are an example of an amenity that draws specific groups (children and parents). Future park amenities can be strategically designed and located to encourage diversity in age throughout the Park.
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Park user demographics are summarized based on intercept survey responses and presented in Figures 18 to Figure 22. Demographic information captured includes race/ethnicity, age, gender, education, and household income. Two years is not significant to measure long-term demographic change; therefore, the comparisons between 2020 and 2022 data should be taken as “snapshots in time”.

The data shows that while park usage by gender remains relatively stable, other characteristics signal some degree of change in the community. Asians and Hispanics drove a ten percent increase in non-white park users. According to survey data, park users that identify as African-American or Black decreased by two percent, although park usage from this group has historically remained very low. When looking at age, the 18 to 34 group increased ten percent while the 55 to 64 group decreased 12 percent. This shift could be explained by changes in the working population of downtown San Jose.

One instance where the Spring 2022 class was able to observe the diversity of the community surrounding GRP was at the annual “Spring on the Green” festival. At this event, Spring 2022 class members had noted diverse groups of park users participating in various activities throughout the park. Class members estimated that approximately 200 people attended this festival. The crowd had a wide range of age groups, including small children and middle-aged adults. In addition, the attendees were notably diverse, with Hispanics and Latinos making up a large portion of the crowd. In Arena Green East, one class member observed 20 to 30 people meeting up to play futsal every Thursday and Saturday. Other classmates noted that the tennis courts appeared to always be in use with a wide variety of people using the facilities.
In addition to ensuring that public spaces like the GRP are welcoming to people of all races, it is equally important that these spaces are accessible to a diverse mixture of incomes.

Figures 23 indicate that between the Fall 2020 and Spring 2022 studies, park user households making over $150,000 a year rose eight percent over these two years, while households that are making less than $20,000 a year decreased by 11 percent. These trends reinforce the need for GRP to provide a variety of amenities for users of all income levels and ensure that the space remains welcoming and accessible to the broader community.
One of the most underrepresented groups in the Guadalupe River Park is park users under 18. According to census data, persons under 18 constitute 22.3 percent of the city’s population, but within survey results from both study years, that number is three percent in the Guadalupe River Park. Direct observation data shows that approximately eight percent of the under 18 study population were found outside the Gardens area where the Rotary PlayGarden is located. This data indicates strong park participation for younger children who can enjoy playgrounds, but there are few opportunities for youth that are too old for the playgrounds to enjoy the Park.

In summary, Guadalupe River Park visitors are younger, highly educated professionals making six figure salaries which matches qualitative observations of downtown San Jose. 44 percent of survey participants identified as white and 60 percent identified as male. Providing a variety of opportunities to visit the Park for a range of individuals from different backgrounds will encourage further socioeconomic mixing in GRP. Data collected on Socioeconomic Mixing could identify gaps in underrepresented groups and develop special programs, facilities, and amenities, to increase visitation and socioeconomic mixing.
The foundations of making the Guadalupe River Park a healthy civic commons depend on the organic growth of community interaction between individuals. The Guadalupe River Park offers plenty of scenic variety for social interaction to thrive, from sport courts to playgrounds to gardens. Social activities such as sports or social events such as festivals or concerts may be potential avenues for GRP to attract more users to boost social interaction among the community. Park visitors are supportive of the space and desire to see the park succeed. As civic life returns to the public realm, capitalizing on the community’s eagerness to engage with the park more will determine how much civic engagement in the Guadalupe River Park can grow in the coming years.
CHAPTER 6

NEW OPPORTUNITIES & PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS
Based on the findings of this research project, the Spring 2022 class has developed three main recommendations for the park to improve with specific programs that the Conservancy could pursue to address areas for improvement.

