

Clark County Parks Master Plan: Board packet table of contents

1. Planning Commission Recommendations

Exhibit 1: Clark County Parks Advisory Board recommendation

Exhibit 2: Planning Commission meeting minutes

Exhibit 3: Errata Sheet

Exhibit 4: SEPA

Exhibit 5: Comments table

Exhibit 6: Draft Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan Resolution

2. Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan



**Planning Commission Recommendations to the
Clark County Board of Councilors**

FROM: Steve Morasch, Chair
Ron Barca, Vice-Chair
Clark County Planning Commission

DATE: September 22, 2015

SUBJECT: CPZ2015-00001: Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan

RECOMMENDATION: Approval of adoption of the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan

INTRODUCTION

The Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan provides guidance for the future priorities of the park system over the next 20 years, qualifies the county park system for eligibility for federal and state grant resources, fulfills the requirement for a parks element within the county comprehensive plan as part of the State of Washington Growth Management Act (GMA), and reflects the guidance from the Parks Advisory Board related to the recreational needs and priorities of the community.

BACKGROUND

The City of Vancouver and Clark County had previously run a parks department, called the Vancouver-Clark Parks Department. In 2014, the County created a parks department separate from the City of Vancouver. Vancouver-Clark Parks department no longer exists and the City of Vancouver runs its own parks department. The Greater Clark Parks District is a division of Clark County Public Works. The County also created a Parks Advisory Board (PAB) last year.

The current parks plan is expired and also is no longer relevant because the Clark County Parks is now separate from the City of Vancouver Parks Department and a new plan had to be created to reflect the new entity the County created as a result.

The Growth Management Act requires local parks plans as a component of any county master plan (RCW 36.70A.070(8)-Mandatory elements of the comprehensive plan) and this parks plan will ultimately become a chapter of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update.

Per GMA requirements, the plan has the following components:

- Inventory of parks, sports facilities, and trails-only county facilities;
- Needs assessment for parks, recreation, open space and trails;

- Public outreach effort: The county undertook an extensive public involvement effort for this plan and it is documented in the Public Demand chapter;
- Implementation recommendations, including funding strategies; and
- Parks Capital Facilities Plan- 6 & 20 year list of all county parks, trails, and planning projects.

In addition, the state Recreation Conservation Office (RCO) requires a jurisdiction to have an adopted parks master plan to be able to apply for grant funding. The RCO grant applications are due March of 2016. These grants fund many types of parks efforts such as building trails, restoring habitat conditions, or funding to buy and renovate youth recreational facilities.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission voted unanimously **7-0** to recommend approval of the adoption by resolution of the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan. The Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Clark County Councilors:

1. Approve the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan, and
2. Sign the resolution for adopting the plan.

Exhibits

1. Parks Advisory Board recommendation to adopt the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan
2. Errata sheet
3. Planning Commission meeting minutes
4. Comments table
5. SEPA
6. Draft Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan Resolution

Parks Advisory Board (PAB) Parks, Recreation & Open Space (PROS) Plan Recommendation:

The PROS Plan is a dynamic document that embraces expansion and implementation to meet changing community needs and technologies, capitalizing on opportunities and supporting a high quality parks, recreation and trails systems.

The PROS Plan qualifies the county park system for eligibility for state and federal grant and other funding resources, provides direction for the future priorities of the park system over the next two decades, fulfills the requirements for a parks element within the county comprehensive plan as part of the State of Washington Growth Management Act (GMA) and reflects the guidance from the Parks Advisory Board relative to the needs and priorities of the community for further health of the parks, recreation and trails system.

It is the recommendation of the PAB, the Board of County Councilors approves the PROS Plan.

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Public Hearing
Thursday, August 20, 2015**

Public Services Center
BOCC Hearing Room
1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, Washington
6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

MORASCH: All right. Well, welcome to the August 20, 2015, Planning Commission hearing. Can we have the roll call, please.

MORASCH: HERE
WRIGHT: HERE
BARCA: HERE
QUIRING: HERE
JOHNSON: HERE
BLUM: HERE
BENDER: HERE

Staff Present: Chris Cook, Prosecuting Attorney; Laurie Lebowsky, Planner III; Gary Albrecht, Planner II; Kathy Schroader, Office Assistant; and Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for August 20, 2015

MORASCH: All right. Moving on to approval of the agenda, can I get a motion to approve the agenda.

BLUM: Move to approve.

JOHNSON: Second.

MORASCH: All in favor?

EVERYBODY: AYE

MORASCH: Opposed? Motion carries.

B. Approval of Minutes for July 16, 2015

MORASCH: Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes? Are there any comments on the minutes? Hearing none, I'd take a motion to approve the minutes.

BARCA: Motion to approve.

BLUM: Second.

MORASCH: All in favor?

EVERYBODY: AYE

MORASCH: Opposed? Motion carries.

C. Communications from the Public

MORASCH: All right. Now we're at the time on our agenda for communications from the public on items not on our scheduled agenda. Is there anyone in the public that would like to speak to the Planning Commission tonight on a matter that's not on our printed agenda?

Okay. Well, seeing no one, we will go ahead and move on to our first agenda item which is public hearing on the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan. I think we're ready for the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

A. CPZ2015-00001: Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan

The Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (PROS) is the guiding document for the Greater Clark Parks Department regarding provision of parks, recreational facilities, open space, and trails. Per the State of Washington Growth Management Act (GMA) 36.70A requirements, this parks master plan contains the following elements: designation of the general location and extent of land uses including recreation and open space lands; identification of useful lands for recreation, including wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas; estimation of park and recreation demand for at least a 10-year period; and both a six-year and 20-year capital facilities plan.

The County is adopting this plan now because the Greater Clark Parks Department was created in 2014, so the current parks master plan is no longer applicable. The County must adopt a parks plan to be eligible for grants from the state Recreation and Conservation Office.

Staff Contact: Laurie Lebowsky, Planner III
Email: Laurie.Lebowsky@clark.wa.gov
Phone: (360) 397-2280 Ext.4544

LEBOWSKY: Thank you, Commissioners.

MORASCH: Thank you.

LEBOWSKY: Name is Laurie Lebowsky with Community Planning. I would like to start out tonight, I'm going to have help in presenting the parks master plan to the Planning Commission. To my left is Bill Bjerke. He's the Clark County Parks Manager. To my right is Barbara Anderson. She is a Parks Advisory Board co-chair. And then we have Kelly Puntenev who's the other Parks Advisory Board co-chair. In the audience we have Jean Akers. She's the consultant with Conservation Technix who helped prepare the parks master plan. I would ask anyone who's with the Parks Advisory Board to raise your hand or stand up if you're in the audience.

KEEN: I'm Marsha Keen, and I served on the board.

MORASCH: Welcome.

LEBOWSKY: Okay. Next slide. Commissioners, briefly just want to give you some background on why we're here tonight and have the parks draft parks master plan before you. 2014 Clark County Parks, we separated from Vancouver-Clark Parks Department. So the previous plan, parks plan we had adopted is no longer relevant. And also, we are currently not eligible for State parks grants because we do not have a parks plan.

And if you recall last month, there was an article in the Columbian regarding there was some grant funding that was awarded to different agencies, including the City of Vancouver, Port of Camas/Washougal and Department of Natural Resources. They were for trails projects. It was about \$3 million as I said. The County couldn't apply for that grant funding because we didn't have a parks plan which is required by the State.

In addition to the County parks division that was created last year, we also created the County Parks Advisory Board in 2014, and the Parks Advisory Board is a diverse group of volunteers. They have been instrumental in the development of this parks master plan.

And with that, I will turn over the presentation to Barbara Anderson.

ANDERSON: Next slide, please. On this slide you will see some feedback from the extensive outreach that was done. We had a multifaceted approach to our outreach. There were specific stakeholder meetings with user groups, such as the sports fields, neighborhood alliances, the bike and pedestrian group. We also had a web survey as well as going out to local areas and inviting the general public to come and speak to us.

And through all of these meetings, there were a couple of pretty specific outcomes that repeated themselves time and again, and you'll find that the top three bullets on this slide identify the most frequent comments or perceptions that we heard back from these individuals.

And that is, first and foremost, that despite the economic downturn and the slow build-out of parks, our residents still believe that Clark County is doing a really good job in provisioning parks and recreation services to them. They also have a strong belief that the park system

is a major contributor to the positive economic, environmental and health outcomes of Clark County.

And the one issue that repeated itself as the very highest priority was an interest in seeing our trail system interconnections built and trailheads supported. So you'll see that within our plan, it reflects this high priority that our residents placed on the trails and trail connections.

Now, the public also made a pretty strong voice in what they felt was a need for more amenities and access and connections to facilities. And the one area that we seem to be falling down a little bit that we need to really step up on is doing enhanced communications and outreach. And the reason I say we are falling down is because we're still kind of back in the 20th century.

We need to bring to the new technology to our residents. There would be a wonderful use for an app for your mobile phones to find a park or a specific amenity. We need to take and replicate some of the things that we previously offered but are no longer there, such as the web service that easily locates trails and parks with specific amenities identified. So we've acknowledged that, and that is reflected in our plan as well. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Kelly.

PUNTENEY: As Barbara mentioned, we had --

ANDERSON: Oh, next slide, please.

PUNTENEY: Oh. As Barbara mentioned, we had the open houses all throughout the county. We had stakeholder interviews. We had the parks board meetings. We had the surveys went out, and we did, I felt, a pretty decent job in outreach for this plan. We heard hundreds of topics within that outreach, and we broke those up into three categories; that was partnerships, connecting the gaps and increasing accessibility.

So within partnerships, we heard a lot of information about wanting to empower volunteers. Of course, that's something we believe strongly in any way. We also are encouraging ourselves to be partners with our other cities within the county and other nonprofit and our business community.

Connecting the gaps, as you know we've been working on trails for years, but we are down to connecting those gaps now and we've got to continue working hard to do that. We've done kind of low-hanging fruit at this point, but we've got to really keep moving on connecting those pieces of the trail.

And then, of course, increasing our access to our park system, as Barbara just mentioned. We definitely need to continue to promote the system and to make sure that the public knows that we are out there and we have these parks. If people aren't aware of them, we're not going to get the kind of support that we need.

So with that, I think I'll turn this over to Bill. If you have any questions at this point, certainly

feel free to ask them.

BJERKE: Good evening, Commissioners. Can we get the master plan elements. Okay. On this next slide, it shows the key master plan elements which is a requirement within the Growth Management Act and as well as Recreation and Conservation Office which is our --

HOLLEY: Please slow down.

MORASCH: You need to slow down.

BJERKE: Oh, I'm sorry.

HOLLEY: I didn't understand anything you said. And, I'm sorry, I can't go that fast.

BJERKE: Okay. No problem. My apologies. I'll slow down a little bit. So as the key master plan elements, it's required with the Growth Management Act as well as the Recreation and Conservation Office, which is our primary State granting agency. And so then also we need to -- the need for assessment for parks, recreation and open space and trails, and so that was completed.

Result of public outreach effort, and Kelly and Barbara both talked about that, the public demand chapter in the plan. And so with the outreach efforts, that was a series of open houses as well as stakeholder meetings. And then we had over -- I think over 1500 comments that came back from our surveys that we conducted, and actually right now we are still taking comments until this plan is finalized.

And then implementation of the plan is also a requirement with recommendations including funding strategies. So how do we get the monies that we need to to carry these goals out? You know, so of course, we're going to be going to the Board of County Councilors and asking for funding this fall, in fact, but we're also reaching out to other ways to come up with our funding which is, you know, real estate excise tax funds. We've got PIF funds in place right now, but we're also going to be seeking grants, and that's the key component of why we're here and producing this master plan is that we want to become grant eligible. So that's another funding source.

Partnering with different groups, private sector, corporations, there's a lot of different areas that we need to explore to try to partner with groups to bring extra revenues in, and, so... And, of course, our capital facilities plan which actually details out what our intentions are for the 6-year high priority period as well as the 20-year long range plan. So it details out what our intentions are for acquisition, for development, for planning strategies, master planning, all that stuff. It's all in there, so...

