

## MEETING SUMMARY

ISSUE DATE 21 July 2010

MEETING DATE 14 July 2010

MEETING McCormick Village Park Committee  
LOCATION City Hall, Port Orchard  
PROJECT NAME McCormick Village Park  
PROJECT NUMBER 31150.000  
ATTENDEES City Staff: James Weaver, Tom Bonsell  
Park Committee members  
Jones & Jones consultant: Mario Campos, Cory Parker  
DISTRIBUTION

### MEETING SUMMARY

Tom Bonsell opened the meeting by thanking people for participating in the design of the McCormick Village Park.

Cory Parker outlined the schedule for the park design. This is the third meeting of the Parks Committee. Previously, we have discussed the site, potential program elements and the park goals. The purpose of this meeting is to evaluate three draft park alternatives. In August the committee will review a preferred alternative.

Cory then present the three draft park alternatives:

1. The Nature and Community Site Alternative would emphasize passive recreation and forest ecosystem preservation. Trails would have interpretive components and playgrounds would be more natural "imaginative play."
2. The Fitness and Community Site Alternative would emphasize the health and fitness of the local community. There would be opportunities for active recreation with a full-size soccer field and informal sports field, as well as opportunities for walking, hiking, picnicking, playing and using fitness stations.
3. The Arts and Community Site Alternative would emphasize participation and enjoyment of the "arts," broadly defined. Visitors could come together as a community by enjoying a concert at the amphitheater, walking on a trail and viewing sculpture or strolling through gardens and a reflection pond.

Several questions arose from examining the draft alternatives:

- What hours will the park be open? Dawn to dusk? – This has not yet been determined.
- How will the park be secured during hours it is closed? – After the vision has been developed, we will begin to tackle the operation and maintenance issues.
- Will costs be a consideration in the development of the park? – Yes, cost estimates will be done, and the implementation of park will most likely be phased over time depending on funding.

Mario identified some of the key issues regarding the draft alternatives before asking Committee members to respond to two questions: How do the park alternatives respond to your needs? And how do the park alternatives respond to the needs of your community?

The following is a summation of each participant's thoughts on the three alternatives:

- The city should pursue public/private partnerships to fund the park. The park should have a community focus with families gathering around a water feature and retirees using the fitness stations. More and more people are looking to increase their healthiness outdoors.

Mario clarified aspects of the different alternatives. Alt 1 (nature) will still require substantial funds to construct. Each alternative could provide places for community gathering... as long as there is open space, there will be the desire to hold larger events there, such as farmer's markets and small circuses.

James described the surrounding proposed development. There may be over 4000 residential units developed west of the park site. It may be possible to provide on-street parallel parking along the proposed Campus Parkway.

- The park should have qualities that fit with the communities around it. Open spaces should be flexible to support multiple activities, i.e. art show, soap box.
- Alternative 1 (nature) has the best theme and flavor, although it could also encompass elements from the other alternatives, such as disc golf or an informal field.
- The amount of parking will be a problem. The entrance along Old Clifton Road may be unsafe as it is a blind curve, people drive fast. Open spaces in the park should remain flexible with multiple uses. The amphitheater is nice, but it should not have power, as it is in a quiet area.
- If a fitness trail is added and a running track around the stormwater pond, then Alternative 1 would be the best option. The canopy viewing tower would be nice and a destination. After seeing the disc golf course at Fairgrounds, it is apparent that disc golf is not natural. Course construction leads to cutting of a lot of trees and eroded ground surface. A disc golf course would not fit with Alternative 1.
- Alternative 3 (arts and community) is the best, especially the amphitheater, which would appeal to a variety of users. We need different elements to meet the project's goals of appealing to diverse groups of users.
- While disc golf does have erosion problems, it does not require wholesale tree clearing as suggested. Fairways are cleared of brush and are 30 to 50 feet wide. Banzee Park (sp?) has a nine hole disc golf course that has not changed the park's character. There is a growing popularity to the sport. The local association of disc golfers has contributed to the costs and construction of local courses and would like to help.
- Having three alternatives is great to see what is possible for this park. Alt 1 is the best, but components of the other park alternatives are good, too. The park must have trail, picnic areas, and playgrounds. The other components will have to be evaluated and people should be willing to make trade-offs. The most important thing is to do a quality job. It would be better to have a small, high-quality park, than a large, low-quality park with lots of facilities.
- Alternative 3 (arts and community) is the best starting point. The interior ½ mile trail loop lends itself to smaller branching trail that could be devoted to nature interpretation or fitness stations. Providing a disc golf course would be better than providing an off-leash dog area. The amphitheater would be great if it did not have power, but acoustical only.
- These are three well done park designs. In general, the parks need to have playgrounds and intensive use areas, like fields, close to the southern end where the parking will be. The northern section should be more naturalistic. The amphitheater is a great facility. It could be on the west side, and the steep slopes used to buffer the sound
- There are strong aspects from all three alternatives. Priority should be given to playgrounds and picnic shelters. Safety is the most important consideration as the design is implemented. There is not as much a need for athletic ballfields here at this park. Alternative 1 has the best combination of elements. Each playground needs a restroom

readily accessible for children.

- Other South Kitsap entities are starting to build more athletic fields. There are a lot of other parks going on in the South Kitsap area. It is o.k. to dream about the park... practical considerations can come in later as the park is broken up into phases. All the park concepts sound doable. The track around the stormwater pond sounds great. It is important to build something small at the site as soon as possible so the community can see some momentum.
- The visual presentation of park alternatives is good. The best park elements to include are: fitness stations, viewing tower and bridge, picnic areas (some covered), playground with restrooms, and trails for walking and running.
- Soccer is a major part of the Port Orchard community. There are 1300 kids who play soccer, and 4000 adults. The City does not have a single athletic field where people can play soccer. Soccer players use the school fields. If a synthetic turf field were installed at this park, it would be used from dawn to dusk. It would pay for itself. The park needs to be for the whole community, which includes a long tradition of soccer.

The Committee discussed other potential soccer location in the City. One field will not necessarily solve the problem of not enough fields. This park may not be the best fit to install soccer fields. As the City increases in population and tax base, a permanent Parks Committee and more infrastructure will provide more recreational opportunities for the community.

- The three park alternatives all emphasize the unique aspects of the topography and the site. The best elements are the viewing tower, the trails and suspension bridge and the reflection pool. The park should celebrate the uniqueness of the place.

The Committee discussed park elements, such as athletic fields and off-leash dog areas, in which there was some resistance to providing at this park. The Committee reached consensus on several key points:

1. Alternative 1 and 3 were the most preferred park plans.
2. An athletic soccer field would not be best suited for this park due to topographic constraints, the size of the site, traffic concerns at Old Clifton Road, and potential negative impacts to other areas of the park, such as noise.
3. An off-leash dog area is not suitable for the park, due to impacts to nature, wildlife and erosion.

For other park elements, the Committee should ask the questions: Is this a desirable element to include in the park design? And is there political will to fund and build this park element? An element could be desirable and not ready to be funded, in which case, it may be included in the park design, but put in a later phase.

Jones & Jones will develop a Preferred Alternative for next month's meeting, based on participant comments and the findings of the survey available on the web. This Preferred Alternative will likely use Alternative 1 as a base and include the most popular elements of Alt 2 and 3.

The Committee discussed funding opportunities for the park. Can we come up with examples of other park funding mechanisms? How did they raise the money for what they wanted to do? Funding comes from multiple sources and gets funded in different ways.

Tom adjourned the meeting.

21 July 2010

J&J#31150.000