1. MAKE THE PARK A DESTINATION

Strategy One: Offer Reservations for Picnic Areas and Open Spaces

The Conservancy should work with the City’s Parks and Recreation Department to coordinate reservations for picnic areas and green spaces throughout the Park during weekends. The earnings from these rentals can then be used to maintain the cleanliness of the Park and for maintenance purposes. When the spaces are not reserved during weekdays, they should be left open as first come, first serve areas for residents who do not want to pay the reservation fees. Allowing parties to reserve areas of the Park will encourage park users to plan gatherings and push the City to provide adequate park staff to clean the picnic areas and bathrooms. Increased cleanliness and staffing will attract more park users and transform the Park into a desirable destination for private parties.
Strategy Two: Promote Events within the Park and Open Spaces

In addition to private parties reserving park areas, the Conservancy should work with the City to host community and regional events. These events can include festivals, concerts, speeches, running events, farmer’s markets, food vendors, and cookoffs. Events like these are held all over the Bay Area and result in large turnouts. The goal should be to attract people to the Park so that the Park becomes a memorable part of people’s lives.

Festivals, concerts, and speeches can be advertised on websites such as Eventbrite. The Park can be transformed similarly to Golden Gate Park in San Francisco during the Outside Lands Music Festival. With a large amount of open space and easily accessible entry points from the surrounding downtown area, GRP is brimming with potential for concerts and music festivals. These festivals would bring significant revenue to the City, specifically for local hospitality businesses and food vendors.

GRP could also be a potential site for a downtown running event similar to the Hot Chocolate Run, and City Beer Runs in San Francisco. The long winding trails, proximity to nature, and the Park’s integration with the downtown area allow easy conversion into a race-ready space. Race events would also attract competitors from all over the Bay Area and could bring in additional revenue for the City and its local businesses.

Food vendor gatherings, farmer’s markets, and cookoffs would tap into the City’s diverse culinary heritage and communities. Food trucks, local restaurants, and aspiring chefs can gather at different locations in the Park while attendees can interact with one another and exchange culinary experiences. In addition, food is an integral part of many different cultures, which can increase the diversity and usage of the Park.

These events can also be combined to attract many people with different backgrounds and interests to the Park at once. With a wide variety of events and activities, people can participate in experiences that may not usually interest them. Attracting groups of people with alternative passions in a shared space may strengthen community bonds and inspire people to interact with those they would otherwise not.
Strategy Three: Add More Large Public Art Exhibits Throughout the Park

The “Breeze of Innovation” installation is coming to Arena Green West in the near future. Additional large public art exhibits should be strategically placed throughout the Park to encourage travel to other sections of the Park. These exhibits will inspire visitors to stop at the “Breeze of Innovation” and venture through the entirety of the Park. (Urban Confluence Silicon Valley, 2022) The Guadalupe River Art Walk program is another existing art exhibit that has resulted in murals along the trail. The Art Walk encourages travel through this portion of the Park and could act as a guide to larger art features scattered throughout the Park.

Another example is a graffiti art exhibit. Removing graffiti can be expensive and time-consuming; instead, graffiti can be used as an asset to the Park. For example, Graffiti Alley, located in Baltimore, Maryland, allows anyone in the community to add their art to the alley (Atlas Obscura, 2022). As a result, the area has incorporated the urban community’s art forms, creativity, and attracted new city visitors. An interactive art exhibit, such as Graffiti Alley, encourages visitors to come to the Park and engage with others to express their artistic ability. Other art exhibits, such as large sculptures, could be created by local artists to develop a sense of community identity within the Park and may attract more residents to utilize GRP as a local open green space.
2. CREATE AMENITIES TO ATTRACT THE YOUTH

The socioeconomic data reveals that one of the most underrepresented groups in Guadalupe River Park is park users under 18 years old. Amenities and age-appropriate programming must be established to increase the number of park users under 18 years old.

**Strategy One: Social Media Presence**

Given the prevalent use of social media amongst the youth, the Park must have a social media presence for marketing purposes. The Conservancy needs to consider expanding its social media outlets to attract younger visitors.

The Park should increase its social media presence with custom Geotags for users to attach to their videos or pictures via Instagram, Facebook, and Snapchat. There was a rise in Tik Tok usage during the pandemic, and the Conservancy should use it to their advantage. The Conservancy could start a prize competition in which it challenges teenagers to make Tik Toks in the Park and select the best video to win. When engaging with the youth, there should always be social media advertising. For example, the Conservancy could incentivize people to follow their social media accounts before giving out GRP merchandise at outreach tables.

