

**PUBLIC HEARING
HOCKINSON COMMUNITY PARK**

**PUD SERVICE CENTER
JULY 28, 2005
7:00 P.M. – 9:00 P.M.**

Commissioners in attendance: Co-chair Debbie Abraham
Co-chair Dale Erickson
Joe Cote
Florence Wager
Jeanne Caswell
Joey Fuerstenberg

Staff in attendance: David Judd, Director, Vancouver-Clark Parks and Recreation
Steve Duh, Park Planner
Dan George, Sports Fields/Special Projects
Jim Sandlin, Landscape Designer
Nancy Hubbard, Planning and Development Manager
Pete Capell, Clark County Public Works Director

The purpose of this additional monthly Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission meeting was to provide and receive information from Clark County staff, the Hockinson neighborhood citizens, consultants for Clark County, and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission regarding the pending Hockinson Meadows Community Park, a 240-acre community park scheduled to be built in the Hockinson area. The format of the meeting is as follows: presentation from staff, questions from the commission to staff, 'open mic' for input from community residents, further questions of staff by commission, exclusive discussion among commissioners, and the voting process.

In order to speak, attendees were asked to complete an information card.

Six commissioners, six staff members, one consultant to Clark County, and approximately 70-80 citizens were in attendance. Various maps of the intended park were in the room. Citizens were reminded to complete an information card to be recognized during the 'open mic' portion of this meeting. This will be the final public hearing/meeting on Hockinson Park unless the Clark County Board of Commissioners requests an additional public hearing/meeting. As the project commences and the need arises further input will be solicited from the citizens.

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Jim Sandlin presented an overall view of this project.

Debbie Abraham: I would like to propose an unofficial equestrian trail in the southern 40 acres of the park.

Nancy Hubbard: The code reads 'for any person to ride on the horse property under the jurisdiction of the county not designated in posted areas for bridle paths is prohibited'. I talked to the Commission before about it is I don't think this is appropriate for our general equestrian population. I don't see a way that we could make a concession given the code restriction to allow it for local use only. What I think the department should do is create an equestrian opportunity that is not available to people unless you live next to the park. Because of the wetlands, we looked at a couple of areas that we are going to be connecting to the neighborhood. All of them would cross over wetland areas and wetland areas would require some reinforced trail components in order to accommodate the equestrians. So it just doesn't look like it's a reasonable spot to have equestrian facilities.

Audience: I think we're getting the cart before the horse. Who says we're going to have to have 16 ball fields and soccer fields? We're talking an area that you're missing a good spot to put baseball fields in the whole place is going to take a lot of money. Delta Park has spent over \$600K for fields trying to mitigate the same thing doing the same thing you're doing with wetlands. If you multiply that out, you're going to have to have a tremendous budget. With equestrian trails, you're draining into Lacamas Lake how much fertilizer can you throw on ball fields and drain into Lacamas Lake without killing fish and algae growing. Lacamas Lake already has a problem with algae growing. We haven't even gotten involved with the wetland mitigation, the Army Corp of Engineers. Originally this should have been identified, the first step is 'what are wetlands how much land do we have to mitigate and how much is it going to cost? And then how many ball fields can we build on this piece of property. So I think we haven't been very realistic about the whole approach and when we get back to horse people and you say we start out with 21 ball fields and now we're 16, and 8 soccer fields, everybody in their right mind says there is no room for horses.

Debbie Abraham: One of the things that we have done as a department and with the Commission's help and also the public, is go through a major public outreach process several times to figure out what people want in their community parks. Regional parks want horse facilities, but every time we've gone out to the public there is not a big quest for equestrian facilities in the community park. The things that are identified are playground equipment, lawn space, and sports fields. The county commissioners have been clear, and we've checked with them several times about the use of sports fields and they are clear that that is a priority in a community park. So based on their decision-making authority, that's what we've come up with for this project. To think about horses would be great, but it has a very limited use, and to spend \$200K+ for a few users is not quite feasible. In the end, it comes down to what our standards are for our parks and our components are supposed to be.

Could you talk about the permitting process and what's going to happen in the next couple of years on the County side and the Corps of Engineers side?

Jim Sandlin: Yes, last time we met, Brent Davis was here to discuss what the requirements are that they are looking for. Clark County will follow first what the Army Corps of Engineers requirements are and then they may have their own requirements on top of that. The permitting process for wetlands now, to disturb and mitigate wetlands, is running about two years from beginning to end. If we presented them this, they would not accept it. So what we have to do now, is go through an engineered process, say how many yards of earth are we moving, where are we disturbing, are we making our best effort to avoid wetlands, what are the mitigation efforts we're requiring? We have to have a full-blown plan to that. We then submit all of those, nearing between 75% and 90% construction drawings ready,

typed and set up. That will get us in the door and in the process. After reviewing it, they will come back with further modifications, etc. We'll go back and forth until the Army Corps of Engineers is satisfied. At the same time, we'll be working with the county to make sure there is not conflict of interest between the two. The county may find, for instance, there are wildlife habitats, not only are these wetlands, but also nesting areas for a hawk, and will tell us to avoid that area. There will be an entire layer of things going on. The rest of the permitting process is not nearly that arduous but it is the main component before we can do in anything in terms of breaking ground.

Florence Wager: Essentially, what comprises phase 1? The fields?

Jim Sandlin: Right now, we trying to strike a balance between both the athletic fields that are needed as well as the core park facilities. Again, in our last meeting, the highest priority we heard was trails. So we want to get as much of the trail in but a lot of the trails also depends on 'is it going somewhere?' Again, our target is to put in what you're seeing here in terms of core community park elements, having parking to support certain sports courts, play areas, improvements along the ditch, two shelters, and restrooms. Any restrooms we put in, we have to explore the ability to put in a septic system for those. This core area would be the first area to get restrooms. Anything else in terms of athletic fields, part of it is their ability to raise funds for concession buildings, restroom construction, things like that as well as they are more likely to have a better ability based on frequency of use, and knowing when it's being used. Like portable toilets, and things like that being put in and maintained. What you're seeing is that Evergreen Little League is getting kicked out of their current facility. They have almost a totally mature little league system in place, so they need all 8 fields. Highland is less mature and there has been agreements between them and Evergreen to share some facilities so they are only allowed to build 5 fields. The lighting has been determined based on immediate needs and with the commitment that we're only going to have three of these baseball fields lit for first 10 years. Then it goes back to public process to verify if there is an essential need for additional or not. Then the soccer fields, which have been shown in the previous plans, are designated areas for being lit also.

We'd like to get things like off-leash areas. There will be the caretaker's facility and we'll have some other support maintenance type things throughout the county to help us maintain the park.

Dale Erickson: For the audience, this is a Parks and Recreation Advisory Commissioners meeting and you're invited to make public comments if you have filled out cards. I would love for you to interrupt while we're having our meeting, but there is a section of this meeting, which is designed for your comments. So let Jim talk, and when we turn it over to you, if we have your card, you'll be given the opportunity to speak. If you have more comments or questions, fill out more cards and bring them up here. So please hold your comments while Jim is speaking.

Jim, the Metropolitan Park District provided a certain amount of income to generate the maintenance for these park improvements. How much is going to have to be spent on this one versus how much are the sports groups going to contribute for the maintenance of these new fields?