Okay. Next slide, please. So plan implementation. So the cost of the 6-year capital facilities plan in the urban unincorporated area alone is \$38 million. That's what we've identified. In the regional system, it's \$79 million, and that is over the 6- and 20-year period. And so there's more challenges. There's challenges to this funding strategy, and that is we

need more funding. We really don't have any. We're crawling out of the economic downturn and we're still feeling the pain from that. And so with luck, we will hopefully be able to secure some funding from our Board of County Councilors as we see that funding is coming in at a little higher than expected rate, so we want to get a piece of that.

The Metropolitan Park District was approved by the voters in 2005 by proposition, and that's a junior taxing district. And when the recession occurred a few years ago, the revenue declined pretty significantly. We've been averaging -- well, it started off at 27 cents back in 2006, and then it went down to about 25 cents per thousand. And then when the recession occurred, being at the bottom of the junior taxing district, we were the first ones to be hit and it actually went down into the single digits, and it scared us because that is the primary source for maintaining our parks in the urban unincorporated area.

And the one thing that we've identified in this plan is that we would like to protect that if we could. Of course, that's going to require a vote of the public to make that happen. And so when we do that, it would protect the levy rate at 25 cents, and that's for a period of six years from the time that it's voted or approved. And so in the event that there's another economic downturn, we wouldn't actually be depleted all the way down to potentially zero or the actual -- the levy could actually be wiped out, which is a scary thought. So that was, I think, for our longevity in parks, I think it's pretty obvious that we need to try to do what we can to protect the levy that keeps us going.

Also identified in the plan, when we separated from the City of Vancouver, with Vancouver-Clark Parks, and we formed our own parks division within Clark County as a standalone entity, we had a staff that was basically -- we had enough staff to essentially hold the line, so that was to hold on to what we've got, maintain what we've got, but we didn't necessarily get the staff that we needed to move forward with our planning components.

So when this capital facilities plan goes into effect, we're going to need somebody to actually go out there and do some planning for us. So we actually do need a planner that can focus solely on this plan and all the objectives within it. And we also need a grant writer because that takes an enormous amount of time. So there's two positions there that the parks division used to have back when it was Vancouver-Clark Parks but it no longer has that right now, and so we noticed that that is a key component to our success in the master plan going forward, so...

I think that's it on this one. So I'd like to turn this back over to Laurie.

LEBOWSKY: Okay. I'm going to talk about comments received for SEPA. We had our SEPA comment period, actually received no comments. We last week received a comment from Washington Trails Association via e-mail - that's separate from SEPA - and that was forwarded on to the members of the Planning Commission.

On the slide here you see the timeline. Before I talk about the timeline, however, I do want to say that we also sent a notice to Commerce. Staff from Commerce contacted me and

said they had no comments. As Bill indicated, we are still open to receiving public comments on the plan.

I'm going to go back to the timeline, you see it on the slide. We have a work session with the Board on September 2nd. It goes to a Board hearing on September 15th. The proposal is to adopt the parks plan as a resolution, that makes Clark County Parks grant eligible. The grant applications are due March of 2016. And then the plan is that we would re-adopt the parks plan as a chapter in the 2016 comprehensive plan update as we are required to have a parks element under the Growth Management Act.

I am going to just wrap up my staff report by saying based on the information that you received in your packet and in the staff report and the exhibits, staff is recommending to the Planning Commission that you approve the Clark County Parks Recreation and Open Space Plan. And I'll turn it back over to you. I'm here to answer questions. Bill's here and then we have Barbara and Kelly. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Well, thank you all for coming. Does the Planning Commission have any questions for staff at this point?

JOHNSON: Yeah, I do. This is kind of out of the box, Bill. I understand the split between Vancouver and the County. Do they still have their grant writer and planner or did they let them --

BJERKE: Yes. Well, and before the County split, there was, of course, and then with the recession, there was a lot of staff that left, you know. So that whole staff was depleted, but I believe they do still have those folks, yes.

JOHNSON: I was just curious at certain aspects of getting your grant writer because it's coming up fast in 2016.

BJERKE: That's correct. That's why we've been pretty proactive in trying to put in for those two positions this fall, so during the budget re-adopt.

JOHNSON: Thanks.

QUIRING: I guess my question would be about these positions. You're talking about full-time positions for this and not maybe a contract grant writer? I know that they're out there. I would imagine that they, if they do this sort of thing, they know what's available and they could do this on a contract basis rather than being a full-time employee. I understand the planner needs to coordinate all the parks and everything.

BJERKE: Yes.

QUIRING: I just question the grant writer.

BJERKE: That would probably be our Plan B if we do not get the positions. The idea of

having a grant writer and a planner that is on staff is that they get to know our organization, how it works, what the needs are and they can focus in on the priorities based on, you know, the, you know, the comp plan and what the folks want, you know. They learn the culture of where we're at here in Clark County and get to know it fairly well. So it's hard to be a staff person when it comes to, you know, having that background knowledge versus, you know, a contractual person who comes in for a period of time and does it.

QUIRING: Yeah. I'm not talking about coming in for a period of time. I'm talking about a long-term contract person upon whom you call or who would even maybe alert you - the County I should say - about grants available for parks. I've worked with grant writers before. They know what they're doing and what -- so it isn't about knowing the culture of the county. It's about knowing what they're doing in order to write a grant to have it granted to us, so... And I would think that there would be that kind of person available.

BJERKE: Sure. Sure.

QUIRING: And I would suggest it not be Plan B, that you should consider it as a Plan A.

BJERKE: Thank you.

BARCA: I'd like to make a comment. I heard you talk about introducing the master plan into the 2016 comp plan review. I'm definitely all for that. One of the things that I think would be very helpful for everybody is at that time you kind of paint the picture of what the instate for the comp plan and what it looks like for the parks system, recognizing that you have a shortfall even in the 6-year capital facilities plan, that's the reality of funding on the ground.

But I think it's important for the public to understand that you're not just lurching from capital facilities plan to capital facilities plan trying to see what you can go ahead and rustle up in the way of funds. I think it's really important for the organization to be able to paint a picture of what you're going to give the community in the form of the value of the park system built out the way that you would hope that it could be built out.

There's certainly some parks in the greater metropolitan area that, you know, are really good examples of when they're funded correctly and the right mix of facilities are in place, they show how great of an asset they are to the community, and I think it garners greater acceptance and willingness to fund things, but we have to kind of help people with their imagination about what that's supposed to look like.

BJERKE: Yeah. We talked about that as far as improving our marketing skills, if you will, to get ourselves out there, our brand name, and to try to get to, you know, people aware that we are here and that we're doing good things and with the hope that they'll back us and fund us, you know, for these different projects that we have in mind, and so...

That's the one thing is outreach to our funds, and Barbara talked about that a little bit. We need to get up to the times and make sure that we're, you know, our platform is on every

device out there that's easily accessible. And then also we've gotten a lot of comments back from the public about signage. People know that we have parks, but they don't know where they're at and they don't know how to get there. And so we need to make sure our access to our folks to let them know about us and our parks are easily accessible, so I agree.

BARCA: Yeah. And that's all good for today in what we have in the way of facilities, but I'm really talking about trying to create, as you call it, a master plan, show them what it looks like with the build-out comparable to the comp plan.

BJERKE: Right.

BARCA: You've got 20-years worth of growth here. Here's what the park system should look like to accommodate that.

BJERKE: Yes.

JOHNSON: Vision.

BARCA: Yeah, it's a vision. Thank you.

BJERKE: Great. And our levels of service obviously are lacking. We need to bring that up. And if we were to actually diagram what that would look like, if we were meeting our service levels, I think that would impress many folks.

LEBOWSKY: I appreciate your comments, Commissioner Barca, but we'll look at that, but I just also want to emphasize this is a 20-year plan and we do have a mission statement and vision statement and goals to kind of help paint that picture that you're talking about.

BARCA: Maybe you'll look at it again.

PUNTENEY: And maps.

BARCA: Yeah.

LEBOWSKY: And maps. Thank you.

MORASCH: All right. Any other questions for staff at this time? Okay. Hearing none, we are going to open it to the public now. So the first person on the list is Jean Akers. And, yeah, we'll need to make some space up here for public testimony.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

AKERS: I checked the no comment.

MORASCH: No comment?

AKERS: I don't need to make a comment.

MORASCH: No comment. Okay. Great. Well, thank you. And then Ryan Ojerio, did you wish to make a comment? It looks like you checked yes.

OJERIO: Yeah, I did.

MORASCH: All right. Well, come on down to the microphone here, state your name and maybe spell your last name for the court reporter and welcome to the Planning Commission.

OJERIO: Right here?

MORASCH: Yep, that's fine.

OJERIO: Ryan Ojerio, O-j-e-r-i-o. And I wrote in some comments by e-mail and I just came to re-emphasize those comments, but also maybe provide some examples that might be useful for the Commission to hear. First, an introduction of who I am. I'm the regional manager for the Washington Trails Association, and we're a private nonprofit and we're based out of Seattle, but I work out of our Vancouver office right over here in downtown Vancouver.

And our mission is to preserve, enhance, protect and improve trails for hiking and walking throughout the state. And we do that through a mix of collaboration, advocacy, education, engaging the public and getting them out on trails, and then we also do volunteer trail maintenance and construction. And so my role spreads all those different hats.

Last year for Clark County Parks, we did something like 2,400 hours of volunteer maintenance in new trail construction. And this year to date, we've done 1,885 hours of maintenance and mostly construction on the new Vancouver Lake ADA or accessible barrier free trail out there.

And so one of the comments that I put in there is that we really like seeing the fact that they're looking for additional staff support to expand partnerships. And I rely and my volunteers rely on the County park staff to support our program and to provide the leadership and the project specifications and the materials to get our projects done. So without their volunteer coordinator Karen, you know, we'd probably cut those hours in half maybe, or be at like 30 percent because we wouldn't have that catalyst to get things going, but not only the coordination, but the on the ground staff people.

We were over at Vancouver Lake and we're laying down crushed rock because it's going to be a barrier free trail, and one of the Clark County park staff persons, Roger, came out with a tractor, and we had four mechanized wheelbarrows and we'd have to load those with a shovel, and so Roger's there with a front loader and he just goes boom and he dumps it right in the motorized wheelbarrow and it speeds it up. The volunteers feel appreciated there. They're leveraged, you know, four or five times over. And so it's a really good

partnership if we have staff present and that can help out with that.

The other part that I want to emphasize that we really like about the plan is the idea of connectivity and connecting the parks together so that people can get to them without relying on a car. If you go to Lacamas Park, sometimes it's hard to find a place to park, and there's new housing developments going in there and people having the ability to just walk from the school to the park or the neighborhood to a park is really important. So we'd like to see that.

The three things I want to emphasize that are kind of described in the plan but maybe want to elevate them to the top is the idea of providing meeting the demand for soft surface native trails in a natural setting. And that's the number one place that people like to hike and walk, and it is the top priority. The survey -- the survey respondents in this planning process said hiking and walking is the top priority.

And so the connectivity is important to be able to get to those places, but the loops and the quality of the natural setting, the quality of the trail experience is that pearl within that string of pearls of parks and natural areas connected by bikeways and sidewalks. So we don't want to lose track of the pearls and the desire to get everything connected. They both go hand in hand.

The second point I want to emphasize is the idea of a really high quality walking and hiking experience. And if you have a great trail that people want to hike again and again and again, they're going to do it again and again and again. I think if you've gone to a restaurant and you've said, well, that was pretty good, but maybe you're not going to go there again. It's the same thing with trails. You go to a trail and you have a great experience, you tell your friends, you hike it again and again and again. Cape Horn is a great example. It's got a very high level of service for not a lot of trail mileage. There are a lot of trails out there that just -- they weren't designed properly or they're just not very popular and so they're not providing a lot of value for the investment.

And then the third thing that I think is really important to emphasize is the idea of sustainability. And when you think about sustainability in the trail setting, we think about if you take your daughter on a trail, it's going to look the same when she takes her son or daughter on that trail 10, 20, 30 years, however long out. So that trail looks the same. It's not eroded. It doesn't have to be paved with asphalt. It's been designed in a way that that natural setting stays the way that it was.