Creating social media attractions throughout the parks, such as Love Lock Bridges, where couples place padlocks on bridges, fences, statues, or installations to commemorate their bond, have been proven to be popular destinations amongst the youth. Other attractions could include picturesque murals or landmarks like the planned “Breeze of Innovation.” Scenic, “Instagrammable” attractions may be the Park’s best option for increasing the number of youth visitors. Forging a solid connection between the Park and today’s youth could lead to lifelong memories and encourage the youth to reach out to others to visit the Park.

*Photo Credit: URBP 295 Studio, Spring 2022*
Strategy Two: Enhance Existing Youth Sports Facilities and Produce Low-Cost Youth Recreational Spaces

There is space and opportunity to further improve existing sports fields to attract youth to the Park. For example, a baseball field would allow Little League baseball teams to play or practice. While all open spaces do not need to be assigned to a specific sport, bleachers can be installed in the green area to make it possible to host games with spectators. In addition, a concession stand could be constructed near these fields for attendees.

The Conservancy could also provide table, chair, and sporting equipment rentals for use in the Park. This would allow the Conservancy to interact with people and develop rapport with the community while promoting recreational activities.

Low-cost recreational spaces such as a minimalistic skate park, disc golf course, or basketball courts could be installed within the Park. These spaces would invite younger park users to bring their family and friends to participate in recreational activities.

Strategy Three: Youth Programs and Outreach

During research done during the Spring of 2022, we found that teenagers were one of the missing population of park users. The low number of teenagers in the Park is primarily due to the lack of programs targeting their age group. Some events can include movie showings, carnivals, dance classes, art classes, concerts, youth talent shows, career days, and youth-targeted festivals. It is essential to note the Conservancy does not have to be responsible for producing all of these events but for collaborating with existing entities and serving as the “host” of the events.
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Although there are existing playgrounds for small children, the Park lacks amenities attracting the youth. During an observation day at Arena Green West, we noticed a group of high school students gathering. However, they only stood outside, waited for others to come, and moved to another place. Creating a warm and welcoming space is necessary to attract younger visitors to the Park. For example, seatings and desks can be arranged and movable for small and big groups. Free WiFi and outdoor electrical outlets should be offered for the youth to read and study. Having an area for healthy exercise activities and spending time with friends or family will increase the Park’s allure to younger visitors.

School Outreach

Educational programs and field trips operated by GRPC are generally focused on youth under 12. Educational interns are required to be over 16. This leaves out youth in their early teens. A possible opportunity for youth programming could be outreach to local junior high schools. Environmental clubs, youth service corps, or natural science classes could be targeted for outreach, subject to staffing. This programming would expose youth to environmental stewardship, community engagement, and advocacy. Also, the Conservancy could spearhead organizing community sports teams. By setting up tournaments, teenagers can play a competitive sport for free to target the youth that can’t afford to play on other teams.

Meet and Greets with Local Sports Teams

Most professional sports teams encourage or even require team members to volunteer time with the community in various ways. Local sports teams, such as the San Jose Earthquakes, San Francisco 49ers, or the San Jose Sharks, could host fundraising events or youth outreach events in the Park. The Park presents a perfect location for these local teams to come out and meet with younger fans to create lifelong memories for both the fans and the teams.
3. COEXISTENCE WITH THE UNHOUSED

There is no issue more critical than redefining the relationship between Guadalupe River Park and the local unhoused population. All other goals of the RCC initiative and the Conservancy depend on mitigating the real and perceived negative impacts of unsanctioned living on park grounds. Park cleanliness, attractability, and a sense of safety for park patrons will only be achieved with a significant rethinking of the social contract between all users.

It is unreasonable to expect the GRPC to solve the decades-long housing crisis that directly contributes to the continued growth of the unhoused population. However, there are a few concrete strategies that GRPC can support to achieve peaceful coexistence with the unhoused. Initially conceived by local advocacy group SPUR and urban design firm Gehl as part of their research on Guadalupe River Park, this narrative serves as inspiration for our recommendations here.