Jim Sandlin: My understanding is that in these developed areas we would put the same amount of maintenance in terms of mowing, watering, etc. in those areas as we typically would in the informal lawn areas. More frequent mowing, additional fertilizer, longer irrigation, etc., is all an arrangement

that begins to get compensated through the little league. In terms of the magnitude of what portion of park district funding goes in here, I would have to defer the question.

Just to add a little bit to that. We haven't yet gone through the cost analysis for the project but that is separate from the question. With regard to the maintenance costs and agreement with the different leagues, that's still a work in progress.

Dale Erickson: Are we going to allow equipment storage for these leagues? Are we providing it or are they providing their own storage?

Jim Sandlin: We will have some space allocated for maintenance. A maintenance yard for the storage of materials, sand, soil, etc. How we work that arrangement with the league has yet to be determined.

I would also think that if there was a facility on site there would be some shared use that enables the county more efficient maintaining. Not always having to trailer and load and offload equipment. Again, the arrangement with the little leagues are things like concession buildings. Anything above and beyond the basic improvements that we're providing. There is going to be some arrangement for them to pay for a portion of that or all of it, depending on what the agreement ends up being.

Debbie Abraham: Will you talk a bit about the traffic plan?

Jim Sandlin: Based on the report we got from DKS, who, since the last time we met, has done a recent model on Delta Park and actually met with some of the county representatives to discuss what the anticipated changes would be. What they are looking at is turn lanes at the intersection of 119th and 172nd. One turn lane is oriented for northbound traffic, and one is coming from the east. That should alleviate some of the stacking that might occur at that intersection. Beyond that, depending on how the stacking is arranged, and the flows out of the park, there will have to be a center lane somewhere in the range of about 150 feet long for stacking and turning in that area. Entrance placements will be determined on site lines, the ability to provide adequate stacking of traffic, etc. The studies have indicated, and what we know today about the roadways, that the planned facilities are able to meet the new pressure.

Debbie Abraham: Didn't we get information back from Tucson regarding their sports fields there, and the traffic problems?

Nancy Hubbard: The Tucson facility is on county property and leased to a private agency that privately manages the facility. The traffic issue was in 1980 and has since been resolved by the interstate system. So the traffic problems could have been a result of the fields and general growth in the area. We are going to continue to research the Tucson field and the one in Santa Clara also. I think that information will be helpful when we go through the permitting process with Clark County talking about general effect and those will be two good examples. I think the Santa Clara facility is a privately managed complex also on county owned land.

Jim Sandlin: I would also add that in terms of dealing with the traffic issue, when we go through traffic development review all these issues will be gone over again in great detail to make sure all mandatory code requirements are met.

Joey Fuerstenberg: What is the number of trips we are talking about?

Jim Sandlin: The traffic report was based on trip generations. Everything is documented as to what their sources were. Most recently a trip generation study was done based on Delta Park with a similar amount of users, and during a high activity time. Again they have to give multiple sources and not just pick a convenient one to model it from, so checks and balances are done to make sure you're getting a fair reading on these things. Again, DKS is doing the traffic report and it is being reviewed by county departments including public works, transportation, etc.

Florence Wager: So Jim, this is a 10-year Master Plan but it could go out 20 years?

Jim Sandlin: It could go 20 years based on our ability to get the improvements built. What I've seen with Master Plans that begin to exceed that 10-year limit is sometimes there is a recreational change, a development change, maybe rezoning of areas, etc. If that happens it begins to make sense that the plan be reevaluated to determine that what was planned 10 years prior is still appropriate. In the event that it is, and we've met the design criteria, it allows us to move forward without reoccurring costs associated with reviewing again. It does get reviewed each time we do a phase of development to make sure we're still meeting what was in the original improved guideline.

Regarding the ditch, there are two ditches. One is actually regulated and ultimately ties into China Ditch, which runs on this side of the road. Currently, when you look at the ditch, it's obviously a manmade ditch, with shear cuts, etc. As it stands, in order for us to ensure public safety, health, welfare, etc. we would fence it for the entire length of it. We have been in discussion with habitat representative at the county as well as the wetland biologist. What we will continue to explore at time of development is what are our opportunities to begin to lay down the slopes on this ditch, create gentler transitions in and out to take away the possibility of someone falling into it and not being able to climb back out. Additionally, between these hedges of walkways and the ditch, I personally would envision that becoming an area where there is more native grass, shrubs, for buffer areas that we're developing. Plus the ditch itself does have a buffer requirement not unlike the wetlands; so we'll be working to see how much area do we have to keep use out of, whether it's 50, 75 or 100 feet. I think there will be areas that we'll end up fencing mainly out of a safety concern.

Dale Erickson: This is a community park so I'm assuming these are daylight operation hours except for these sports fields that are lit. Will there be security-enclosed off-gates during the off-hour periods?

Jim Sandlin: Again, that is an option. Typically what we do in our parks is have a gate. Then we have the traffic gate that prohibits those people trying to get in but allow people to get out. We have a caretaker on site that would make sure the park is shut down and people are out. We have several different options. We can do that entirely at both entry points, or we could selectively cut off certain parking lots that will minimize people's ability to bring their cars in. That is one of the reasons we establish the caretaker facilities to keep an eye on the park.

Dale Erickson: Perimeter fencing?

Jim Sandlin: Perimeter fencing at this point is still our typical chain link fence. We will have some special fencing that occurs around the off-leash areas. We would like to have upgraded fencing, nice quality but again, at what cost? Are we losing a playground to have a more visually appealing fence? Yes, there will be perimeter fencing protecting both the park and the adjacent properties.

Dale Erickson: With the REET's and park impact fees that we have in the bank and 35 parks in the Metropolitan Park District that are going to be developed, how much money are we talking about to develop this park? Are we talking about the \$13M we have in the bank?

Jim Sandlin: Currently in the combined account between park impact fees and Reeds, there is about \$14M. As we look at the development of the full Metropolitan Park District program (those 35 sites), we are looking at \$29 to \$30M to build those. We initially set aside almost \$5M for this project and that is just the PIF and Reed and excludes the sports field Reed and any other contributions that come in, either from grants or other organizations. We have received a state grant for this project, in part for development and in part for acquisition. \$300K will be coming to this project for development from the state. We can reapply to the state as we move through this program. A major benefit to these Master Plans is that you have something to show when you start applying for these grants.

Debbie Abraham: Can you talk about the off-leash areas and/or specific playground equipment that you are going to choose?

Jim Sandlin: What we anticipate doing is as we get into the design development, is we will involve stakeholders from off-leash to come in and help determine what is the exact detailing for what we need. We'll be meeting with little leagues and the sports facility folks also to establish a baseline. Just because they have the money to build one type of structure, we have to make sure it falls within the standards that we're setting for the park. We'll be looking at different aspects of the core park, again I mention these playground areas, especially in a community park, we have less ability to get into more elaborate designs than in a neighborhood park, just due to the budget and the scale of things. But in community parks you have the ability to really get into some creative adventure playground type settings and you want to bring the knowledge base of the community and try and represent that.