The other part of that is that a trail that's sustainable is a neglect tolerant. And so we have trails that we've built, that we maintain, that we don't have to do any maintenance on. There's no erosion happening. There's very little ground disturbance happening. The trail's not widening. It looks exactly the same as when we constructed it four years ago, and I expect it will look the same 20 years from now too.

There's other trails, and Round Lake is one good example, where we spent three days this past spring rehabbing the water bars and it was a huge job. Each work party had, I think,

about eight to ten people on it and we spent all day rehabbing the water bars, and we're going to do that again probably next year, if not two years, but every season.

And if you design the trail the first way, you can cut down on the lifecycle maintenance costs. And so whenever we put in a new trail, we're always emphasizing that sustainability. And so when people say, why are building all these new trails? We can't maintain the ones we have. We're building neglect tolerant trails. And then we're going back and we're regrading and rerouting, like at Whipple Creek, to make some of those trails neglect tolerant, cut down on our maintenance costs.

So those are the parts that we'd like to see emphasized in the plan and implemented, and we need staff to do it and grants. So we got the people, the volunteers. We got a great partner. We just need a plan. And that's all I have to say.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Does anybody have any questions for Ryan?

BARCA: Thanks.

MORASCH: All right. Well, thank you for coming. And there are no more sign-ups on the sheet. Is there somebody? Milada, would you like to come and talk? You know the drill.

ALLEN: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Milada Allen, Post Office Box 61552, Vancouver, Washington. And I have been the Felida Neighborhood Association president for about 12 years or so, and the Felida Neighborhood Association has 17,000 people.

Parks are a quality of life. We have about 700 volunteers that volunteer all over the county. They don't care if they get credit for it or not. They volunteer. And because they know that it's very important for all of us, they know it's important for their kids and the future generations of their kids. There are many kids that come to the Felida Park and point to what they had done in the last ten years, including some Boy Scout projects and in-kind volunteer projects as well as in-kind donations, including the picnic shelter and everything else, so they have an ownership of that.

And, of course, because we didn't have a plan for the past two years, there was many, many opportunities for grants, but we could not apply for them. And, of course, when we built the Felida Park in partnership with the City/Clark Parks and Rec, almost a million dollars came from the community. That community effort and value added to that park. So when you come out there, you will see this beautiful gorgeous park that people don't remember that the community had come together and brought it together because there was a plan, because there were opportunities for grants; however, it was extremely time-consuming for us to go chase those grants, and we're volunteers. We don't get paid for this. We're not attorneys. We're not consultants. We don't get paid for it. We don't charge for it.

So it would be wonderful to have a full-time grant writer out there because we do have other parks out there including Sgt. Brad Crawford Park, which is Phase II, and, of course, we do

have the Memorial Arches Fund set up; however, there are other opportunities for us to have ADA accessible areas within parks that there are grants available. And again, it is time-consuming to do the grants, and if you're dealing with somebody on a contract basis, it may be at the last on their priority list.

I was not going to speak, but when I heard that, I thought, well, I better say something. Because the grants that were written by the community for the park, for the public, went directly to the County or directly to the Parks, they don't come to us, and so we cannot afford to pay for the grant writers.

However, we can make this park system so much better if we can go to a county full-time staff and say, hey, listen, there's this grant opportunity. This is what the community thought about. And, for example, in the Cougar Creek Woods Park that we saved from being surplused not once, not twice, not three times, but four times. If we can have that dialogue, the partnerships between the community and the parks would be that much stronger.

As you saw, there's a shortfall of what is projected to be developed, how much you have available and what the shortfall is. The shortfall is pretty big. And if you had that grant writer, you pay maybe 150k per year, but just that one grant, \$1 million will save you so much more. Plus you're going to have a, quote, unquote, net profit of 750k right off the bat after the salary goes out.

So the Felida Neighborhood Association is 17,000 people as well as our board feel that if you guys want the neighborhood and the community partnerships, make it easier on us so we don't have to go out there and hire a grant writer. You don't have to go at the last minute and go find a grant writer. They'll be available there. And those grants do take a long time.

So if you have somebody there only on a contract basis, you will not be able to capture all of the funding that's out there available for us to make this so much better, to make our parks something we can be all proud of and that we can use and our kids can have healthy choices for the rest of their lives. But 150k or so for one salaried person, I don't know for how much more for overhead, but I calculated about 50 percent overhead, that is such a great investment. And I hope, I hope that you do recommend that they hire that grant writer. The 700 or some volunteers that are out there that are available, you know, to help out, but let's make it easier for them.

And also the when -- backing up a little bit -- when the parks had the divorce from the City, we were afraid they were going to become the stepchildren, and now that we have seen the PAB working together to bring something very quickly to you in order to capture all those opportunities that are out there for the grants and everything else.

So please consider that these folks came from very diverse backgrounds. It was very, very quick and hard approach, yet they all came together. And my kudos to Barbara Anderson and Kelly Puntoney, the two co-chairs, they kept it rolling, they kept it on task and I think the document is much better than what I expected it to be just because of the short time that we had, but then also Jean Akers with her experience that she brought into it made it a much

stronger document. So I am really grateful that this has come together. And I do hope that you recommend that this particular plan is adopted for resolution.

I was hoping to see a little bit more allocated to the Cougar Creek Woods Park other than the 5k --

BJERKE: In the works.

ALLEN: -- because they did get reimbursed \$540,000 for acquisition of that from the State. So we thought, well, maybe another half a million would be nice just to start with. But there's -- I think there's so many different components in that particular plan that are very strong components.

There's some things that need to be strengthened, like the surplus problems that we have with the park acquisitions. They go through a lot of public review, yet when we're surplus them, they're done very quickly without input, and I think that the zone change for parks upon acquisition should be a protecting tool. And maybe you can make a recommendation that there's some more, not just the ordinance itself, but also that there are tools developed to protect those parks from being surplus. Thank you very much.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you. Does anyone have any questions for Milada Allen? All right. Thank you. Is there anyone else in the audience that didn't get a chance to sign in that wants to testify?

Okay. We will then close the public hearing and I will turn it over to the Planning Commission for any additional questions of staff. No further questions? All right. Deliberations. Anybody want to talk? Nobody wants to talk. Does somebody want to make a motion?

BARCA: I make a **MOTION** to approve based on staff recommendation.

BENDER: **Second.**

MORASCH: The motion's been made and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion?

WRIGHT: I'll second.

MORASCH: Yeah, it's been seconded.

WRIGHT: Oh, it has. I'm sorry.

MORASCH: Is there any discussion on the motion?

WRIGHT: I had a thought that, you know, there's been some comments that have come in after the text -- can you hear me? Can you hear me now? Okay.

There's been some comments, some good comments that came in tonight, that have come in by e-mail as well, that may or may not be fully reflected in the plan. But I guess in my experience in implementing plans, the implementation is where the rubber meets the road, and you have the biggest issue with getting your funds. Without the funds, it's all just a dream.

And so there's a lot of good comments. I'm sure as you go through the years, things will be implemented as fully as you can when you get your money, and that's the way of the world, unfortunately, is without funds, you don't have a project. So in my experience, I think we can have a lot of confidence in the Parks Department and Bill to deliver the plan and to take comments as they come in over the years that would improve the implementation of the program.

MORASCH: Thank you. You mentioned the e-mail. Were you referring to Ryan Ojerio's e-mail?

WRIGHT: Yes.

MORASCH: I'm trying to say his last name right this time. Was that the e-mail?

WRIGHT: Yeah, I got that here.

MORASCH: All right. Any other discussion?

QUIRING: I guess I just want to comment that in accepting or moving this for approval to the Board that I'm assuming that they see our comments. I wouldn't want to stop the plan from going forward just because I think, just because of my comment about a contract grant writer.

I have worked with grant writers and they would have a priority. It isn't like you hire somebody to write your grants and then they set it over here and leave it till later. They actually would have a priority. And I certainly don't think a grant writer would get 150k. I just think that's just completely unrealistic. And so I'm sure on the scale of the County salaries, it wouldn't be something. So I needed to say that on the record that even if this is approved and a grant writer is hired, I don't suspect that that would be at the rate that a grant writer would be hired, so...

And I guess I want clarification on what we're approving. We're approving this entire book of recommendations?

BARCA: So on Page 3 of 3, the proposed action is to adopt the parks master plan by resolution. So the master plan book is being adopted by us. And it doesn't say anything specifically about what type of personnel shall be hired.

QUIRING: No, it doesn't.

BARCA: Okay. So let's just be clear on that.

MORASCH: All right. Any other discussion? In that case, there's a motion. Can we get a roll call on the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BARCA: AYE
QUIRING: AYE
JOHNSON: AYE
BLUM: AYE
BENDER: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. So the motion carries, 7 to 0. I want to thank everyone for coming and their presentations tonight. And we will close that public hearing and move on to our next public hearing which is the shoreline. And is it Gordy or you? All right. Gary, Shoreline Master Plan Limited Amendment. Gary Albrecht. Although I think Gordy's name is on the staff report, so... All right. Whenever you're ready, Gary.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION, continued

B. SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM LIMITED AMENDMENT

The Planning Commission will consider a proposal for a limited amendment to the Clark County Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The limited amendment would improve the consistency between the county's shoreline program and the state standards. The amendment would add text to clarify normal maintenance in the list of exemptions, regulate replacement of non-conforming residential structures that are damaged or destroyed, and clarify SMP text to improve implementation.

Staff Contact: Gary Albrecht, AICP
Email: Gary.Albrecht@clark.wa.gov
Phone: (360) 397-2280, Ext. 4318

ALBRECHT: Thank you, Chair Morasch, Planning Commission. Good evening. Gary Albrecht, Clark County Community Planning. Clark County adopted an updated shoreline master program in July 2012. The proposal in front of the Planning Commission is to propose a limited amendment to the shoreline master program that would improve the consistency between the County's shoreline program and the State standards. It includes eight sections of code amendments in Exhibit 1.

And during a Planning Commission work session on August 4th, 2015, the Planning

Commission had a question about the meaning of Clark County Code 40.460.230(B)(2). Staff indicated that this section needed further clarification and other sections of the code might need clarification too.

Staff mentioned that any additional changes would be proposed during the hearing in Exhibit 3. So there are three sections of code amendments in Exhibit 3. So at this time, would you like to look at Exhibit 3? I can pull it up on the screen.

BARCA: Please. Does everybody else have a copy of this update, August 20th?

QUIRING: It was at our desk.

BARCA: It was. I just want to make sure everybody's got a copy.

ALBRECHT: The first change in this one, the 40.460.230, the (B)(2), up at the top, the clarification, "Subject to the provisions of CCC 40.460.250" were added.

And then, Kathy, can you scroll down to the next section. So 40.460.630, Use-Specific Development Regulations (K)(13), this is the language that was added over what was presented to you on August 4th.

And then, Kathy, can you scroll down to the bottom of the page. And as a result of making the change up there, we -- scroll on down -- we made two definition changes in Clark County Code 40.460.800, the definition sections for normal maintenance and normal repair.

I would like to point out that in the original Exhibit 1, there's a reference to Chapter 40.386. So if the PC decides to make a recommendation to approve these limited amendments, and in the adopting ordinance the portion of the code that refers to 40.386 will not become effective until January 8th, 2016. I just needed to say that for the record or for the ordinance.

And then based upon the information and the findings presented in this report and in the supporting documents, staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward to the Board of Clark County Councilors a recommendation of approval for limited amendment to the shoreline master program. And that's all I have.

MORASCH: All right. Thank you, Gary. Any questions for staff?

BARCA: I would like just to take a moment and say thank you for hearing us in the work session and going back and rewording this in a fashion that made it simpler for us to understand what you were trying to get at.

ALBRECHT: You're very welcome.

BARCA: Yeah.

MORASCH: Yeah, appreciate your work on that.

ALBRECHT: It was a huge effort.

MORASCH: Good.

BARCA: All right. We already said thanks. What else do you want?

ALBRECHT: I couldn't have done it without our Prosecuting Attorney Chris Cook and Planning Manager Gordy Euler.