Strategy One: Connecting Unhoused Residents with Opportunities

First, the Conservancy can assist in connecting members of the unhoused population to local resources and employment opportunities. For example, Recovery Cafe San Jose is a nearby community center for the unhoused that offers a safe space for stabilization, mentorship, and skills training to lead to productive employment opportunities. The non-profit offers many types of programs designed to teach marketable skills and accountability, including one-on-one career coaching, resume/interview assistance, and opportunities to give back to their community through work shifts at the cafe. Some programs even provide ServSafe certifications, which enable work in the food industry. More individuals might start their journey towards long-term employment and housing stability by having volunteers or Conservancy staff spread the word about the Recovery Cafe as they engage with the unhoused population. A similar program for Woodruff Park in Atlanta had a dedicated social worker role created in 2018, leading to 109 placements in permanent housing (Madison, 2020).

With more funding, a more impactful approach may be to employ the unhoused to maintain the Park. This program could ensure their commitment to improving conditions in the Park while simultaneously creating a stabilizing source of income. If the work included training for soft skills and relationship-building with staff employers, there may be secondary benefits for the unhoused. Direct employment by the Conservancy could also bypass many barriers that prevent the unhoused from traditional employment, such as mental health issues, substance abuse issues, lack of professional experience, and the digital literacy gap.
**Strategy Two: Establish Rules for Coexistence**

Another promising idea to facilitate coexistence is to codesign park rules with the surrounding community and the unhoused population. The Conservancy could collaborate with the City of San Jose to facilitate public meetings to hash these rules out and train neighborhood ambassadors to maintain accountability. A successful example of this can be seen in the City of Philadelphia’s Shared Spaces initiative, which created a shared code of conduct establishing clear standards of behavior along with the tools and engagement needed to support them. Their Guide to Sharing Public Spaces detailed the community’s values, permitted, prohibited, or discouraged behaviors, how warnings/fines/arrests would be applied, and contact information for various agencies responsible for enforcement.

A set of rules for Guadalupe River Park might include:

- No public urination, plus a commitment to a cleaning schedule for public restrooms
- Bathroom or area ambassadors to maintain standards and prevent misuse
- Restriction on tents to be out of sight of main recreational pathways
- No dumping of waste into the river
- A promise to not call the police for enforcement of minor infractions, depending on unarmed community ambassadors instead

*Photo Credit: URBP 295 Studio, Spring 2022*
Strategy Three: Engage in Tough Conversations

Finally, the Conservancy can play a leading role in changing the way the public views homelessness in general by raising awareness and public education through knowledge mobilization. The Homeless Hub states that it is increasingly essential for societies to destigmatize the unhoused to adequately address the root causes of homelessness, such as the lack of affordable housing and the failures of the social safety net. Sustained advocacy efforts with local and regional governments for more funding for supportive or transitional housing programs will be vital to minimizing long-term chronic homelessness.

In addition to public advocacy, the Conservancy can also help educate park users about coexistence with the unhoused through its numerous programs and events. Perhaps volunteers can lead a walking tour of the mini-shelters being provided to the unhoused or introduce the public to current and former unhoused community members through interviews or forums at the Recovery Cafe to humanize them. Building this bridge of understanding between the unhoused and the broader community will undoubtedly create a stronger foundation for productive dialogue and solutions.

Photo Credit: URBP 295 Studio, Spring 2022
CHAPTER 7 

CLOSING THOUGHTS

The surveying and data collection should be an ongoing process. In the future, this study could be improved by aiming to create a larger sample size for both the indirect observations and intercept surveys. For example, raising the target number of intercept surveys to 220 or incorporating at least two direct observations per weekday would improve the ability to make more statistically significant findings in the data analysis. In addition, different portions of the park can be added to the study, and online surveys can be distributed to all San Jose residents.
In order to increase the sample size, it is necessary to broaden the engagement with the community for this study. Future students could be more proactive in promoting both the participation and the agency of traditionally marginalized communities. This goal of broadening engagement is achievable by collaborating with existing community networks in surrounding neighborhoods. These networks are well in tune with the issues these marginalized communities face and are equipped to speak for their issues.