Debbie Abraham: From the public's perspective during the county's development review process, will there be opportunities for the public to be informed or review documents as they go out as more detailed design is refined.

Jim Sandlin: Yes, we'll maintain the websites and keep them going and other things like that. Having much more public outreach as we get into specific areas. Figuring out what this next phase is we're getting into and when it's appropriate to bring people in and get their input that's constructive and so forth.

Dale Erickson: I know it's been brought up once before, but what are the seasons for soccer and little league?

Jim Sandlin: Baseball starts generally in March, and runs through June, All-Stars in July. Soccer is generally a fall sport, right before school starts.

Dale Erickson: And lights on as early as January for spring practice?

Jim Sandlin: These are items that would be covered in the Good Neighbor Agreement.

Dale Erickson: Do we have a model of a Good Neighbor Agreement for folks to look at, both the commission and the public? Has this already been distributed?

Jim Sandlin: It has not been distributed and I'm in the process of gathering examples from around the region. I should have some available by the end of next week for distribution.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Audience: I'd like to address the issue of BMX. Extreme sports in a family park is something we need to consider carefully. That flows right into safety and security for the park. Also, I'd like to see us consider native trees, plants and shrubs for the park. This will cut expenses of watering if we do native plantings. Thank you.

Dale Erickson: I'm on the Urban Forestry Commission and native plants is what we will be putting in there, because it does take less water and less maintenance because they are native to this area.

Audience: My comments are about the access. I'm a little disappointed that the equestrian access is not going to be provided. I think there is a missed opportunity; it feels like it could have been transitioned in. I rode out there the other night, and I think it could have been included especially for the short term it could be phased in. Just like the off-leash area there, you could just have a horse area and the horses could just run around. They don't need a lot of facilities.

Also, related to that, is access. I like a lot of the design, but I see a lot of parking and it just reminds me that we're just building another facility that people are going to have to drive their vehicles to. Are our kids going to be able to get their bikes to this place? How can you get there besides driving your car?

I don't want to be negative on this, and I think it's great the field is going to be there, but it still feels like we missed the opportunity to put them in a different place and address the neighbors concerns more. There is a lot of land there where they could have been spaced out, maybe they wouldn't have been in a whole group like this, but the biggest parking area is right there near the neighbors. I say this to share the feelings of a lot of neighbors in the area.

Audience: I am currently the president of Highlands Little League, and we are looking to be housed in the southern section. We service 350 kids approximately right now and will continue to grow. This park facility will give us that ability. Right now we're tied in with Battle Ground Little League, we use a public park in Battle Ground. We're very constrained there. We provide all of our maintenance for the field. Last year we spent over \$20K just on upgrades to that park. When we leave, we're leaving those behind. It's not just for us, because we only have that park for a certain amount of time.

So it's for the public. I know there were many comments in past meetings about security and the kids. One of the things I want to address is that generally you will not see little league kids running afar and going into someone's neighborhood because their parents are there watching them. It's not those kids that are doing it during those hours. It's the other hours that you have to worry about. We do service an area that is broader than the 3 miles. A lot of our kids will be coming to that park facility and it will be servicing a larger development area. So getting this facility in is a great thing from Highland's Little League standpoint and also as a neighbor to the area. I live just a couple miles away and I would like to make the park more accessible to kids on bikes. Thank you. Good luck.

Debbie Abraham: One of the things that the parks department does try to do is work with the transportation department to provide trails in the master plan agreement in the county trails program. There will be a forum on November 4 at the Hilton to talk about visioning. Write a letter to your county commissions telling them you want trails, or you want something attached like what they've done along Padden Parkway. Those are the kinds of things we get grants and money for. They just need to decide to do it.

Audience: I'd like to speak about the off-leash area. I'm on the board for DOGPAW, which works for getting off-leash areas in the county. If you want to see what an area is like, we just opened Ross Park. What we'd like is a fence all around the perimeter and a double gate. On an average day we have about 300 people bringing their dogs to Pacific Park, which is now being developed. The Ross opening had approximately 500 people there. I would encourage you to think about changing this plan to make it bigger, expanding it to the west, and moving the parking to the south. That looks like 3 to 5 acres. We would hope that it would be 8 to 10 acres.

Jim Sandlin: The Ross site is 9 acres and this plan is 5.5 acres.

Dale Erickson: How much parking are you providing for that?

Jim Sandlin: Forty-three slots. Which would also share trailhead parking for trail access to this site as well.

Dale Erickson: Not all the people at Pacific are moving to this park. And we're looking at other sites throughout the city and county area. We're looking at multiple locations so even though this is a fairly good site, it's not the only one that DOGPAW is going to be using.

Audience: Thank you. I'd like to raise attention to the large, flat, grassy flexible areas that are going to be used most all year around. Also, the safety and congestion. We've heard that over the next 10 years this will service 40,000 to 55,000 people and most of those family households will not have baseball players. So they'll be regulated to 4 acres of flatland. I have 5 acres of land and I've had baseball games out there because I'm a coach, and 12 boys consumes a quarter of that very easily when they're playing, etc. If you double it, and double it again, and try to put 200+ in there, I think you'd realize it would be saturated very quickly. I'm concerned that they are eliminating the non-flat flexible areas that could be used in the spring and fall to 4 acres. The dog acreage is 5.5 acres, so the off-leash areas actually have more than the 55,000 who would be wanting to access the areas. We've got 240 acres here and yet there is only 4 acres for these groups to be used.

Imagine these scenarios: You have an extended family reunion with say 150 people, and you have a business group that wants to reserve it for 300 employees, and then another group of another 300 or 400 people out there. Where would they go? They would not fit in this 4-acre area. There is just no way they could fit in that. But if you go to Evergreen or Orchards Park, they could accommodate them very well, with much less acreage.

Imagine this: It's late June, coming to the end of baseball season. At the end of every baseball season, you have gatherings, closing ceremonies for players, coaches, and all the parents. When you have those activities you invite every player on every team. There will be 36 to 40 teams that will be trying to converge on this area. It's a nightmare trying to get all those cars in and out. If, at the same time, you're trying to accommodate some family activities, you can see that the usage would well overwhelm the roads being used.

I'd like to propose something that I think is workable. I would be more than happy to go before the Army Corps of Engineers to propose this. If we say the number one people we are servicing in this area are the 40,000 to 55,000 people that are going to be living around it, what are we doing to take care of them. I would say if we want to have adequate resources for them you don't need 4 acres you need closer to 20 acres. How would you accommodate that? I would recommend you take one or the other of these complexes and move it north where the old softball complex was. Then you tell the Army Corps of Engineers our number one concern is the 40,000 to 55,000 people who pay our taxes, we're going to accommodate them with large, spacey, grassy fields. Then by moving the other one up, we've gone through the approach, we've avoided, based on our first thing, then we put in the second ball field and then the third ball can be avoided, and we can minimize and mitigate as appropriate. That would be a win-win for everyone. Right now, I don't think the 55,000 people that are visiting in the future are going to be very happy with 4 acres. That is my recommendation; take care of the people who are going to be servicing that area. I don't understand the rationalization that all the special interest groups get priority over the people that service the area. (Applause)

Audience: I live a half mile from the corner of 172nd and 119th St. First, I'm the individual that told you about the Tuscan ballpark. If you have any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer those. Regarding a number of the comments that are in this flyer, you talk about being a community park. You talk about the area currently being rural, but rapidly changing to urban. Where is this coming from? If you go north of Ward Road, what is changing? There are not huge housing developments going in. It's not rapidly changing to an urban area. You take a 2-mile radius around this park; I can promise you there are more than 100 horses. How is that urban? Please consider the fact that this is not an urban area. We don't need to bring all this traffic in. Ballparks? Great! Fields, parks? All that is good. But let's not overdo it. What is the turnover rate for games? Every 1-1/2 hour, every 2 hours?