MORASCH: All right. Well, thanks to all of you. There's no one on the sign-in sheet. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to testify on this matter? Seeing no one, then we will go ahead and close the public hearing and turn it over to the Planning Commission for deliberations and/or a motion.

WRIGHT: If I had a question of you, are you comfortable with the words now?

BARCA: Bill, talk into the mic, please.

WRIGHT: Steve, are you comfortable with the language changes that were made in there?

MORASCH: Yes, I think that the language is much more clear now, thanks to their rework on it. The part that I thought was confusing has now been deleted, and so I think it's more clear and better.

WRIGHT: You think so?

MORASCH: Yeah. Any other deliberation or does somebody want to make a motion?

JOHNSON: I make a **MOTION** that we accept the reco- -- excuse me.

QUIRING: I **second** it.

MORASCH: All right. It's been --

JOHNSON: One more time. I would -- let me start again. I'm good at that. I make a **motion** that we **accept** the recommendation of staff with the approval of the limited amendment for the shoreline master plan, to the shoreline master plan.

QUIRING: And now I **second** it.

MORASCH: It's been moved and seconded to approve the limited amendment to the shoreline master plan as proposed by staff. Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, let's move to the roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE

WRIGHT: AYE
BARCA: AYE
QUIRING: YES
JOHNSON: AYE
BLUM: AYE
BENDER: AYE
MORASCH: AYE

MORASCH: All right. Well, that motion carried unanimously, so that concludes the hearing on the shoreline master program limited amendment. Thank you, Gary.

ALBRECHT: You're welcome.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MORASCH: Oh, all right. Well, then with that, I think we are at the end of our agenda, so we are now adjourned. Thank you all for coming.

The record of tonight's hearing, as well as the supporting documents and presentations can be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at: <http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/PCmeetings.html>.

Proceedings can be viewed on CTV on the following web page link:

<http://old.cityofvancouver.us/cvtv/cvtvindex.ask?section=25437&catID=13>.

Minutes Transcribed by:

Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.

Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant, Clark County Community Planning

Table of Contents: Adjust numbering starting with chapter 6, page 43.

Executive Summary – end of 1st sentence – change “systems” to “system”

Page vii – Implementation: 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence - remove “with”

Page 3 – define the acronym “BOCC” (within time line graphic)

Page 9, Economic Character paragraph, End of 2nd sentence – revise labor force forecast to 91,200 for 20-year period ending in 2035.

Pg. 40, Boat Ramp & Shore Launch Facilities: Figure 29 Add column referencing what water body/river the launch site accesses.

Add Glossary of Terms

Appendix A – CFP:

Revise Cougar Creek Woods Park MP & phase 1 cost estimate

Appendix B – Inventory and Maps:

- Add community park inventory in UUA
- Add UUA urban natural areas inventory list.
- Add regional parks inventory list
- Add regional trails inventory list
- Add UUA park map (from CCGIS)

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF NON SIGNIFICANCE (DNS)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the following proposal has been determined to have no probable significant adverse impact on the environment, and that an environmental impact statement is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). Written comments on the following proposal, or DNS, may be submitted to the Responsible Official by **August 14, 2015**.

DESCRIPTION:

CPZ2015-00001 Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan –

The Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (PROS) represents the guiding document for the Greater Clark Parks Department regarding provision of parks, recreational facilities, open space, and trails. Per the State of Washington Growth Management Act (GMA) 36.70A requirements, this parks master plan contains the following elements: designation of the general location and extent of land uses including recreation and open space lands; identification of useful lands for recreation, including wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas; estimation of park and recreation demand for at least a 10-year period; and both a six-year and 20-year capital facilities plan.

ACTION REQUESTED: It is requested the Board of County Commissioners adopt the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:

Oliver Orjiako, Director
Community Planning
PO Box 9810
Vancouver WA 98666-9810
oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov

BILL TO:

Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant
Clark County Community Planning
PO Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810
(360) 397-2280 ext. 4558
Sonja.wiser@clark.wa.gov

PUBLICATION DATE: Friday, July 31, 2015

PLEASE E-MAIL OR CALL TO CONFIRM RECEIPT AND PUBLICATION DATE

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Description of proposal: CPZ2015-00001 Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan –

The Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (PROS) represents the guiding document for the Greater Clark Parks Department regarding provision of parks, recreational facilities, open space, and trails. Per the State of Washington Growth Management Act (GMA) 36.70A requirements, this parks master plan contains the following elements: designation of the general location and extent of land uses including recreation and open space lands; identification of useful lands for recreation, including wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas; estimation of park and recreation demand for at least a 10-year period; and both a six-year and 20-year capital facilities plan.

Proponent Clark County Community Planning

Location of proposal, including street address, if any Not a site specific request

Lead agency Greater Clark Parks District

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

- There is no comment period for this DNS.
- This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.
- This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date below. Comments must be submitted by **August 14th, 2015**.

Responsible official Gordon Euler

Position/title Program Manager II

Phone. (360) 397-2280 ext.4968

Address Clark County Community Planning P.O. Box 9810 Vancouver, WA 98666

Date. 7-27-15 Signature



(OPTIONAL)

- You may appeal this determination to (name) _____
at (location) _____
no later than (date) _____
by (method) _____

You should be prepared to make specific factual objections.

Contact _____ to read or ask about the procedures for SEPA appeals.

- There is no agency appeal.

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
CPZ 2015-00001 Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan
2. Name of applicant:
Clark County
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
*Laurie Lebowsky
Clark County Community Planning
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810
(360) 397-2280 extension 4544*
4. Date checklist prepared:
July 27, 2015
5. Agency requesting checklist:
Clark County, WA
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
If approved by the Clark County Board of Councilors, the Parks Master Plan would be effective July 1, 2016, as part the county's 2016 comprehensive plan update.
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
No, as this is a non-project action.
8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
No, as this is a non-project action.
9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.
No, I do not as this is a non-project action
10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
None, this is a non-project action.
11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The proposal is a 20-year Parks Master Plan, which includes a parks capital facilities plan; inventory of existing facilities; mission statement; vision statements; documentation of the

public outreach process; goals and objectives for the parks; recreation, policy recommendations; open space; and trails facilities under the jurisdiction of the Greater Clark Parks District.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

All parks, open space, recreation facilities, and trails under the jurisdiction of the Greater Clark Parks District. Please refer to the parks master plan for exact location and description of facilities.

The draft plan can be found via the following weblink: www.clark.wa.gov/parks

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site

(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other Not Applicable

All terrains apply since it involves all county parks, open space, and trails facilities.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

Not applicable.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

Not applicable.

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No development is anticipated as part of this application.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

h.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No development is anticipated as part of this application.

i. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

j.

None. This is a non-project action.

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

None, this is a non-project action.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

None are proposed as part of this non-project action.

3. Water

a. Surface Water:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

Not applicable, this is a non-project action.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

No

3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

None.

4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

None.

5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No.

b. Ground Water:

1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

Not applicable.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater): *Not applicable*

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Not applicable. This is a non-project action.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

Not applicable.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

No mitigation measures are proposed as part of this non-project action.

4. Plants

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- shrubs
- grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

None as part of this non-project action.

c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None as part of this non-project action.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

None as part of this non-project action.

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

None as part of this non-project action.

5. Animals

a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site. Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
 mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
 fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____

Not applicable, this is a non-project action.

b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Not applicable, this is a non-project action.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

Not applicable, this is a non-project action.

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

Not applicable, this is a non-project action.

- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

Not applicable, this is a non-project action.

6. Energy and natural resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

None as this is a non-project action.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

None as this is a non-project action.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

None as this is a non-project action.

7. Environmental health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

None as this is a non-project action.

- 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

None as this is a non-project action.

- 2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

None as this is a non-project action.

- 3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.

None as this is a non-project action.

- 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

None as this is a non-project action.

- 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

None as this is a non-project action.

b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

None as this is a non-project action.

- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)?
Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

None as this is a non-project action.

- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

None as this is a non-project action.

8. Land and shoreline use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

None as this is a non-project action.

- b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

None as this is a non-project action.

- 1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

None as this is a non-project action.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

None as this is a non-project action.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

None as this is a non-project action.

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

Various-R1-20, R1-10, R1-7.5, R1-6, R1-5, R-12, R-18, R-22, R-30, R-43, OR-15, OR-18, OR-22, OR-30, OR-43, C-2, C-3, GC, Mixed Use, BP, IL, IH, PF, U, A, R-5, R-10, R-20, RC-1, RC-2.5, CR-2, AG-20, AGWL, FR-40, FR-80, UR-10

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

Various-urban low-density residential, urban medium density residential, office residential, neighborhood commercial, community commercial, general commercial, mixed use, light industrial, heavy industrial, public facilities, rural residential, rural center residential, rural industrial, agriculture, agri-wildlife, parks/open space, university, and airport

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

Not applicable

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

Not applicable, as this is a non-project action

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

Not applicable, as this is a non-project action

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

Not applicable, as this is a non-project action

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

Not applicable, as this is a non-project action

- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

Not applicable, as this is a non-project action

- m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

Not applicable, as this is a non-project action

9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

Not applicable

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

Not applicable

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

Not applicable

10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

Not applicable

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

Not applicable

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

Not applicable

11. Light and glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

Not applicable

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

Not applicable

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

Not applicable

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

Not applicable

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

Not applicable

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

The Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space should increase recreational uses over the long term

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

The Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space should increase recreational uses and opportunities over the long term

13. Historic and cultural preservation

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.

Not applicable

- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

Not applicable

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

Not applicable

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

Not applicable, non-project action

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

Not applicable, non-project action

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Not applicable, non-project action

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

Not applicable, non-project action

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

Not applicable, non-project action

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable, non-project action

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?

Not applicable, non-project action

- g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable, non-project action

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

Not applicable, non-project action

15. Public services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable, non-project action

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

Not applicable, non-project action

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:
electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system,
other _____

Not applicable, non-project action

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

Not applicable, non-project action

C. Signature

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: Laurie Lebowsky

Name of signee Laurie Lebowsky

Position and Agency/Organization Planner, Clark County Community Planning

Date Submitted: 07/27/15

D. supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?
This is a long-term parks master plan. Some elements of the plan would protect resources, such as open space. Development of parks, trails, and recreation will be subject to local code standards regarding stormwater and emissions. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:
Development of parks, trails, and recreational facilities will be subject to local code standards when future projects are developed. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

This is a long-term parks master plan. Some elements of the plan would protect resources, such as plants, animals, fish, or marine life. Future development of parks, trails, and recreational projects will be subject to local code standards regarding habitat. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

Future development of parks, trails, and recreational projects will be subject to local code standards regarding habitat. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

This plan is for parks and there should be very little likelihood of depleting energy and natural resources. Future parks projects may actually enhance natural resources, such as future open space projects. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

Future parks projects may actually enhance natural resources, such as future open space projects. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

This is a plan for parks and one component of this plan is protecting open space. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

Any future parks projects would follow code requirements regard protection of resources. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

Any future parks development would address code requirements regarding shorelines. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

Follow the requirements of the county's adopted shoreline master plan. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Some parks projects, such as protecting open space, would decrease demand on transportation, public services or utilities. Construction of community or regional parks may increase demand on transportation, public services, and utilities. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

Parks projects, as do other projects, would address all applicable code standards regarding mitigation of potential impacts to transportation, public services, and utilities. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

We do not believe this parks master plan will conflict with local, state, or federal laws. The purpose of the parks master plan is to comply with GMA requirements. In addition, this is a twenty-year plan and a "big picture" view of projects for parks; therefore, many of the projects have not had detailed analyses performed on them so it is too soon at this time to discuss the anticipated environmental impacts.



proud past, promising future

COMMUNITY PLANNING

Today's Date:	July 27, 2015
File Name:	Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan
File Number:	CPZ 2015-00001
Publication Date:	July 31, 2015
Comment Deadline Date:	August 14th, 2015
Project Manager:	Laurie Lebowsky, Planner III

Attached is an environmental Determination of Non-significance (DNS) and associated environmental checklist issued pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Rules (Chapter 197-11, Washington Administrative Code). The enclosed review comments reflect evaluation of the determination within fourteen (14) days of the DNS publication date. The lead agency will not act on this proposal until the close of the 14-day comment period.