Esri’s ArcGIS Survey123 software was helpful during the study by giving students access to powerful data processing and surveying tools. Future classes would benefit from having more training in setting up the mobile app, practice in answering questions, and troubleshooting problems. Occasionally, students would fall back on paper-based surveys, which complicated the data aggregation and analysis phases when running into technical difficulties. Future survey efforts should utilize either paper or electronic surveys rather than utilizing both to avoid confusion.

Intercept surveys could also incorporate more questions related to the four RCC goals (Civic Engagement, Value Creation, Environmental Sustainability, and Socioeconomic Mixing). For example, there was only a single question about modes of travel (Environmental Sustainability). Given current trends in urban mobility, it may be more revealing to ask questions about micro-mobility (e.g., scooters or hoverboards) and electric bicycles.

Finally, to better promote this research in the future, students could organize and conduct public tours involving key stakeholders to help others familiarize themselves with the park and witness first-hand some of the issues raised in this study. Increasing exposure to unaware residents could build more empathy and energy for community involvement, which might lead to increased public or private investment.
CLOSING THOUGHTS FROM THE STUDENT TEAM

John Muir stated that “in every walk with nature one receives far more than one seeks.” We are very lucky to have the Guadalupe River run through our city.

The river has shaped so many people’s lives throughout time: times that history has not documented, to current times when we can appreciate why the river is so special. The river shaped early agriculture in the Valley of the Heart’s Delight and it also experienced devastating floods and subsequent flood mitigation projects. Today, visitors enjoy countless recreational opportunities, including a simple connection with nature by walking on the trails.

The park means so much to so many. As a graduate urban planning student team, we now are more connected to the park and throughout life will remember the magical and majestic elements we experienced as we spent time by the river.
**Points of Interest**

1. San José, Costa Rica  
   Sister City Plaza
2. Veracruz & Guadalajara, Mexico  
   Sister City Plaza
3. Dublin, Ireland  
   Sister City Plaza
4. Parade of Animals  
   Artist: Michael Boris
5. Monopoly in the Park
6. Okayama, Japan  
   Sister City Plaza
7. Veterans Memorial of San José - Santa Clara Valley  
   Artist: Manhattan Projects
8. The Muwekma Ohlone Tribute  
   Artists: Peter Schifferin (Coyotes) & Tom Andrews (Eagle and Hummingbirds)
9. Wildlife of the Guadalupe River  
   Artist: Nobi Nagasawa
10. Tainan, Taiwan  
    Sister City Plaza
11. Remembering Agriculture  
    Artist: Tony May
12. Vietnam Memorial
13. Five Skaters  
    Artist: Mike Mandel and Larry Sultan
14. The Weavers' Gifts  
    Artist: Alan Aounihan
15. Children's Carousel at Arena Green
16. Ekaterinburg, Russia  
    Sister City Plaza
17. Pune, India  
    Sister City Plaza
18. Rotary PlayGarden

*Photo Credit: Guadalupe River Park Conservancy*
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Department of Urban and Regional Planning Graduate Capstone Studio. 2020. “Guadalupe River Park.”


APPENDICES
241
Total number of Survey Respondents

128
Total number of Direct Observations
SECTION A
Introduction & Screener

A-1.  Hi, do you have a moment to talk about Guadalupe River Park?
[Clarify Geography if Necessary: May be useful to provide optional/additional text explaining the exact boundaries of the site, especially if it includes multiple areas/spaces.]
a.  Yes [SKIP TO Section C]
b.  No [TERMINATE AND COMPLETE Section B]

SECTION B
Declined to Take Survey
or No Response

If a respondent declines to take the survey, please fill out the following demographic questions using your best judgment.