Response: They usually start at 5:30 p.m. to about 7:30 p.m. (on the lighted fields they can start at 8:00 p.m. and run until 10:00 p.m.)

There is a new set of games about every 2 hours? Correct? So, not considering all the other traffic that's going to be coming to the park (dogs, trails, play areas, etc.) just the ball fields, the 24 ball fields between baseball and soccer, if they're in full use, that is 1,000 vehicles per game set. Simple math – $24 \times 42 = 1008$. That's just for those ball fields. The seasons aren't really overlapping a lot, but there will be activities on those ball fields during off-season. People will go out there and play. So

there is a lot of traffic here. A study being done on Delta Park along I-5 is not comparable to Hockinson with a 2-lane road access that people have to travel for miles onto to come to this park. This park needs to be designed for this community if it's truly a community park. Access for the community. Bicycles, walking, equestrian! Even if you throw the equestrian out of it, which doesn't make sense, because that's what community is, you're current design is for traffic. Let's throw in 42 parking spots per field, let's put in 24 fields, plus all the other activities. It's all designed to bring traffic to this area. It is not designed for the community use because you don't even have a way for the community to get there other than driving. I'm not going to want to go there if I have to sit in traffic and wait to get there. If we're really talking people bringing 100's of dogs everyday, bingo, per dog you will have 1/2 to 1 vehicle per dog. The number of people coming here is going to be pretty extensive. Another comment I'm hearing is the active fields trying to be balanced with passive areas. Of the useable land, the non-wetland area, what percentage is active versus passive? It looks to me like the active use with ball fields and the usage areas is probably 75 to 80%.

Debbie Abraham: The passive areas would be the wetland areas.

Audience: No, you can't count that as passive area.

Debbie Abraham: But I think when they talk about passive land they are talking about non-usable wetlands.

Audience: But that's not an option. They can't use the wetlands, right?

Debbie Abraham: That would be the passive part. The active part would use the community part, the ball field part, and as we look at them, that would be the wetland part. It's about half and half. Actually about 45 – 55.

Audience: But that is not the point. The point is of the usable land, the non-wetland area, how much is active and how much is passive? You still need the passive in there for use that is not hyper sports. So the balance is not really there. Another comment is 'there is not enough developable area gained through the elimination of the 5 softball fields to reconsider an equestrian component of this park'. And then you made the comment about the equestrian being too expensive. How much is it costing you per field?

Response: \$120K, it varies on size and system.

Audience: It's usually over \$100K. How many acres does it take for a ball field? Maybe two? OK give me that \$120K and give me two ball fields so half the money is facing two ball fields. I'll build you a nice covered outdoor arena, I'll give you plenty of space for trailers, plenty of room for people to ride into the property because it can be a destination, and we'll put up a trail course so people can come and have something to do. And put the trails in that are dedicated use for equestrian use. That money will more than pay for that. You're only giving up two ball fields, and that's it. There is more that can be done here for the community than what the plan is currently. I'm sure there is another area in Clark County where two ball fields can be placed. There is too much traffic with this plan. I think your traffic study needs a lot more work. Comparing us to Delta Park is not comparable. Thank you. (Applause)

Audience: Many of my concerns have already been addressed. I am in support of having tennis courts because there are no public tennis courts in Clark County, basically. And, as for the trails, I have concerns about whether or not there will be trails for children to ride their bikes on that would be paved, not bark mulch for walking. And safety issues as well, I know the trail systems they have down in Eugene cause lots of safety concerns with women who do not feel safe walking on the paths, because they are too many places for people to lurk behind bushes, etc. Thank you.

Audience: I've lived in this area for 32 years. I've ridden a horse and walked the ground on the 240 acres. There really isn't any good land, because this land was owned by the state for about 55 years and they never developed it because of the amount of wetlands and also there is about a 1 to 5 foot drop in elevation. So any time you talk about this land you have to have tremendous fill. Also, China Ditch which has flooded before. So you have to dig out China Ditch, and also where does China Ditch go? It goes to Lacamas Lake. So you're going to have a huge amount of fertilizer going to Lacamas Lake. So unless you have some settling ponds or something else, you're going to have a huge environmental process. I can see 8 ball fields there, and I can also see up by 119th St. where you have real easy access. The way this is developed you've got an asphalt jungle out here. If you have a jogger, he's much rather have a trail or something soft to run on and one jogger was here and made those comments. My big question is, if I'm going to pay the maintenance on this park how much say do I have? I was very disappointed because I have horses. We've brought this up every meeting, saying that is a demand and if we're going to pay the maintenance on this park, why don't we have a say. (Applause)

Audience: I've been taking notes since we sat down and am trying to remember some of the things we've been told in the past and kind of reliving what we weren't told. I see three new faces here, it's nice to see new faces, but I hope that finally our voices will be heard. We've asked many times for more rustic areas and not quite so much development with the ball fields. I understand the need for kids to have a place to play. It is a very rural area and we moved there because of that rural setting. We're not against a park, we've always supported the park, but we were never told from the get-go that this was going to be a huge sports complex. It's been kept from us and it has been admitted it has been kept from us. And we're very frustrated and very angry that none of our concerns have been met except for moving the adult softball out. And that was only done because the leagues didn't want adult softball.

Debbie Abraham: That is not true. It was entirely neighbor concerns; softball would still love to be there.

Audience: Well, then we have the parking; all the parking lots will not be adequate for the amount of ball fields that will be out there. There really are no public areas. This is not a public park like it is supposed to be. It is a sports complex, it has been from the get-go, and very little has changed from our last meeting. In fact, at least I thought we were being heard with the horses because that is very important to that area. It's a rural area; people need a place to play besides playing ball. It's just not all about sports. It's about our country way of life, and bringing the city to us. We don't want it. The question was never answered about hours of operation. Some of us, still work for a living and we have to go to bed. We're not going to be able to go to sleep when there are lights and noise going on till 10:30 p.m. I don't understand why all the ball fields have to be right here. It seems to me that 4 acres

for community use is not enough out of 240 acres. I realize that a lot of it is wetlands. That's usable to no one. It's not usable to the community; it's not usable to the ball fields. I had hoped there would be better solutions, I am very disappointed. (Applause)

Audience: It's very difficult to see and add up the amount of parking up there. This whole traffic thing has not been answered and it needs to be. I'm concerned about the lights of the concessions. I assume it's going to have lights at the parking if you are going to have lighted ball fields. That has not been addressed. How about benches for participants? You are not addressing needs of the ball field people who are coming to support their players. I would like to ask one more time, we have asked at every meeting except for the first one, we would like to be included in some type of planning with this park in mind. I think we need more shelters, more picnic areas. I see up by the dog park there is not even an area for people to sit down. They probably need some play equipment because the dogs are usually left out there where they can really run and have fun. And mom who's coming with two kids needs a place for the little kids. You need to consider that in the dog park area. And, Debbie, you said there wasn't a cry out for the horse people, this is probably the first area that has been large enough to be considered to be horse friendly. Your analogy is not a correct one. You may say that the people have not been asking for it, but we're seeing this is large enough, we are asking for it, we are demanding it. I don't have horses; I just think we need to have horses.