Please address any correspondence to: **Clark County Community Planning**
RE: SEPA Comments
P.O. Box 9810
Vancouver, WA 98660-9810
Or e-mail: commplanning@clark.wa.gov

Federal Agencies:	
Bonneville Power Administration	kspierce@bpa.gov
Federal Aviation Administration, Aeronautics	mohan.l.gupta@faa.gov
Gifford Pinchot National Forest, USDA	cachandler@fs.fed.us
US Army Corps of Engineers	steven.w.manlow@usace.army.mil
US Fish & Wildlife Service, Ridgefield, WA	alex_chmielewski@fws.gov
US Fish & Wildlife Service, ESA Division Mgr.	ken_berg@fws.gov
US Forest Service, NSA Office, Hood River, OR	rshoal@fs.fed.us
Native American Interest:	
Chehalis Tribal Council	gconnelly@chehalistribe.org
Chinook Nation/Indian Country	PO Box 304; Ilwaco, Indian Country 98624
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission	croj@critfc.org
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde	info@grandronde.org
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs	rcraig@wstribes.org
Cowlitz Tribe, Longview WA	permitreview@cowlitz.org
Nisqually Indian Tribe	cushman.joe@nisqually-nsn.gov
Quinalt Nation Business Committee	PO Box 189, Tahola WA 98587
Shoalwater Bay Tribe	PO Box 130, Tokeland WA 98590
Yakima Indian Nation	PO Box 151, Toppenish WA 98948
Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, ID	PO Box 305, Lapwai ID 83540
State Agencies:	
WSDOT, SW Region, Donald Wagner	klockek@wsdot.wa.gov
WSDOT, SW Region, Jeff Barsness	barsnej@wsdot.wa.gov
WSDOT, SW Region, Ken Burgstahler	burgstk@wsdot.wa.gov
State Agencies Required by Department of Commerce:	

1300 Franklin Street • P.O. BOX 9810 • VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON 98666-9810
 (360) 397-2280 • FAX (360) 759-6762 • TDD Relay 711 or (800) 833-6388

Department of Commerce, Ike Nwankwo	ike.nwankwo@commerce.wa.gov
Dept. of Commerce, Review Team	reviewteam@commerce.wa.gov
Dept. of Corrections, Olympia, WA	jlmurphy@doc1.wa.gov
Dept. of Health, Drinking Water	mike.means@doh.wa.gov
Dept. of Ecology, SEPA Unit	gmacoordination@ecy.wa.gov
Dept. of Ecology, Env. Review	sepaunit@ecy.wa.gov
Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, Region 5	teamvancouver@dfw.wa.gov
Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, Priority Habitats	anne.friesz@dfw.wa.gov
Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, Shorelines	margen.carlson@dfw.wa.gov
Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, Review Team	wfwocptap@fws.gov
Dept. of Natural Resources	SEPACENTER@dnr.wa.gov
Dept. of Social & Health Services	robert.hubenthal@dshs.wa.gov
Dept. of Transportation, SW Region	wagnerd@wsdot.wa.gov
Parks & Recreation Commission	randy.kline@parks.wa.gov
Utilities & Transportation Commission	geckhard@utc.wa.gov
WA Office of Archaeology & Historic Preservation	rob.whitlam@dahp.wa.gov
Regional Agencies:	
Regional Transportation Council	lynda.david@rtc.wa.gov
SW Clean Air Agency	bob@swcleanair.org
C-TRAN, Development Review	devrev@c-tran.org
C-TRAN, Jeff Hamm, Exec. Director/CEO	jeffh@c-tran.org
Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Gov'ts	cwcoq@cwcoq.org
Local Agencies:	
Clark County CommDev-Building Division	jim.muir@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Commissioners Office	tina.redline@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Fire Marshall	Jon.dunaway@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Parks & Recreation	bill.bjerke@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Public Works-78 th Street	corrie.guardino@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Environmental Services	joanne.berg@clark.wa.gov
Clark County PW/Transportation	rob.klug@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Sheriff's Office	garry.lucas@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Emergency Management	doug.smith-lee@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Prosecutor's Office-Civil	christine.cook@clark.wa.gov
Clark County Health Department	carla.sowder@clark.wa.gov
Cowlitz County Planning Department	placidoe@co.cowlitz.wa.us
Vancouver Parks & Recreation	parksrec@cityofvancouver.us
Cities & Town:	
City of Battle Ground, Planning	erin.erdman@cityofbg.org
City of Camas, Planning	pbourquin@cityofcamas.us
City of La Center, Planning	jsarvis@ci.lacenter.wa.us
City of La Center, Mayor	jirish@ci.lacenter.wa.us
City of Ridgefield, City Manager	steve.stuart@ci.ridgefield.wa.us
City of Ridgefield, Mayor	ron.onslow@ci.ridgefield.wa.us
City of Ridgefield, E2 Land Use Services	e.eisemann@e2landuse.com
City of Vancouver, Community Planning	bryan.snodgrass@cityofvancouver.us
City of Vancouver, Community Planning	chad.eiken@cityofvancouver.us
City of Vancouver, Community Planning	sandra.towne@cityofvancouver.us
City of Vancouver, Mayor	tim.leavitt@cityofvancouver.us
City of Washougal, Planning	mkneipp@ci.washougal.wa.us
City of Woodland, Planning	smellera@ci.woodland.wa.us
Town of Yacolt, Jeff Niten, Planner III	jeff.niten@clark.wa.gov
Town of Yacolt, Mayor	mayorcarothers@centurytel.net
School Districts:	

Battle Ground School District	lynn.marybeth@battlegroundps.org
Battle Ground School District	jolma.kevin@battlegroundps.org
Camas School District	mike.nerland@camas.wednet.edu
Camas School District	helen.charneski@camas.wednet.edu
Evergreen School District	rgood@egreen.wednet.edu
ESD 112	marnie.allen@esd112.org
Green Mountain School District	joe.jones@greenmountainschool.us
Hockinson School District	sandra.yager@hock.k12.wa.us
La Center School District	mark.mansell@lacenterschools.org
Ridgefield School District	art.edgerly@ridge.k12.wa.us
Vancouver School District	todd.horenstein@vansd.org
Vancouver School District	jennifer.halleck@vansd.org
Washougal School District	joe.steinbrenner@washougalsd.org
Washougal School District	dawn.tarzian@washougalsd.org
Woodland School District	steent@woodlandschools.org
Special Purpose Agencies:	
Clark County Public Utilities (PUD)	dallen@clarkpud.com
Clark Regional Wastewater District	dkiggins@crwwd.com
Col. River Economic Dev. Council (CREDC)	mbomar@credc.org
Vancouver Housing Authority	tdrawz@vhausa.com
Ports:	
Port of Camas-Washougal, Exec. Director	david@portcw.com
Port of Ridgefield, Executive Director	bgrening@portridgefield.org
Port of Vancouver, Environ. Services	pboyden@portvanusa.com
Port of Vancouver	info@portvanusa.com
Port of Woodland	jkeene@portofwoodland.com
Libraries:	
Battle Ground Community Library	jspurlock@fvrl.org
Camas Public Library	rmartin@ci.camass.wa.us
Cascade Park Community Library	ttorres@fvrl.org
Vancouver Community Library	kford@fvrl.org
Ridgefield Community Library	P.O. Box 547, Ridgefield, WA 98642
Van Mall Community Library	bmeisenheimer@fvrl.org
Washougal Community Library	smcgill@fvrl.org
Woodland Public Library	jkeeler@fvrl.org
Fire Districts:	
East County Fire & Rescue	skoehler@ecfr.us
Clark County Fire & Rescue	dennis.mason@clarkfr.org
Clark County Fire & Rescue & District #2	mike.jackson@clarkfr.org
Fire Protection District #3	steve@clarkcofd3.org
Fire Protection District #5	dave.vial@nwrct.org
Fire Protection District #6	jerryg@ccfd6.org
Fire Protection District #10	gordon.brooks@clark.wa.gov
Fire Protection District #13	b.peeler@northcountryems.org
Media:	
Camas-Washougal Post Record	heather.acheson@camaspostrecord.com
Columbian	stephanie.rice@columbian.com
KGW NW TV Channel 8	newsdesk@kgw.com
KOIN News Center 6	koindesk@koin.com
KPDX FOX 49	foxdesk@kpdx.com
Oregonian	abrettman@oregonian.com
Reflector	christine@thereflector.com
Neighborhood Associations:	

Andresen/St. Johns N.A.	n.chambers@comcast.net
East Fork Frontier N.A..	gabriel364@aol.com
East Fork Hills Rural Association	coyoteridge@tds.net
East Minnehaha N.A.	tonysuel@aol.com
Enterprise/Paradise Point N.A.	balancedjw@gmail.com
Fairgrounds N.A.	bridget@bridge-i-t.com
Felida N.A.	gaudeamus@earthlink.net
Fern Prairie N.A.	PO Box 888, Camas WA 98607
Greater Brush Prairie N.A.	rpearson7@gmail.com
Green Meadows N.A.	davesoco@comcast.net
Heritage N.A.	heritageneighborhood@gmail.com
Meadow Glade N.A.	rogerentrekin@comcast.net
NE Hazel Dell N.A.	laurel090807@gmail.com
North Fork Lewis N.A.	PO Box 2121, Woodland, WA 98674
North Salmon Creek N.A.	NSCNA+president@salmoncreeklive.com
Pleasant Highlands N.A.	abramson@lifescipartners.net
Proebstel N.A.	proebstelnawendy@yahoo.com
Ridgefield Junction N.A.	marc.krsul@edwardjones.com
Roads End N.A.	5513 NE 40 th St., Vancouver WA 98661
Sherwood Hills N.A.	vicki.fitzsimmons@edwardjones.com
Sifton N.A.	siftonneighborhood@gmail.com
Sunnyside N.A.	sunysidenava@yahoo.com
Truman N.A.	trumanneighborhood@gmail.com
Washougal River N.A.	brendanaddis@comcast.net
West Hazel Dell N.A.	ilastanek@hotmail.com
Neighborhood Assn. Council (NACCC)	dougballou@comcast.net
Other Interested Parties:	
BIA of SW WA (Building Industry Assn.)	Jamie.howsley@jordanramis.com
Clark County Natural Resource Council	karpjd@comcast.net
Clark County Association of Realtors	coe@ccrealtors.com
Clark County Citizens in Action	1017 NE 107 th St., Vancouver WA 98685
Clark County Citizens United	cccuinc@yahoo.com
Clark County Citizens United	nickredinger@hotmail.com
Clark County Public Health Advisory Council	colliersepticconsult-design@comcast.net
Clifford Aaby	flyboy256@q.com
David Cooper	27715 NE 197 th Ave., Battle Ground WA 98604
David Taylor	davet@ccfd6.org
Eric Fuller & Associates	efuller@ef-inc.com
Foster Pepper & Shefelman	washj@foster.com
Friends of Clark County	charlene.welch@comcast.net
Friends of Columbia Gorge	rick@gorgefriends.org
Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce	kparker@vancouverusa.com
James Howsley	jamie.howsley@jordanramis.com
Ken Hadley	kenhadley@comcast.net
Kent Landerholm & Associates, Inc.	kent.landerholmandassociates@comcast.net
Landerholm, P.S.	randyp@landerholm.com
Landerholm, P.S.	stacey.shields@landerholm.com
Pam Mason	nwzephyr@msn.com
Rural Clark County Preservation Assoc.	ddykes@tds.net
Stoel Rives LLP	mrfeichtinger@stoel.com
SW WA Contractors Association	lisa@swca.org
WSU Finance & Operations	lvalenter@vancouver.wsu.edu
Wuanita Herron	wmherron@juno.com

#END OF LIST#

PARKS

One issue of concern for us downtown (Esther Short Park) is the number of skaters that violate city ordinances against skating in our downtown parks — Esther Short and Turtle Place, for examples, in addition to their illegal use of private property. When asked, these violators often cite two issues: skate parks are unsafe from gang activities and bullying; skate parks are located too far away the city center to use. I'd urge you to consider making the existing parks safer and consider expanding skate parks into areas where skaters can access them more easily. I don't know where all the skate parks are located, but if you have a map/grid, perhaps you can see where the gaps exist and consider plugging where you see a major gap. And, if you do consider developing additional skate parks — please be sure to do so only with local resident input as, the last thing we need is a skate park located in a residential area where the boards can be heard day and night slamming on pavement. There are industrial areas and buffer greenspace areas downtown where placing such a skate park would not be a residential or small business disturbance and I'd urge you to consider these kinds of locations. Call me if you have questions.