B-1.  [Sex]
a.  Male
b.  Female
c.  Other / unknown

B-2.  [Age]
a.  Probably under 18
b.  Probably 18 to 64
c.  Probably over 65

B-3.  [Race]
a.  White
b.  African-American or Black
c.  Hispanic or Latino
d.  Asian
e.  Other: ___________ [Specify]
f.  Don’t know

Start a new survey after answering the questions above.
SECTION C

User Location Data &
Frequency of Visits

If a respondent agrees to take the survey, read this introductory text:

I’m a student researcher at San Jose State doing a survey for the Guadalupe River Park Conservancy, an organization that’s working to improve Guadalupe River Park. Do you have a moment to answer some questions regarding the park?

[CLARIFY GEOGRAPHY OF GUADALUPE RIVER PARK IF NECESSARY]. Everything you tell me will remain completely anonymous, and you are free to skip any questions, if you like.

C-1. Do you live in San Jose?
   a. Yes [SKIP TO Question C-3]
   b. No
   c. [DO NOT READ] No response [SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]

C-2. If selected No for C-1. Where do you live?
   a. City: ________________    State: ________________    [SKIP TO Question C-4]
   b. [DO NOT READ] No response [SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]

C-3. What neighborhood do you live in?
   a. [OPEN ENDED] ________________
   b. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   c. [DO NOT READ] No response

C-4. And what is your zip code?
   a. [OPEN ENDED] __________
   b. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   c. [DO NOT READ] No response

C-5. Generally speaking, in the last year, how often have you come to Guadalupe River Park? [CLARIFY GEOGRAPHY IF NECESSARY]. Would you say:
   a. Every day
   b. Several times a week
   c. Once a week
   d. One to three times a month
   e. Less than once a month
   f. Or is it your first time? [SKIP to Question C-7]
   g. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   h. [DO NOT READ] No response
C-6. Generally speaking, how much time do you spend at Guadalupe River Park when you visit? Is it about: [IF IT IS RESPONDENT'S FIRST TIME AT THE SITE ask, “How much time do you think you’ll spend today?”]
   a. Less than 5 minutes
   b. 5 to 30 minutes
   c. 30 minutes to an hour
   d. 1 to 2 hours
   e. Or more than 2 hours
   f. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   g. [DO NOT READ] No response

C-7. Which of the following categories best describes your primary reason for visiting Guadalupe River Park today?
   a. Attend an event or activity
   b. Exercise or play sports
   c. Socialize with family or friends
   d. Relax and unwind
   e. Just passing through on the way to somewhere else
   f. Or something else [SPECIFY] __________
   g. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   h. [DO NOT READ] No response

C-8. What is your favorite thing about Guadalupe River Park?
   a. [OPEN ENDED] ________________________________

C-9. What would you like to see improved about Guadalupe River Park?
   a. [OPEN ENDED] ________________________________

SECTION D
Civic Engagement

In the past year, have you participated in any of the following activities, specifically in relation to Guadalupe River Park?

D-1. Picked up a piece of litter at Guadalupe River Park.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   d. [DO NOT READ] No response

D-2. Posted on social media or talked to friends about Guadalupe River Park.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   d. [DO NOT READ] No response

   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   d. [DO NOT READ] No response
D-4. Contacted government or an elected official about Guadalupe River Park.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   d. [DO NOT READ] No response

D-5. Attended a community meeting that related to Guadalupe River Park.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   d. [DO NOT READ] No response

D-6. Volunteered some of your time at or for Guadalupe River Park.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   d. [DO NOT READ] No response

D-7. Became a member of an advocacy or stewardship group that supports Guadalupe River Park.
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   d. [DO NOT READ] No response

D-8. Generally, would you like to see more or less government spending on public assets like parks, recreation centers and libraries?
   Remember that if you say “a lot more,” it might require a tax increase to pay for it.
   Would you like to see:
   a. A lot more spending
   b. A little more spending
   c. A little less spending
   d. A lot less spending
   e. Or about the same amount of spending
   f. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   g. [DO NOT READ] No response