Audience: When we were talking before we made a mention where one of the existing fields was there was a fistfight over parking places; you need to check that ratio of parking and consider what our ratio is. I think there is not enough parking. There is not. And I would really like to see a Good Neighbor Agreement established before this is even passed because it is very critical. Thank you. (Applause)

Audience: Will you please elaborate on the Good Neighbor Agreement?

Jim Sandlin: Sure, we refer to it as the Good Neighbor Agreement. It is specifically between the county via the parks department and the adjacent neighbors. It doesn't involve the sports groups. There would be subsequent agreements between the county and the sport groups that would be a result of the Good Neighbor Agreement with regard to lighting and traffic and other issues such as those. It is a document that simply outlines procedures, do's and don'ts, and protocol about how issues get resolved and addressed. As I mentioned earlier, I can provide some drafts of Good Neighbor Agreements that exist in other areas of the region just as a template for folks to consider what might be involved in putting together a Good Neighbor Agreement for this site. With regards to meetings and discussions with neighbors, that is definitely something that we would want to do and I think that's the only way to approach it is to have some face-to-face conversations about reviewing the issues, trying to address the issues, and document those issues and how those are mitigated. So all that would happen at sometime in the not too distant future.

Audience: Would that be done by mail?

Jim Sandlin: We would definitely send out meeting notifications to adjacent neighbors. Again it's primarily interned to mitigate the concerns and issues of adjacent neighbors. So, with regards to the folks who live in the southwest section, maybe working through your homeowners association would be appropriate because it's an organized unit. We can work either with that or with specific individuals as well.

Audience: What is your definition of adjacent:

Jim Sandlin: Adjacent can be a little bit flexible. Typically it's folks who border or are within a specific distance of the property edge. We can define that through discussions as well.

Audience: I will have the lighted ball fields in my living room when you have night games. One thing I have not seen is why in all the meetings, the agencies, the commissions, is why aren't you guys there. Why isn't the neighborhood deciding what the neighborhood park is? Why do we have someone who lives in downtown Vancouver telling me that my zoning cannot remain rural? That I have to have those because the City of Vancouver voted on it, and passed maintenance taxes. Urban growth is going to swallow me up. You're ruining my county.

Debbie Abraham: What level of detailed involvement are you talking about? Getting a map out and drawing on it?

Audience: Something that makes sense, something that serves our neighborhood.

Audience: We did that once, we actually made a presentation in the beginning to show what we wanted.

Debbie Abraham: I can tell you this. If this was an entirely flat piece of non-wetland park we would have an entirely different design. Unfortunately what we have is half the park is wetlands. So you look at the park and they have that first map over there that takes out the wetlands, these are the highland areas. If we thought the Army Corps of Engineers would let us do it, we would love to do that. What a community park has as its features is a playground, lawn area, trails, and sports groups.

Audience: I live up there and is it fair for me to have to move because you decide all the ball fields have to go in that area?

Audience: It's too many sports fields. (Pounding a fist on table.) You're not hearing us; it's too many ball fields!

Debbie Abraham: Where are we supposed to put the ball players?

Angry comments, everyone talking at once, cursing heard!!

Audience: What about the land you already own?

Debbie Abraham: Where: We've got three acre parcels for neighborhood parks, but you can't put sports complexes there. We've got the Pacific Park, which is programmed out, and then everything else is further to the west.

Audience: When we voted on this, it was not put to us that way; that all the ball fields were going here. It was going to be a community park and we're all going to be together and talk about what we'd like to see there. You guys already had it planned that most of it was going to be ball fields.

Audience: This is a means to an end. You had a plan and the plan was to put as many ball fields here because you have nowhere else to put them.

Debbie Abraham: If that was the case, we'd put those 5 softball fields there too and we're not going to do that. I was at the meeting and it was pretty much me pushing this to find out what the county commissioners want to do. Let's take these out. It was not because of the softball people said no, it's not because the wetlands changed, it's because we pushed for it based on what you guys told us – nothing else!

Audience: Would you move into next door to Delta Park?

Audience: You wouldn't, I'm promising you – I lived in Tucson where they put a mega-sports complex. Sixteen ball fields! This is 24!

Debbie Abraham: What percentage of that complex were ball fields? This one is 23%.

Audience: It was all softball fields. There was no other use at that time. You're bringing more traffic here than they had next an interstate with two lanes in each direction, 15 miles outside the city. They added a third in each direction on I-10 to relieve the traffic for 15 miles to and from Tuscan.

Dale Erickson: I'd like to make a comment. Until this gets master planned and goes out for bid, we don't know what we're going to get. If this gentleman says it's going to cost \$600,000 to do a sports field, we might end up with three fields. We don't know at this point. We are master planning for the needs that will stretch out for 10 years. Maybe we won't reach that; maybe there will be other sites available before that. As urban growth continues to build, we're going to find additional locations. It might not end up here. What we're trying to do is master plan what we feel we have available now and what our needs are stretched out over 10 years. If it's going to run \$600,000 per field and we've budgeted \$500,000, we won't get all our fields. It doesn't pencil out. We're not going to put all the Metropolitan Park District funds into maintaining this field and neglect the 34 other parks that we're going to be developing. We're not going to spend all of your REED money and all of park impact fees to develop this park site. So get it in your minds that this isn't going to be done if it doesn't pencil out.

Audience: I still have a lot of trouble understanding why all these contracts were signed with all these little leagues before anybody even knew what was going on.

Debbie Abraham: A Letter of Intent was given to the Evergreen Little League by the Clark County Commissioners because they were in crisis. Contracts had not been signed by the other groups.

Audience: Then we still have play room to get rid of some of these things.

Alex Veliko: In fact we do still have a lot of play room. I think there is a slight misunderstanding. This is a master plan. Let me underline what Dale said. This is the beginning of a process. You can stop the process now and it won't start. Or start the process and as you go along building, you start to find more information, you start to get costs. I don't think our traffic studies are anywhere complete. I don't believe we've done our costing to where we can actually say we're going to have 16 or 10 or 12.

This is a plan. A plan is almost like a budget. When we start to see more concrete data come in, we start to modify the plan. What we're trying to do now is ask ourselves do we want to start? This process is fundamentally what we're doing here. So the questions that you're asking are germane, they just aren't ready to be answered yet. I asked questions about traffic. I know how traffic is done. I've been on a traffic committee, both in the county and the city. The question is not an easy one to answer. I understand trips and all this sort of stuff we get into. The fact of the matter is until we find out how many we're really going to build, how much money they're going to cost, where that money is going to come from, then we can start putting real numbers around. What you're doing now with the public process here is making this commission sensitive to a lot of things, and it's a matter of time. You've got to ask yourself, do we start the process or not. That's what we're trying to address. Period.