My biggest concern for parks is that there is a safe walking route to the park for the kids/families to get there, which means sidewalks. For those not close enough to walk, enough parking for several cars at one time. Otherwise, they tend to park where it is dangerous.

Thank you for your email and I have already did your survey and helped in the search for the County Parks. I will add by law, Counties only purchase lands and once you are annexed into the City do you get a fully developed park. For years we have watch the County sell the land that were deemed for future parks. 'Parks are not a need!!' The Budget money should not fund these to fully developed parks nor should these be maintained by those doing time. One should check out the RCW that govern parks and what the counties can do. Also the liability of those they make an agreement for maintenance, such as soccer groups or neighborhood assn. Beside it's been a proven fact and history, these places are where drug dealers go.

Regarding the Comprehensive Plan for Parks. 1)You need to hire a lot more boots on the ground, i.e., maintenance and grounds keepers. You need blue collar workers to provide the services to the community by keeping up the parks that you already have, and improving hiking and biking trails, and extending them where it makes sense to do so, to connect the major parks throughout the county. (Use Whatcom County as a fine example to pattern after. Whatcom is much smaller in population, yet has highly developed and well maintained trail system and really nice parks). 2)You should NOT sell any lands that are currently owned by parks. Whatever you paid for them when you bought them was a bargain compared to what you would have to pay now or in the future. I feel compelled to let you know that the county park I visit daily, Lucia Falls Park, is uncared for and in terrible shape. There is invasive species (ivy) taking over the entire wooded areas, climbing the trees, and generally killing off native plants. It just looks like hell. Limbs have been down for months even years in some areas there, with no apparent effort to even move them to the side. The signage is falling apart. The trails appear unkempt, no new media having been added since before the Great Recession started. Charlie's untimely death didn't help matters any. But Clark County Parks has dropped the ball, at just simply keeping the park neat and in presentable condition. Its not uncommon to see men fishing in the rocks just beneath the falls, totally illegal, with none trying to stop them. It's sad, the poor condition that this beautiful park has sunk. I also have had occasion to walk past a park in the Minnehaha area that appears to be totally unimproved, been that way for twenty years, as long as I remember. But there has been housing development all around it. Yet there it sits, a nice wooded area, perfect for a picnic area, yet with really no improvement whatsoever, for a decade or more. There is no way around it, these examples, and I'm sure there are many more, are a disgrace for the entire community. I realize the certain ideologues control the county for now, and have set out to starve your budget, and it seems to be working. But when something like this happens, you have to spread the word that you need more budget not less, but in the meantime, you got to get back down to the basics and provide the fundamentals, which is really what 80% or more of folks want anyway. Boots on the ground—maintenance and grounds keepers.

We think you should put the fee back on Lewisville park, because it was kept up better then.It is a shame to let a nice park like this go down hill, and it seems like there has been more vandalism since they took it off.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)
<p>I would like to see: A) Maintenance of existing parks before building new ones. B) more off leash parks. I think the one of 18th in east vancouver is County, but it is used by hundreds of people every week. C) more parks dedicated to high density housing, i.e. apartments or R-* developments. D) a dedicated lap pool on the east side. E) a dedicated tennis center on the east side F) low maintenance grass seed (Korean grass) that never needs mowing.</p>
<p>RE: Fazio Neighborhood park, We have noticed that signs have been set along NW 21st Avenue by this park, advising park visitors (and others) not to park on the pavement. Well, that's great and it's certainly safer than parking there and trying to get your children out with traffic close by, so where are they going to park? We suggest that a parking area be made out of the southernmost part of the park, adjacent to NW 96th Street. Access would be from NW 21st Ave to NW 95th Street and NW 23rd Ct. There could easily be room for 6-8 vehicles. PS. Many vehicles daily are ignoring the signs to "do not park on pavement".</p>
<p>Re: Sorenson Neighborhood Park (Felida) The Great Clark County Parks 2005 levy promised the development of county parks, which included Sorenson Neighborhood Park. We want to know the current schedule for completing the parks, since 2012 wasn't possible. In March 2014, our e-mail was answered by Heath Henderson, David Madore, and Jeff Mize. Heath Henderson said that all of their staff are excited to continue building the parks and it is a very rewarding process for the staff to see the neighborhoods appreciate their new parks. Sorenson Park is slated for 2016. Help make this plan work. Sorenson Park has gone through the master-planning process (2011) and the next step is to initiate the design process. As a voter and as a neighbor to Sorenson Park (Felida neighborhood) for 28 years, we are committed to seeing this park developed. Your help is truly appreciated by many families. Florence (Flossie) B. Wager believed in our parks, too.</p>
<p>Thank you for accepting our comments on Clark County's comprehensive parks plan update. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the process and request that you please place us on any notice list involving the County's parks plan update process. We own property located at 7703 NE 129th Street Vancouver, WA 98662, adjacent to land designated for the Curtin Creek Community Park within the Greater Clark Parks District. We believe that the parks plan update is an appropriate time for the County to reconsider the future use of the Curtin Creek Community Park. The 38.5 acre parcel was originally designated for a future community park. But today, a significant portion of the property is now being used for a wetland enhancement and compensatory mitigation site, subject to a perpetual conservation easement to protect and maintain the ecological functions of the area. There is also a fire station on the property. Given the change in use of this property, we believe it is no longer suitable for a community park, which is a high-intensity use requiring a large, permanent footprint. At this point, it seems better appropriated for a different use. We suggest that the County re-designate the Curtin Creek land from community park to a natural area as a part of the comprehensive parks plan update. A natural area or open space designation is consistent with the long-term protection of the wetland enhancement and mitigation site. A natural area park is managed for both natural and ecological value and light-impact recreational use, which provides for nature-based recreation like bird-watching and low-impact environmental education activities to the extent such activities are consistent and compatible with the restrictions and goals of the required conservation easement. Further, designating the land as a natural area park effectively places the land into reserve for future mitigation projects, which in turn provides the County with its own banking mechanisms for future public works projects. Using this land for dual purposes offers a long-term opportunity for the County that would otherwise be unavailable. Also, there simply is not the demand for a community park in this area, as indicated by the lack of funding and lower than average population growth in this area of the county. The designated park land is also not very visible or accessible from the road given the fire station is in front of the property and the fact that other park sites may be more accessible to higher population densities and be more appropriate. Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to discussing these comments with you further. We believe there are opportunities to work collaboratively to address the future use of the Curtin Creek park site.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)
<p>Just took the parks survey and have additional comment. I would prefer there be a charge for parking and access to Vancouver Lake and other parks (like there used to be) because it feels unsafe to go there. We bring our kayaks and no longer feel we can park car with expensive car top carrier in the parking lot. Lots of untrustworthy people hanging out now. It used to be much safer place to go, especially as women. Also, that might help with how much we have to spend on parks. Thanks.</p>
<p>I noticed the time was running out on sending in comment on the Clark County Parks Comp Plan. I just wanted to highlight Foley Community Orchard in the Felida neighborhood park. The partnerships between, then VCP, Clark Public Utilities and Urban Abundance. Its long term partnerships between public agencies and volunteer driven nonprofits. Here is a well written article about the project: http://www.columbian.com/news/2014/sep/03/volunteers-pick-pounds-of-parks-pears/</p> <p>We look forward to discuss how Urban Abundance can partner with CCP in the future to develop more Community Orchards.</p>
<p>What happened to the gazebo that was supposed to be built at Covington Park off NE 94th Avenue? We lost out on part of the park when NE 90th Avenue had to be extended from NE 68th Street through to NE 71st Street, did we lose this too? Thank you</p>
<p>Is it true we already have over 7,000 acres set aside for park land ????? enough already, socialist programs only work, until you run out of other people's MONEY!!!!</p>
<p>Greetings, I would like to see: A) Maintenance of existing parks before building new ones. B) more off leash parks. I think the one of 18th in east vancouver is County, but it is used by hundreds of people every week. C) more parks dedicated to high density housing, i.e. apartments or R-* developments. D) a dedicated lap pool on the east side. E) a dedicated tennis center on the east side F) low maintenance grass seed (Korean grass) that never needs mowing.</p>
<p>This is great to see people participating in the survey! As an after thought, I should have specifically stated my preference to a 'Regional Park' as something more akin to Gresham's Blue Lake Park. There is a park that really provides a lot of interaction for individuals, families, small & large groups AND offers some ways to allow funding back into the park by parking fees and facilities rentals. Just a thought! Thanks!</p>
<p>Maybe some things to consider when planning future parks -parks for Seniors??? -parks for those with little or no access to yards and safe places to play. -parks with more benches and smaller sheltered picnic areas—kind of like at rest stops along the freeways. We have made many cross-country trips and always found those rest areas so pleasant—yes, noisy because of freeway traffic—but most have 3-4 single picnic tables with a roof! Sometimes they even have wind breaks. -clean bathrooms This afternoon we checked out Felida Community Park—looks very nice with some of the amenities that would be good for Seniors.</p>
<p>As a resident of the West Minnehaha neighborhood, I can attest to the desirability of these “pocket” parks as our grandchildren have grown up using them and making them a priority stop whenever they visit us from their home in Snohomish. Keep up the good work! I am concerned, however, about their maintenance and their susceptibility to tagging and other destructive activities. Knowing Park personnel are stretched thin, I suggest that you promote volunteer assistance through the neighborhood associations for basic upkeep (such as weeding and picking up wind-downed branches) and security (security patrols such as Neighborhood Watch and maybe videocam surveillance so police can be notified of problem activity). Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

A disc golf course would be great! I currently pay Oregon State Park fees because I play at Dabney, Rooster Rock, McIver, Champoeg, etc. I would love to make such contributions to the Clark County Parks if there were courses to play.

I am the field scheduler and administrator for Salmon Creek Soccer Club. We serve about 1000 children each year from the county. With the formation of many new sports such as flag football, ultimate frisbee, and lacrosse competition for school fields is at an all time high. We are struggling to find place for our players to practice without destroying the fields that they have to play on. Numbers of soccer players each season is also going up and finding enough fields to accomodate all of the games each weekend is difficult. Especially with the league shortening our season and adding double headers. I believe that working on improving the drainage in the fields that we have and creating some new fields, the young soccer players in the community would be well served. Many sports can play anywhere there is a flat patch of grass but soccer is harder. We need space of a specific size and certain types of grass hold up to the abuse of cleats better. I hope that you will take this into consideration when developing your long range plan and help the youth soccer players here in Clark County.

Hi, I am e-mailing in regards to the County's long term planning for parks.
We really need more turf soccer fields in the Vancouver area and esp. here in NW Vancouver. Soccer is a growing sport in Washington and we need more turf (possibly multi-use like Lacrosse, football) to play on. We are outgrowing our ability to provide field space. Grass fields can only be played on so much (when they are really wet) before it kills the grass and just becomes a big mud pit. In dry weather grass fields are great, esp. when it is really hot out- since turf can make you feel 10 degrees hotter on a hot day. In order for Advanced teams to remain competitive they also need to practice on turf.
Thanks for your time :)

Clark County Parks Department,
I am a Little League coach for Salmon Creek Little League and a resident of Salmon Creek. Our family primarily uses Luke Jensen Sports Park over all other County parks. Here are my suggestions, also suggested by my league president:
1) Multi-use Turf Fields - Salmon Creek Little League pushed for 100% Turf fields at LJSP - Using Field 1 and Field 4/5 at LJSP as a models - both are designed for multiple sports, they are used year round, have lower maintenance costs, and given our weather are playable in light rain. F1 came with an initial cost of about \$1 million, and depending wear has about a 10 year life. Compare annual maintenance costs of natural grass vs the \$100k annual replacement budget, and that gap closes.
2) Lights - extend the day year round so the fields can be used longer year round.
3) Plenty of Parking - Distribute parking around the entire facility
4) Revenue model - LJSP is the first park in the County that uses a revenue model to offset the costs to run the field. This should continue, and let the funds from taxes for Parks be used to develop parks that hopefully stand on their own going forward. LJSP is a great example where users are not bashful about paying for great facilities, and there's no reason to limit development of these facilities to the taxes raised.
5) Develop large enough facilities that multi sport tournaments can be run - Other cities in our region have annual tournaments that the sport communities learn about and plan to return to each year. The business side of that brings outside funds into our parks, and also fills local hotels, restaurants, etc.
6) Joint Partnerships - County & Public - Salmon Creek Little League has wanted to join forces with the county and get the best of both worlds, but the county has been reluctant to form these. There is a huge pool of volunteers in our group and others who want to do things for their respective organizations. It's just another way to extend the tax dollars they have to work with, and getting more value from that initial investment.