D-9. Generally, do you think that most people are trustworthy?
   Would you say:
   a. People can be trusted, or
   b. People cannot be trusted
   c. [DO NOT READ] It depends
   d. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   e. [DO NOT READ] No response
SECTION E

Socioeconomic Mixing

E-1. Over the past few years, how do you think this neighborhood has changed overall? Do you think it has:
   a. Improved a lot
   b. Improved some
   c. Declined some
   d. Declined a lot
   e. Or has it stayed about the same
   f. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   g. [DO NOT READ] No response

E-2. Over the next few years, how do you think this neighborhood is likely to change?
   Do you think it will:
   a. Improve a lot
   b. Improve some
   c. Decline some
   d. Decline a lot
   e. Or stay about the same
   f. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   g. [DO NOT READ] No response

E-3. I am curious what kind of impact you think Guadalupe River Park has on this neighborhood?
   Do you think it has a:
   a. Very positive impact
   b. Somewhat positive impact
   c. Somewhat negative impact
   d. Very negative impact
   e. Or does it have no impact on this neighborhood
   f. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
   g. [DO NOT READ] No response

E-4. Have you ever met anybody for the first time at Guadalupe River Park, including strangers or friends of friends?
   a. Yes
   b. No [SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]
   c. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know [SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]
   d. [DO NOT READ] No response [SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]

SECTION F

Environmental Sustainability

F-1. We are interested in knowing how people travel to the Guadalupe River Park or to this neighborhood. How did you get to this area today from where you are living or staying? Did you:
   a. Walk
   b. Bike
   c. Drive
   d. Use public transit
SECTION G
Value Creation

G-1. Generally speaking, how safe do you feel walking in this neighborhood during the day?
a. Very safe
b. Somewhat safe
c. Somewhat unsafe, or
d. Very unsafe
e. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
f. [DO NOT READ] No response

G-2. Generally speaking, how safe do you feel walking in this neighborhood at night?
a. Very safe
b. Somewhat safe
c. Somewhat unsafe
d. Very unsafe
e. [DO NOT READ] Don’t know
f. [DO NOT READ] No response

SECTION H
Demographics

H-1. Which of the following age brackets do you fall within?
Feel free to stop me when I say the correct one.
a. Under 18
b. 18 to 24
c. 25 to 34
d. 35 to 44
e. 45 to 54
f. 55 to 64, or
g. 65 and over
h. [DO NOT READ] No response

H-2. What is the highest level of education you have completed? Feel free to stop me when I say the correct one. Is it:
a. Less than High School
b. High School or a G.E.D. program
c. An Associate’s Degree or Certificate program
d. A Bachelor’s Degree, or
e. A Master’s or PhD.
f. [DO NOT READ] No response

H-3. Are you currently enrolled as a student in a full- or part-time educational program?
a. Yes
b. No
c. [DO NOT READ] No response

H-4. Which of the following best describes your race or ethnicity?
a. White
b. African-American or Black
c. Hispanic or Latino
d. Asian
e. Other [SPECIFY] __________
f. [DO NOT READ] No response
APPENDIX B

DIRECT OBSERVATION INSTRUMENTS

User Count Worksheet: Arena Green East

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td>WEATHER</td>
<td>TEMP.</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>TASK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Circle)</td>
<td>(Approx.) °F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 1: Tally Users

Area: GUADALUPE RIVER TRAIL & OTHER PATHS IN ARENA GREEN EAST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elk. Age / Younger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area: MISC. AREAS & TENNIS COURTS IN ARENA GREEN EAST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elk. Age / Younger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 2: Count Passersby

At the location, count people who cross the trajectory lines over 10 minutes.

If someone crosses the line twice, count them twice.

Notes: Write a sentence or two about what you saw, making sure to note anything unusual. Make sure to note if people are using the large open spaces across the street from the park.
User Count Worksheet: Arena Green West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AM / PM</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>YOUR NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

WEATHER (Circle one) Rain Storm Cloudy Sunny Other

 TEMP. (Approx.) __ __

Task 1: Tally Users in each area. This count is a snapshot in time. Count each area once per hour. Use a new worksheet every hour.