Audience: Our concerns are saying 'oh yeah, go ahead and build the park', when we don't know how much it's going to cost, we don't know how much is going to be out there, and we have to live with it. You folks can go home, turn off your lights at night, and go to sleep and sleep well. Well guess what? We can't.

I was born and raised in this county and have seen terrible things happen to this county because of unchecked growth and demands for this and that public service and it all comes out of the public pocket.

Alex Veliko: To put things back in perspective. If you're going to start a process, we've already modified a plan. The plan is something that is modified in time – it's a 10-year plan. I believe that the neighborhood association should be part of that discussion as we go through the modification process and that's the easiest way to get through grievances by talking to the neighborhood association. We are here to see if we want to start this process.

Audience: To the three new faces here, you don't realize all this planning before the vote, that to us it was a community park. We were asked what we wanted, what our vision was. After the vote was passed that gave them maintenance money for this park, then we were told about the ball fields. Then I hear a sports complex. Grant money to pay for the property. All of these things happened without the neighbors being told. That's why there is so much anger in this room. We feel like we've been betrayed and we're going to pay for it on top of it.

Florence Wager: I'd like to make a comment. I live on a community park right up here on the square. (David Douglas). I'm on the south side, there is a buffer of trees, there is a little ravine, and a usable area, which is lighted ball fields, and our yard is the only one fenced because we have dogs. The rest of the neighbors didn't even want perimeter fencing. David Douglas Park is on the north side. The other three sides are not fenced. Mine may be a singular experience, but I think I speak for all of my neighbors who have lived there for years and years. In fact, we've had no trouble. There are lighted fields; there is some noise at night, but not late (10:00 p.m.). I like the sounds of kids playing. Working in my garden, I like the sounds of kids. There are nine ball fields and they take up about 75% of the usable area.

Alex Veliko: Regarding that percentage, this is a lot smaller percentage, so you can't go by that. I have talked to the Vancouver police and Clark County sheriff's office about problems with Douglas.

We've had three incidents in ten years. That's pretty darn good. I don't want to get into a discussion about percentages on ball fields. To me, every one of these things is changeable in time.

Audience: It's the traffic!

Alex Veliko: I know, and that's my concern.

Audience: Thank you, and I'd like to tell you you've done a good job for doing what you're told to do. The plan is a great job for being told what to do. On the other hand, what everybody is asking you guys to do is to look at less ball fields. It is a community park, out of 240 acres you want to give us four? If this is a 10-year plan, why do we have to do ball fields in the lower south section? Get the eight in the middle, if you have to give up the two soccer fields, because there are other soccer fields south of this property. Give Highlands those two and give the community open fields to do stuff. Don't give 240 acres to everybody except the neighborhoods, and give us a little, tiny square. Thank you. (Applause)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY CLOSED

Questions from Commission

Jeanne Caswell: I have a question of staff. There has been a lot of discussion about community connectivity, bike paths, and sidewalks during the half-street improvement phase that's going to be required. What kind of activity will there be, and are there bike paths, bike lanes, or sidewalks on the roadway, will those things be provided?

Jim Sandlin: When we get into half street improvements as the property gets developed, there are those infrastructure items such as sidewalks and medians and things like that. In the interim as properties as being developed adjacent to this area, and the neighborhoods around it, it's part of the overall review process that you have to start building in requirements for greenway access from neighborhoods that take you away from the heavier traveled arterials and moving interior through the sites. Again, in this public process, we've heard some people say that they are open to the idea of allowing some access. We've had other people say, 'no way, we don't want anybody accessing through our neighborhood'. So those are the types of things that we have to work out in the overall planning level and when we go through review.

Pete Capell: Because we are in the rural area, things are built to rural standards. So there won't be sidewalks.

Debbie Abraham: What about asphalt pavement for bike paths? Is that an option?

Pete Capell: It would not be at this point a county code condition of development but it is something that I certainly would be supportive of as well. We have significant road improvements that are planned for the area but they don't include those frontage improvements at this time. Hopefully those will be something that will be included at a later date. If that were a requirement of the project it certainly would drive the cost up. But it is an option.

Debbie Abraham: Beyond the park, getting to the park is one of the bigger issues. I know there is stuff planned for 182nd across 119th. Will they have bike lanes, and could the county decide to have bike lanes? Not talking just on the park site, but to get to the park site?

Pete Capell: Yes. All I'm trying to say is the code does not require the parks to build that as part of their development. And there are not current road fund plans to develop that portion of the infrastructure at this particular time, but that doesn't preclude us from doing that.

Debbie Abraham: What kind of challenging process would that be to make the transportation provide access to the site coming from different directions? How far into the process will that be?

Jim Sandlin: We are currently undergoing the Clark County trails master plan. That's going to help establish what those priorities are.

Alex Veliko: When the county does the traffic study, do they do it the same way the city does?

Pete Capell: Yes, they look at the number of trips.

Alex Veliko: So when you look at the number of trips, does anyone looked at a first cut of this?

Pete Capell: I've not seen the traffic study, but what Jim is talking about and what DKS is one of several firms in the area that routinely does that, so I'm sure that is what is included. I'd like to clarify one thing. Previously in discussion about Delta Park, the analogy is trip generation. How many trips are generated from each single ball field so you can use that as a comparable for Hockinson. That's the only thing that's comparable because everything else is different, but it give you a good idea of how many trips you can anticipate that need to be served. That study will then look at the road system that feeds this particular facility and will be unique to this facility.

Jim Sandlin: In addition, in preparation of the study that we've been give, there are sittings that they have mapped with several people from the county and discussed these issues with them to make sure the models that they're going after are appropriate. So there has been interaction with the county staff regarding this study.

Debbie Abraham: Regarding the parking space issue, 42 parking spaces per field. What other parks in Clark County have used that same standard and how has it worked out?

Pete Capell: I honestly don't have the answer to that one.

Debbie Abraham: I'm thinking Felida Park was 42 and they have three fields and I think there were 128 and that worked out pretty well, I think. That worked out well, they were clear on off-street parking.

Pete Capell: When we start getting into the specific details, we can answer these, but just not off the top of my head. If there are items that need specific level of detail, it's a matter of going back to what occurred before Felida and tracking that information.

Florence Wager: I want to check that I heard accurately. That is I want the assurance that the neighborhood will be involved in the park planning as it progresses. Is that correct?

Jim Sandlin: Yes. Again this serves as our guide; we take a whole other level of improvement. What we're seeing is that we're providing the place holders now, we can't get this approved and then say 'you know what, we're going to move Highland to the other edge of the park'. That's reinventing the master plan. Now that we've established where these uses are going we want to bring the people that had the highest interest and the highest level of knowledge into what is the best way to continue to find this. What is the best product we're going to be able to get for our dollar? What type of trails? What is the type of play experience they want?

Joey Fuerstenberg: The five softball fields that were taken out, it appears that they were just taken out, and it wasn't actually put back in its place. I thought they were down a little further.