There is a VERY large, and growing, interest in Clark County, an surrounding areas, for Pickle Ball. This sport is so popular that Firstenberg Community Center has expended the number of courts availability and times to accommodate the growing interest. Washougal recently converted old tennis courts that were not being used into 6 Pickle Ball courts and they are being used every day by large numbers of players. Clark County is the home of The Columbia River Pickle Ball Club that was form just a few years ago and has tripled in members and has hosted several sanctions tournaments drawing players as far away as Phoenix and Northern California. I would like to suggest that the County provide more Pickle Ball courts, or re-vamp old un-used tennis court, into Pickle Ball Courts. If you would like more information regarding the size and scope of Pickle Ball in Clark County, you can contact Michael Wolfe at wolfemike@aol.com. Mr. Wolfe has been instrumental in promoting Pickle Ball in Clark County. At the moment the Pickle Ball enthusiast in Clark County are playing where ever they can find available courts.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS
<p>Trail maintenance for hikers, bicycles, and horses are my main concern. And bathrooms! I would like to see more natural areas that horseback riding is allowed in such as Whipple Creek Regional Park and allow a trail obstacle use area at the west side of fairgrounds park. there is one already submitted to the county for the property that joins Whipple Creek Regional Park east of 11th Ave making it possible for all users to learn how to use the trails correctly. Not all children play ball. some enjoy nature and can learn better from the natural environment please consider more connecting horse trails that can be used to enjoy nature. this allows many elder people to get outside and exerise. More parking areas that are graveled and larger for trailers to use. maintain existing trails for the future. save wooded areas and plant more for the future. Maintain the Mill area at Whipple creek. allow the restoration of the old bridge Mill & water wheel and the Gazebo area which already are in the park. support a restroom area for the Whipple Creek Regional Park users. please consider a larger parking area as our trailers are larger now and more people walk at the park also need parking. keep things rustic but safe and maintainable, no pavement at all. Interconnecting trails at Daybreak for equestrian use would also help natural trails, less pavement and concrete</p>
<p>One thing I didn't have a chance to comment on in the survey is lack of parking at some trails. I don't know if it is Clark County Park or not, but there is a newer trail head on Fruit Valley Road near Vancouver Lake. When they last improved this trail head they closed off street parking. I still don't understand why that was done. The trailhead isn't really within walking distance of many homes and they got rid of the parking. ?????? Also restrooms are very important to us older people. I hate to admit it, but I have sometimes had to find a tree while out walking on some of the trails. I really try to make sure I am not offending anyone, but I fear getting cited for indecent exposure.</p>
<p>I'd like to see more available single track mountain bike trails in the parks. I have no problem going and helping with trail work at various parks if that would help. Having trails closer to home makes it easier to get the whole family out riding and we all like more rugged trails than the current wide gravel paths. A bike park in the county would be an awesome idea to get everyone out as well. Something like what Castle Rock has</p>
<p>It has come to my attention there are some upcoming open forums on use of open spaces for parks. I may not be able to attend any of them due to my work schedule. So I wanted to express my interest in the need for BMX tracks to be included in the design of any parks. Someone may recall that a Vancouver resident & bmx racer has done some extensive communication with the Parks Department in the past in regards to this very topic . He did spark an interest and we were going to get the go ahead for the space located out off Andresen but we were told the grant fell through. The sport of BMX racing is & has been a very family friendly sport and would go over quite well in our neighboring communities.</p>
<p>Good morning, I missed the open houses. I would just like to say as a horse trail rider and hiker, my family and I hope all future projects include multi use trails and horse trails. Thank you for all that is done to encourage a love of nature and enjoying this beautiful land.</p>
<p>Hi! I read with great interest the article on Updated Parks Plan in the Works in the Columbian newspaper. I have completed the survey and I appreciate the opportunity you give us to share feedback/priorities. I want to bring to your attention that the trail by the Quarry off on 192 Ave, just north of SR 14 (exit 10) is very nice but incomplete. Can the extension of the walking/bicycling trail to Goodwin Street (new Breckenridge subdivision) and connecting NW 18th Ave. (also SE 40th St) be considered in Clark County plan? It will create a complete great walking loop, great for those who want walking and exercising. We had a very successful HOA meeting last Saturday and our members supported this concept wholeheartedly. I would be more than happy to meet with you in person to explain further. Thank you very much.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS (CONT'D)
<p>I completed the online survey and attended the Camas open house where I put some dots on the boards, but I did not fill out a comment card. On both the survey and the boards, I voiced my preference for trails and open space as a priority over other facilities such as sports fields. These comments provide further information on my preferences as the County updates its parks plan.</p> <p>I would like the updated parks plan to provide for acquisition of new regional park land and open space and development of walking and hiking trails. I walk for exercise and would like more natural areas to walk in, like those I enjoy at Lacamas Park. When I am in that park, I enjoy walking along the water, hearing the birds singing, and seeing what native plants are in bloom. In addition to my enjoyment, the park provides habitat for wildlife. Having habitat for wildlife in parks results in more wildlife in neighborhoods and backyards, such as my backyard where I have bird feeders. I think it is important to have a network of trails and open space for wildlife and for people to enjoy nature. I live close to Lacamas Heritage trail and would walk there more but the parking lot is often full. It would be nice to have more areas like it and Lacamas Park in Clark County. It would also be nice if there was more interconnection between parks and trails for better movement of wildlife and so those areas don't become isolated islands surrounded by development. Whipple Creek is also a nice park to enjoy nature in but unfortunately horses turn the trails into a muddy mess. I don't think the County needs to provide more places for riding horses, which are owned by a small percentage of County residents. Mountain biking also needs to be limited so trails aren't torn up by their tires. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the parks plan update.</p>
<p>Hi, I would like to see the bike path completed between Battle Ground Lake State Park and Battle Ground. There is a beautiful path started from Battle Ground Lake that dead ends in the middle of nowhere. In the Battle Ground area, there are few paths for walking or bicycling, in fact, other than Lewisville Park there are absolutely no county parks close to Battle Ground, third largest city in Clark County. To complete this path would give residents access to Battle Ground Lake, one of the treasures in Clark County. Currently we have to drive to the Lake or ride on county roads with high speed traffic and narrow shoulders. I always dreaded taking my kids for a bike ride to the lake. Not much incentive to get exercise that way! Thanks for reading and I hope you can take some positive action to get this path done. It would be a feather in Clark County's and north county's cap.</p>
COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLICATION OF DRAFT PLAN (WITH RESPONSES)
PARKS
<p>We do not need any more county parks. Right now there are 4 within 1 square mile of where I live. And nobody ever talks about the maintenance costs we pay for these parks that are almost always empty. We need more funds sent to the fire departments that are understaffed for this fire season</p> <p><u>RESPONSE:</u> Provision of Parks is determined by a needs assessment, discussed on page 21 of the plan.</p>
<p>What is it that we as a community can do to ensure the area referred to as Green Mountain in Camas/Vancouver remains under the guidance of Clark County? We are very concerned about the lack of vision and what that will mean as far as impact to our communities livability.</p> <p><u>RESPONSE:</u> The Green Mountain Property is under the custodianship of Clark County's Department of Environmental Service's Legacy Lands Program. Pat Lee is the Legacy Lands Manager. This property is identified to be a future Regional Park which is detailed in both the Conservation plan and Parks Plan. The planned development along the south side of Green Mountain is within the jurisdiction of the City of Camas. The County plans to partner with Camas to make some significant trail connections that will eventually link Green Mountain to Lacamas Lake Regional Park. Another trail is also planned to link Green Mountain to Camp Bonneville in the future.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)
<p>Will equestrian use be a factor in the parks development? <u>RESPONSE:</u> Yes. Equestrian use will definitely be a part of the development scope for the Parks Master Plan, including connecting trails. Projects in the Capital Facilities Plan include trails with an equestrian component</p>
<p>Hello, I participated in the Parks Plan open house at 3 Creeks Library. I would like to reemphasize my comment about restrooms in the parks. Restrooms are needed by ALL parks users, regardless of what activity they came to the park for. Restrooms are especially needed by kids and older people. Restrooms are a basic human need. I just wanted to share my input that restrooms are a very important factor when it comes to enjoying time at the park. Please have restroom access as much as possible, even if it means using port-a potties. <u>RESPONSE:</u> Neighborhood parks usually do not have restrooms because they are designed for people who live nearby to visit for short periods of time.</p>
<p>Greetings, I would like to know the plans of what type of facilities the county is developing at the Curtin Creek Community Park. Will there be sport fields developed there? I hope that the area will be used for trails to view the wetlands and the diverse eco- system around the creek. I am very interested in the plan, because I am a landowner on the creek. Could you please direct me to where I may find out the tentative proposal for Curtin Creek Community Park? Thank you for your help. <u>RESPONSE:</u> I've attached the three concept plans and all three do show sports fields. There is a conservation covenant for the riparian area (also attached) around the creek so that area will be used for passive recreation only such as a trail that meanders along the riparian area toward NE 119th street as a connection and for wildlife/ wetland viewing. Our trails plan shows a trail that follows Curtin Creek with the intent of connecting the Salmon Creek Greenway to Padden Parkway. The park and trail system are both listed in appendix A of the draft Parks Comprehensive Plan which is currently on our parks page. Here is the link. http://www.clark.wa.gov/publicworks/parks/index.html Please let me know if you have any other questions and I'll do my best to answer them. Thank you for your inquiry.</p>
<p>Thank you for your quick information on the Sorenson Neighborhood Park (Felida). Since I can see you have concerns regarding the County Councilors funding to maintain the parks, I will continue to have concerns, too. We voted for the parks and maintaining them, too. Also, everyone knows we continue to pay for this vote, since we did think this was our responsibility, too. I hope the County Councilors see that their follow through is important to the success of the parks for families here. It is not a waste of money to fund our park. I will see at the Sept. 8th meeting. <u>RESPONSE:</u> There is an open house planned for Sorenson Park on Tuesday September 8th at Fire District 6. Scot Brantley will be the project manager and McKay & Sposito will be there to unveil some playground designs for the community to choose from. The mailers will be going out I believe around August 11th so you should get one. I plan to be there as well and hope to see you. As for PIF, we are now at \$782,442,000 which is a few thousand short of our goal but I anticipate we should hit it around next month. The only hurdle left is to be sure we have funding to maintain it once built and I have been discussing this with our County Councilors. If they provide us the funding we need at the beginning of 2016, we will be able to start construction in May of 2016. Looking good so far.</p>
<p>I believe serious consideration should be given to extending park hours so they are open earlier in the day, especially during the summer months. An opening time of 7AM when the sun rises well before 6AM does not make a lot of sense. I pass by Pacific Park throughout the year between 6 and 7AM. There are frequently a number of cars parked on the street because the gate is not unlocked until 7 or later. Restroom facilities are also not available to park users until the OFFICIAL opening time of 7AM. Let's take action to get these parks open at a more reasonable time for the benefit of us citizens. <u>RESPONSE:</u> This issue is discussed in Chapter 10 or the implementation chapter of the Parks Master Plan</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)

The Clark County Aging Services Readiness Plan includes several recommendations regarding County Parks. They are as follows:

Parks as meeting places: Develop creative ways to use parks as meeting places for community groups or neighborhood associations by installing shelters, gazebos and low lighting for neighborhood gatherings. The groups using the facilities could help maintain the parks.