AREA A: ARENA GREEN WEST & CONFLUENCE POINT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Site Visitors</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. Age / Younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Female Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitors Within 6 ft. of Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Recreation / Exercising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hisp./Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

User Count Worksheet: Cuadalupe Gardens Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AM / PM</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>YOUR NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

WEATHER (Circle one) Rain Storm Cloudy Sunny Other

 TEMP. (Approx.) __ __

Task 1: Tally Users in each area. This count is a snapshot in time. Count each area once per hour. Use a new worksheet every hour.

AREA A: PERIMETER PATHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Site Visitors</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. Age / Younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Female Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitors Within 6 ft. of Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Recreation / Exercising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hisp./Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AREA B: CUADALUPE GARDENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Site Visitors</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. Age / Younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Female Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitors Within 6 ft. of Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Recreation / Exercising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hisp./Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AREA C: HERITAGE ROSE GARDEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Site Visitors</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. Age / Younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Female Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitors Within 6 ft. of Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Recreation / Exercising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hisp./Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
User Count Worksheet: River Trail Area

**Task 1: Tally Users**
In each area, this count is a snapshot in time. Count each area once per hour. Use a new worksheet every hour.

**AREA A: GUADALUPE RIVER TRAIL & OTHER PATHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Site Visitors</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. Age / Younger</td>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors Within 6 ft. of Others</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation / Exercising</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AREA B: VISITOR CENTER EXTERIOR AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Site Visitors</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. Age / Younger</td>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors Within 6 ft. of Others</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation / Exercising</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AREA B: NORTHWESTERN MEADOWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Site Visitors</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. Age / Younger</td>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors Within 6 ft. of Others</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation / Exercising</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AREA B: OFF-PATH AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Site Visitors</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. Age / Younger</td>
<td>Middle / H.S. Age</td>
<td>College / 18-35</td>
<td>Over 65 / Senior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors Within 6 ft. of Others</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation / Exercising</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 2: Count Passersby**
Who crosses the imaginary line over 10 minutes. If someone crosses the line twice, count them twice.

*Stand at the start on Coleman & lock down at both lines... count them at the same time.*

**LINE A: GUADALUPE RIVER TRAIL EAST (UPPER & LOWER)**
- Pedestrians
- Bikers
- Cars

**LINE B: GUADALUPE RIVER TRAIL WEST**
- Pedestrians
- Bikers
- Cars

**Notes**
Write a sentence or two about what you saw, making sure to note anything unusual.
Make sure to note if people are using the large open space across the street from the park.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Main gathering
- Natural enjoying
- Healing
- Youth/children

Recommendations:
- Create colorful area for retreat, gathering, study, reading
- Provide electronic plug as outdoor wifi
- Add tables for eating picnics
- Add seating
- Add benches
- Add retail ADA
- Center Plaza
- Renovate bathroom
- Add food trucks
- Add food kiosks
- Add seating
- Add retail, ADA
- Circle seating to connect people
- W. St John
- Landscape
- River
APPENDIX C  ADDITIONAL SURVEY DATA CHARTS

Figure 24: Primary reason for visiting the Guadalupe River Park by gender identity.

Figure 25: Results from the US Forest Service’s i-Tree toolset.
Figure 26: Travel mode distribution for Guadalupe River Park visitors between San Jose residents and non-residents.

*Sample size for survey respondents that identified as non-binary is 2 and is not included in Figure 27: Time spent in the Guadalupe River Park based on reported gender identity.
Figure 28: Park user demographic change in race/ethnicity from 2020 to 2022.

Figure 29: Park user demographic change in age from 2020 to 2022.
Figure 30: Park user demographic change in education from 2020 to 2022.

Figure 31: Perception of the Guadalupe River Park’s impact on the neighborhood.

Figure 32: Perception of nighttime safety in the Guadalupe River Park by location.
For more details, datasets or other information, please contact:

Professors:

Rick Kos, AICP
richard.kos@sjsu.edu

Ahoura Zandiatashbar, PhD
ahoura.zandiatashbar@sjsu.edu