Jim Sandlin: What occurred is when we had a larger program, essentially when we go back talking about what our regulatory requirements seek to avoid then minimize and mitigate. There was a more expensive development in this overall park based on the fact that we were fitting in an additional program item. So we knew we were going to incur the additional cost of having to mitigate for the wetlands. It was a program item that was seen as something that was doable. Then when we removed the softball fields, we had to go back and reevaluate if we were still using the upland areas to the best of our ability prior to encroaching the wetlands again. So by removing an area encroaching on wetlands, we can't just automatically stick another element there. So what occurred is essentially we had ball fields all the way through there, we're incurring that impact also. When we removed the pressure of the five ball fields complex and maintained that we still had this upland area, we were able to redistribute some of that and continue to preserve a more valuable piece of the wetland. That's more valuable based on adjacencies to forested wetland versus this very disturbed wetland area out here. So that's how things got redistributed between the prior.

Joey Fuerstenberg: On the map, you've got naturalized areas, developed areas, I'm trying to see on the upper-left hand corner by the Prairie soccer fields, you're saying that is wetlands and naturalized areas primarily and nothing can be developed there?

Jim Sandlin: There are portions of buffers; naturalized areas are a portion of buffer and small upland areas in between those. What you see is the dark blue is the natural wetland and then we have 50 feet outside of that, so depending on what we're able to work out with the people who are going to review our plans. Our first move is to take the bigger cohesive places where we can plan development. We look at what fits best, how we're using the economy of space and is most appropriate.

Joey Fuerstenberg: On this entire site, how many shelters of wetland will there be?

Jim Sandlin: This shows two of the larger ones and then about four distributed out.

Joey Fuerstenberg: So the larger ones accommodate how many of the smaller ones?

Jim Sandlin: Again, I think a typical large shelter is probably in that 40 feet by 60 feet. Again in terms of the guide what we're presenting as the master plan is maybe not even specific to items like that. If

we find that we can afford to add another shelter, we haven't narrowed it down to we're going to have exactly 15 picnic tables. Those types of things. What we're saying is the program for that community core area and this is the general area that it's going to incur in.

If we say this core area is going to have between four, five or six small shelters, and we show four, then that's not something that's going to kick them into re-review. We are going to be dealing with budget items that will be background and associated with this overall master plan document.

Joey Fuerstenberg: Right, we're just stepping back and looking at the big picture. So, the question I would ask is the amount of open space for the general populace. How can you accommodate additional land for that?

Jim Sandlin: Looking at the 10 year, we not putting ball fields in here. We just said that the two acre area for ball fields. So we're looking at six acres freed up here. The two acre spot, four acres continuance with each other, so now we've got eight additional acres – six acres whatever in that area which are now available. The other thing that we've spoken on throughout this whole process is that you see outlined where a ball field is, but there is no permanent fencing. The only permanent fencing is the backstops and the wing fences. These are not closed off to the public. If there is a program in place, they've got priority in that time frame but beyond that, it's open. This is not a park that's excluding people from using people from using any aspect of it.

Consultant from Morasi: There has been a lot of discussion about the four acres for the community. There may be some confusion. That is four acres there (on map) and that is the open lawn area. (Now points out various areas on map.) The lawn comes back through here, there are trails and shelters and play areas and smaller shelters in here, there's parking up here, there are courts up here, a lawn area up here, this is lawn through here, open meadow up in this area, small lawn area shelter – play area here, and half-court basketball – additional lawn here, if the extreme sports doesn't go in, so just a comparison. This block here is 40 acres. My eye tells me that's about 20 acres. Twenty acres for a community park (we're working on other community parks right now in Sherwood, Wilsonville, McMinnville and they are all 20-acre community parks.) So, it's a very standard size for a community park in terms of what is happening elsewhere in the region.

Alex Veliko: Let me ask you about the northern part. You've got the trail going through, is that open? Can that be used a part of the community park? Because the impression I got, was this four acres was it.

Jim Sandlin: The four acres is upland area. These areas in between wetland buffer and there are certain restrictions in having livestock, dogs, etc. (Points to upland areas) It's part of the upland area. What we've designated here is naturalized areas versus developed areas. You see trails going through naturalized areas, we'd utilize those wetlands and uplands areas to provide areas people can access. There is also some mitigation that's going to occur on this project by putting roads through and this entire area (on map) is prime to mitigate. It's low grade so it's easier to improve. So as we develop this, you may find some of these upland areas becoming smaller, because we're now creating more wetland state approved areas to be disturbed. Those are some of the things that we won't know until we get to that next level of design in the actual quantities. That's when we begin work with the regulatory agencies.

Joey Fuerstenberg: Another question I've heard is about the equestrian issues. I thought I'd mention doing a small equestrian center. What is the feasibility of doing something like that? I know the code says something about the trail, having a bridle trail, it needs to be specified a bridle trail. What about doing a center type thing for the horse community? If there was a center-type thing, would that be a big problem? Wouldn't that work? Does it have to be combined with a trail of some variety?

Nancy Hubbard: I think the suggestion we heard was eliminating baseball fields. That's really a decision for the County Commissioners and the Board that they have chosen to accommodate the little league and make that a priority for our community park. The concept is (frankly I don't think the parks department has talked about a facility,) an indoor riding arena that's something we're working with equestrian groups to talk about what it is that the equestrian community wants. The suggestion I heard tonight was put that in instead of ball fields. I didn't think that was an issue we were willing to address.

Joey Fuerstenberg: But can they coexist with each other?

Nancy Hubbard: Can ball fields and horses coexist? They could, but it's not an ideal situation. Salmon Creek currently has horse trails going by the softball fields. It's not a pleasant place to ride. The trails are shared trails; it's not safe for horses or for people using the trails. What I think the parks department would like to do is create good quality, long-term opportunities for the equestrian population. We have put together a committee of the equestrian groups and we're talking about what we can do in the short-term and long-term to take care of that need. Definitely the equestrian population is underserved and we're going to try to address that.

Florence Wager: Are we not addressing that out at the fairgrounds?

Nancy Hubbard: That also, but there needs to be more equestrian appropriate trails, they need to be longer, they need to be continuous to something, and they're also needs to be additional opportunities explored. The trail course setup, we can look into an arena. I think there are a lot of things we need to look into, but I don't think they are appropriate on this site.

Debbie Abraham: What would be the cost of it, and the trails are there and the neighbors can use them, but we can't say they could use them. Now you've got these rules that say they can't at all. What would happen, what's the enforcement of that? Would someone need to call the sheriff's department? What would happen?

David Judd: Technically, it would be trespassing.

Commissioner: But what would be the enforcement of that? Would someone have to call the sheriff's office to actually report it?

David Judd: Debbie, that's something that the sheriff office would have to answer. They're responsible for enforcing all the laws and what we're saying is if it's against county code we simply are not going to violate that. One part of government can't violate the other, whether it's a park or not

is it now county property and the code says you're not supposed to trespass unless there is a bridle trail, so right now they are trespassing.

Joey Fuerstenberg: More on the horse issue, I'm thinking like the dog off-leash area. It doesn't have to be a fancy area, just an area where they could run around. For now, it seems feasible in the areas that are available.

