

PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD

DRAFT RECORD OF MEETING

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2004

JACK DAVIS PARKS MAINTENANCE SHOP

690 COUNTY SHOP LANE

BURLINGTON WA 98233

6:30 P.M.

6:30 – 6:35 p.m. **Roll Call of General Meeting**

**Present**

Keith Magee, Chairman

Liz McNett Crowl

**Absent**

Carroll Dillon

Colleen Fisher, Vice Chair

Curtis Metz

Jerry Krampetz

John Semrau

Lloyd Brown

Peter Swanson

**Staff**

Bob Vaux

Brian Adams

Jim Rabenstein

Lauren Woodmansee

Patrik Dylan

Tawni Helms

**Guests**

**November Minutes** – The November minutes were not reviewed due to lack of quorum.

6:32 – 6:45 p.m. **Public Comment Period** – none received

6:45 – 8:15 p.m. **Comp Plan Update**

**The Comp Plan presentation for the March 2<sup>nd</sup> Planning Commission was reviewed** – Before beginning the overview Keith inquired about the purpose of the presentation. Bob stated that he was establishing the setting of the presentation to illustrate everything we do in the Parks and Recreation Department. The goal is to emphasize that we are responsible for a broad scope of services that go far beyond the Cascade Trail and the Frailey Gun Range. After establishing our scope, the presentation will then detail how the comp plan was developed and how recommendations were made. Patrik Dylan offered that the theme of the presentation is **thoroughness, competence and reasonableness**. Brian also mentioned that it would be very important to emphasize the Boards involvement and support of the comp plan process.

**Comments on the Comp Plan review**

Keith offered that there was too much emphasis on the mechanics of the comp plan and not enough information regarding the the public's input. He suggested that there should be more information regarding the survey results and emphasis on how we are **listening** to what the people are telling us and hearing what they want.

Bob responded that one of the reasons for describing the mechanics of the comp plan process is to appease the planning commission. The mechanics of the process are what the Planning Commission is appointed to hear and inquire about.

Keith suggested that to incorporate the definitions of the comp plan process stop and describe slowly how the chart and tables work. Otherwise we risk losing the audience Liz McNett Crowl stated that the survey is powerful testimony and really is the "voice of the people". Keith also suggested that the presentation should include an emphasis on the analyses of needs from the voice of the people. He inquired about the questions and concerns

presented at the comp plan work session i.e. County comparison to other counties. Brian said there was little scrutiny on the neighboring county comparisons other than the reference from Harry Ota to ensure Skagit County doesn't become another Lynwood. Brian also stated that any concerns regarding the chosen County comparisons were resolved at the end of the study session.

Bob added that many of our participants come from our neighboring counties so it is valuable for us to know what they are providing their Parks systems. Brian added that we aren't creating LOS to find money but rather it is only 25% of the formula used to determine the recommendations and further SCPR receives no capital facilities/land acquisition allocations so must be creative and resourceful.

After reviewing the recommendations that scored as high priority during the comp plan process Keith inquired about the fact that there were three high priority recommendations that weren't a result of the survey or comp plan process. The three recommendations included HMSP improvements, Clear Lake improvements and SVP improvements. Valid as they are, the challenge will be to articulate *why* they are on the list of recommendations.

Bob related that although the three are existing projects they still fall into the comp plan priorities. All three are identified as regional parks, determined to be the highest need park type as per the survey. Additionally, two of the three include shoreline access another high priority revealed in the comp plan. Another justification is the fact that they are all revenue builders.

In reviewing the high need recommendations Liz suggested that they be categorized by facility type to accentuate the relation to the Analysis of Need. Everyone agreed.

8:15 – 8:25 p.m.

#### Staff Reports

- A) **Capital Facilities Plan** - Currently the Capital Facilities Plan is still in process therefore Bob was unable to give a report on the plan.
- B) **REET** – Bob distributed the Financial Plan Gary Rowe created in lieu of the Capital Facilities Plan. Keith inquired if SCPR was to be involved with providing information for the CFP? Bob replied that we were involved and provided timely input. Keith asked specifically if SCPR was able to provide changes/input to the CFP? Bob affirmed that SCPR did provide board approved input but that submission has not yet been incorporated or returned to him. Keith stated that he would be meeting with Gary Rowe and was intending to ask for a document that describes the CFP process and associated timeline. Bob responded that the best he can provide the Parks Advisory Board at this time is the Financial Plan created by Gary Rowe. The Financial Plan was then reviewed. Funding was discussed as follows:

#### 340 Land Acquisition

\$250,000. New Administration Bldg.

#### Discussion

as more is learned about the pros/cons of moving the parks admin the actual move may not materialize

#### 352 Park Acquisition Fund

\$ 25,000 Indoor Rec Ctr. Feasibility study

\$ 70,000 NSRA

\$200,000 SVP/Dreamfield Completion

\$ 75,000 ClearLake Beach improvements

\$ 5,000 Frailey Mountain Shooting Range

projected timeline is fall 2004

completion of the 300,000 project

money moved from special pathways fund

#### 102 Special Pathways

\$450,000 Cascade trail 03 flood trestle repair

\$185,000 Cascade trail 03 flood surface repair

both projects are been approved through FEMA and

both projects have dramatically different costs associated with the repair

**New Staff Reporting Format** – Bob introduced the new Quarterly newsletter that will replace the monthly staff reports that were submitted to the Parks Advisory Board and the Board of County Commissioners. The goal is to reach a larger audience and to provide information and updates in an attractive reader friendly format. The idea of a quarterly newsletter came out of the new marketing committee meeting.

Adjourn – The meeting ended at 8:40