Dale Erickson: Let's move this on. We have nine commissioners and six of them are here. We have a quorum. **I would like to make a motion, just to see where we stand as commissioners, as to acceptance of the master plan for Hockinson Meadows Community Park.**

Jeanne Caswell: **I second the motion.**

Dale Erickson: Now we can discuss it as commissioners as to what each of us think.

Alex Veliko: I have two reservations. I think we have to start the process. One reservation I have is traffic and what we're going to do about the traffic. Because this is rural we have a different set of rules and have to take into consideration access. The second issue is usability. I believe that study isn't as complete as it should be. (Many of Alex's comments were unintelligible). Commissioner Veliko's comments included a need in the county for little league fields and adult groups. If I could get assurance that those things could be done; I would like to start the process.

Debbie Abraham: Given the sports fields needs, looking at the grounds, looking at the studies, the current use, percentages, I feel very confident in those numbers.

Florence Wager: Since we're into the trails and bikeway planning stage right now, this is a platform to do some more studies and recommendations.

Dale Erickson: This is considered rural now, but is this any of the part where the county commissioners are considering expanding the urban growth boundary that's under consideration or is that in different areas?

Jim Sandlin: It's not at this time, it doesn't include this.

Jeanne Caswell: I would like to have more attention paid to finding open space for the community. I'd also like connectivity to the community to be considered. Whether we look at temporary asphalt overlay to give expanded bike paths that isn't up to roadway standards, but yet can serve the same purpose. Not gravel and not too steep a slope so bikes can actually stay upright. The other thing I'd like to see is us do to take the trails committee that fund activity that parks become a #1 priority for funding future trails in the county. I'm supportive of the concept because it will begin the process but I'd like staff to pay particular attention to addressing those two outstanding issues.

Joey Fuerstenberg: I agree with that, however it seems like there are some additional issues that staff didn't do because they didn't have numbers on top of their head. It seems like if we approve a master plan, granted it will have to be changed down the road but just to approve the master plan just to get things rolling, I don't think we're under that tight of a timeframe. We have a lot of people here that are

irritated. Certainly there are a lot of issues with sites, wetlands, and such. I'm wondering if there is a way to try to accommodate a bridle trail, some additional open space to actually have on the plan before we approve it.

Dale Erickson: A community park is only one element of the park system. I was thinking about that when it was said that everyone will be coming to this park, all the neighbors from all over. Actually in the 35 parks that are going to be developed there will be a lot of neighborhood parks. There's going to be a couple other community parks. We have the trails elements, we have open space elements. This is just one aspect of a park system, and it's a large aspect. We've never had to deal with 240 acres for a community park. If it was 20 acres, this would be easy. This is in a rural area, and it makes it that much harder. It's a hard decision for us. We have been listening and even though we have three new people here, they have been involved in a lot of discussions, not maybe here in front of you, but at our meetings. Lots of communications.

We have received lots of emails on every aspect of this program. We're volunteers, if we have to go through this on every park that we develop, here's my resignation. But, this is important to us, it really is. I'm glad that you came to our commission meeting two months ago and aired your concerns. That opened our eyes. Debbie was in on all the meetings and feeding information back to us, 'hey, we've upset a lot of people'. That's why we started this open mic process and solicited your feedback. That was shared by staff, by the commission, so when these three people are coming here tonight, they are not coming in with blinders on, they do know what's going on. This is my third meeting now, and I'm learning a lot more too. But like Alex said, this is a process and we have to start somewhere. This might not even happen. We planned Pacific Park five years ago and we had to redo it just last year. We redid the whole master plan again. What we do is pass on our recommendations along with our concerns. Those concerns are documented. As far as equestrian, I'm right there on equestrian trails. But does it fit into a community park? I've never known a community park that has equestrian. I would like to see other types of facilities for equestrian use.

We have to start somewhere. I like this plan in knowing that it won't go forward without the money available to do it. We do have to address some needs of the community, we've got sports fields needs. So let's get something going. Write it down on paper, find out what it's going to cost, we might have to scale back. I'm concerned about the congestion. That's a terrible area out there. There are ditches on both sides of the road, two lanes, hardly any shoulders, scary! Those things need to be addressed. But those are things that have to be worked through the process. I feel there are a lot of sports fields there, but there are also 240 acres. That's a lot. One nice thing is we are phasing this park. If we get to a certain phase and we can't handle the congestion, we're not going to step up and do any more until that element is taken care of.

We have good consultants working on this, the staff has put in hours and hours, we've had five meetings with you, and we've listened, but we also have to service those other 40,000 people who will be using this and their needs. I think this plan addresses the needs of a community park.

Debbie Abraham: I have been with this process from the get-go. I think major accommodations have been made to this plan. I think it's a good plan. Mostly this park is going to be open space. I was involved with Felida Park. Those neighbors were concerned about sports fields going in there. The county commissioners said sports fields were going in there. The neighbors love that park. There has

been no crime in that park. When soccer teams are there and even when they aren't, it's grassy fields. When you look at that park from the street, you see playground equipment and open fields. I think when this park is built, you're going to be happy. I think you will enjoy it. When you look at the buffers, and you look at how far away are those fields? I think it measure about 300 yards. But when it's built, it's not going to be that bad. I hope it's not that bad. My only concern, the only things I would change is to add that southern 40 soft chip trail for the equestrians. I've been firm about that all along, and outvoted about that all along. We've got a motion; we've got a second.

I would make a secondary motion to amend the plan to add equestrian. We'll vote on that now. I vote yes, anyone else? Three more yes's, and two no's. So we now have a motion

What happens now is this will go before the county commissioners and they will see this entire presentation. I believe they will probably see it with an equestrian loop trail in the southern 40, and they will decide whether they want to adopt it the way the four of us who voted yes and they will make their decision vote on what they want to see.

Audience: So should we call the county commissioners about this?

Debbie Abraham: Email them. They want to know what you want. To reiterate the equestrian issue, the discussions have been the equestrians would love to have the entire park be an equestrian facility and that's not going to happen. So the question is 'Can we accommodate equestrians at all'? My feeling is I would love to see a loop and I've talked to equestrian people and they have said a loop around the bottom 40 would make them happy. I'm willing to compromise enough to allow that loop and so that was the motion I made.

Audience: Forty acres, when you have horses cantering, goes by very quickly.

Debbie Abraham: That's exactly why no one has really advocated for this. Basically staff has said, you heard Nancy and the Big Horse Council think it's a bad idea, and staff thinks it's a bad idea. This is to accommodate the immediate neighbors.

Audience: Debbie, all 40,000 who come to the park people can use this loop?

Debbie Abraham: I seriously doubt that those 40,000 people will be using that as an equestrian area. Clark County does not spend a whole lot of money on their parks. Our standards are very low compared to the national standards. We don't have a lot of park land. We don't have a lot of development. With our limited dollars we need to decide where to put our money. An equestrian area is very expensive and for now it's at the fairgrounds. So this loop is basically to meet the needs of the local neighbors only.

Audience: The lower 40 is not the place to put the horses, because that's where all the ball fields are. Your concern about horses and ball fields is true. You've got a 240-acre park and you've got a large area without any of that.....

Debbie Abraham: I've walked that and been a big advocate of this since the beginning and they're not going to put the horse trails anywhere near the level.

Dale Erickson: **I move we adjourn the meeting.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.