Expand programs to encourage development of more neighborhood pocket parks and community gardens: Smaller, flexible, close-to-home parks could include informal natural play areas, community gardens, restored creeks and landscaping with trees, shrubs and flowers.

Provide safe, accessible public facilities such as commons, parks, especially near concentrations of older adult's homes.

Construct interpretive heritage trails: The health benefits of walking are well established and extremely important in addressing not only health but social equity issues for seniors, in particular. Clark County is rich in local and regional history, but many residents are not familiar with it. Development of heritage trails would encourage walking and other activities while giving residents an innovative way to learn about the area. Existing or new trails, sidewalks and pathways could have exhibits and/or art interpreting the area's history.

RESPONSE:

Goals 4 & 7 of the plan addresses the concerns of the Commission on Aging. Also, page 25 of the plan.

The last time I spoke with you was at the open house at Three Creeks Community Library on March 5th. I have written comments and did the online survey. But most importantly, have we been heard and has our vote counted for our neighborhood park?

We want to hear that the funding for the Sorenson Neighborhood Park (Felida) has a green light to proceed. Will this happen in 2016? I hope you appreciate hearing from us again. We will appreciate your commitment, too.

RESPONSE:

I just heard yesterday that there is an open house planned for Sorenson Park on Tuesday September 8th at Fire District 6. Scot Brantley will be the project manager and McKay & Sposito will be there to unveil some playground designs for the community to choose from. The mailers will be going out I believe around August 11th so you should get one. I plan to be there as well and hope to see you. As for PIF, we are now at 782,442,000 which is a few thousand short of our goal but I anticipate we should hit it around next month. The only hurdle left is to be sure we have funding to maintain it once built and I have been discussing this with our County Councilors. If they provide us the funding we need at the beginning of 2016, we will be able to start construction in May of 2016. Looking good so far.

The Great Clark County Parks 2005 Levy promised the development of county parks, which included Sorenson Neighborhood Park. Currently Sorenson Park is slated for 2016. Sorenson Park has gone through the master-planning process (2011) and the design process is almost complete. Our taxes have been collected since this levy and as a neighbor to Sorenson Park (Felida neighborhood) for 28 years, we are committed to seeing this park developed. Help make this process work. Florence (Flossie) B. Wager believed in our parks, too.

Also, we would like to have a cost sheet for Sorenson Park, so we can better understand where the money for this park is going. We do appreciate our neighborhood park. Also, it would be interesting to see how much is spent on each park project. The development of county parks is very interesting. We believed in them enough to vote for them in 2005.

RESPONSE:

There is an open house planned for Sorenson Park on Tuesday September 8th at Fire District 6. Scot Brantley will be the project manager and McKay & Sposito will be there to unveil some playground designs for the community to choose from.

As for PIF, we are now at 782,442,000 which is a few thousand short of our goal but I anticipate we should hit it around next month. The only hurdle left is to be sure we have funding to maintain it once built and I have been discussing this with our County Councilors. If they provide us the funding we need at the beginning of 2016, we will be able to start construction in May of 2016. Looking good so far.

Detailed information regarding parks projects is included in Appendix A of the Capital Facilities Plan of the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space plan.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

This looks like you have put considerable work into developing a new plan for my county park systems. Where are the pools? What about a recreation center for our youth? These weren't even an option to choose when you proposed what new facilities we wanted/needed. 48% of the respondents mentioned that swimming was high on their list of activities. That is a pretty high percentage, but the options for swimming in our county are severely limited. For those of us in the north end of the county, there aren't any. I fully support the growth for hiking/walking trails, but should that eliminate our option for a pool or a rec center?. We have in our city a skate park, public park, and a ballfield. Few options for our kids to have activities if they are not into skateboarding or baseball. The skate park is frequently used for drug use and teenagers use the buildings on the ballpark to sneak away from school and engage in non-age appropriate activities. Please consider the option of a recreation center for our youth that includes a pool.

RESPONSE:

Goal 1 of the Parks Master Plan discusses a Community Center and Goal 4: Water Access is also included.

Hi, I am e-mailing in regards to the County's long term planning for parks

We really need more turf soccer fields in the Vancouver area and esp. here in NW Vancouver. Soccer is a growing sport in Washington and we need more turf (possibly multi-use like Lacrosse, football) to play on. We are outgrowing our ability to provide field space. Grass fields can only be played on so much (when they are really wet) before it kills the grass and just becomes a big mud pit. In dry weather grass fields are great, esp. when it is really hot out- since turf can make you feel 10 degrees hotter on a hot day. In order for Advanced teams to remain competitive they also need to practice on turf. Thanks for your time :!

RESPONSE:

Goal 5: Provide all-season designs for sports fields.

TRAILS

We spoke about ideas and the desire to have a mountain-bike specific trail nearby Battle Ground. I had called to express an interest in working with Clark County to design/create/maintain bicycle specific trails accessible from town and usable by riders of all skill levels. I do know there is a demand for off-road cycling because I see the turnout of riders at various trails in the area such as Cold Creek or Lacamas Lake any given day of the week.

It is true that we have a lot of excellent riding in the SW WA region already. But this requires packing up a vehicle and driving an hour or more to reach the trail. These amazing trails are typically rated intermediate to advanced levels in terms of physical or technical difficulty and the equipment required. Entry level (or family friendly) options are typically packed with joggers, horses, dog walkers, children, cars, etc. - which can often lead to unfavorable or even dangerous interactions amongst these various user groups.

It's a great feeling to coast back to the house after a satisfying evening ride. And to introduce new riders to the sport and see them progress. I believe there are properties in the immediate area with potential and we have a healthy community of riders that are eager to support this effort.

I would love to keep this conversation going with you. Please keep us in mind.

RESPONSE:

Goal 4: Trail System; Goal 5: BMX/Pump Track

Goal 3: Implement Trails & Bikeways Plan

I'm writing in regards to the proposed county parks plan. I like your idea of connecting parks and green spaces with trails. I urge you to keep the trails more "natural." This means single and double track that is either dirt or gravel. Paved paths are nice for road bikes and strollers but we also need some natural, less compacted surfaces that are more suitable for off road cyclists and runners and walkers. Thank you for taking the time to involve the community in this process.

RESPONSE:

Our public involvement talked a lot about connecting trails and parks

Goal 3: Implement Trails & Bikeways Plan

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS (CONT'D)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan. WTA's mission is to preserve, enhance, and promote hiking opportunities in Washington state through collaboration, education, advocacy and volunteer trail maintenance. With the support of over 600 members in Southwest Washington we speak for hikers and welcome the chance to further our mission through the planning process. Survey data and public comments summarized in the draft plan reflect what we hear from our constituents. Hiking and walking are very popular activities and that pedestrians prefer trails in a natural setting. In addition to the high percentage of participants engaging in hiking and walking, your survey respondents also ranked trails as their highest priority to address in the plan. We echo their support for more hiking opportunities in Clark County.

We also support trail construction and maintenance through our volunteer programs. Last year we completed more than 2,400 hours working on the new trail at Vancouver Lake and restoring trails at both Whipple Creek and Lacamas Parks. Thus far in 2015 we've done over 1,200 hours with much more planned.

We support many of the goals and objectives laid out in the draft plan. In particular we support the goal of connecting neighborhoods to parks with pedestrian and bicycling trails to reduce reliance on cars to access hiking trails (concurrently reducing parking lot congestion at trailheads). We also strongly support the addition of new staff resources to enable efforts on collaborating, planning and revenue generation. Without recreation staff like Karen Llewellyn, Roger Anderson and Terry Riggs we could not complete the work that we do.

To improve the plan we would like to see more emphasis placed on serving the demand for trails in a natural setting that provide a high quality hiking experience. The proliferation of user-created paths at Whipple Creek Park, Lacamas Park and many other facilities is strong evidence of an unmet demand for soft-surface trails in a natural setting that form loop options. The concept of connectivity is prominent throughout the draft plan; we would like to see equal emphasis placed on the "pearls" connected by the "string" of regional trails. Although one could argue that individual Park's Master Plans are the place to highlight such local and primitive trails, we believe these trails deserve a prominent place in a comprehensive plan given the overwhelming support for them and so that the plan offers a truly comprehensive overview of what the park system should become.

While it is tempting to simply adopt user-created trails into the system these paths are rarely designed and built to modern standards for user safety and sustainability, often leading to greater problems in the long term. Similarly, using old road corridors for trails often creates erosion problems and doesn't provide the same experience of single track that is heavily favored by hikers, mountain bikers and equestrians alike. It would be a tragic mistake to ignore the serious design pitfalls of road corridors and user created trails in developing trail systems at Green Mountain, Camp Bonneville and other Clark County parks.

Thank you again for the opportunity to engage in this important planning process. We look forward to working together to make Clark County a great place to hike.

- Sincerely, Ryan

Ryan Ojerio

SW Washington Regional Manager Washington Trails Association

www.wta.org

RESPONSE:

A follow-up implementation strategy for the Parks Advisory Board should be to consider language for planning for trails and not automatically assuming an old road or right-of-way would be appropriate for a soft-surface trail.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS (CONT'D)

The City of Ridgefield has the following comments on the Draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan.

Regional Sports Complex Along I-5 Corridor:

The City of Ridgefield, in collaboration with the Ridgefield School District, is developing a regional sports complex near the city limits and we see this as a strong candidate project for agency partnering. A regional sports complex along the I-5 corridor is included in the County's Draft 6-Year Regional Systems Plan under Special Facility Development/Acquisition, with acquisition scheduled for 2019 and development scheduled for 2021. Ridgefield's sports complex site is located in close proximity to I-5, within two miles of interstate access, and appears to "qualify" for this project. In 2015/2016 the City will be preparing a market assessment, acquiring property from the developer, developing a design and preparing construction documents. Development (i.e. construction) of the facility is scheduled to occur in 2017, pending securement of funding. We would like to discuss this partnering opportunity with Clark County and potentially move this project ahead in the County's 6-Year Plan.

Regional Trails Development:

The Regional Trails Map included at the end of Appendix B of the Draft Plan shows three regional trail connections to the Ridgefield area: an east trail connection along the I-5 corridor, a central trail connection along Lake River, and a west trail connection through the Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge. Only one of these trail connections is included in the 20-Year Plan and we would like to see all three included. The Ridgefield community is highly supportive of multi-model travel and we are interested in collaborating on each of these projects, as each would both provide travel options and promote healthy living for Ridgefield.

Thanks you for allowing the opportunity to comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Respectfully yours,
Timothy C. Shell, P.E.
Public Works Director
City of Ridgefield
tim.shell@ci.ridgefield.wa.us
www.ci.ridgefield.wa.us
(360) 857-5023

RESPONSES:

Sports Complex: Goal 5 of the master plan discusses expanding sports facilities.

Trails: The two trails referenced in this email will be included in the final version of the PROS

Since I won't be able to attend your upcoming Board of County Councilors Hearing for Parks Master Plan on Tuesday September 22nd, I would like to express my family's love for our local parks. My husband, Will, and I moved to Clark County in the fall of 2002. We wanted to be in Camas due to the excellent schools and library, as well as to the proximity to LaCamas Park. Since then, we have run, hiked and mountain biked* there several times a week. I can't tell you how much I LOVE that park...! More recently, we have included our two girls on our bike rides there. Also, I will take about 5 of our kids' friends for a (loud) hike to LaCamas Park. They all love it. No one can accuse our neighborhood kids of having Nature Deficit Disorder. Additionally, our family likes to ride our bikes and hike in nearby areas, such as Thrillium on Larch Mountain. However, due to hav+A84ing a full family schedule, we don't get to go to these farther off places more than a few times a year. It would be wonderful to have closer parks in which to hike and ride our bikes. Having beautiful settings in which to recreate and rejuvenate is such a vital element to a healthy community, and I hope you will consider including more parks where we can bike. I understand that there will be a new development in the Green Mountain area; I hope you will include a park with dirt trails that are properly planned for hiking and mountain biking. Recent "trails" that have been built by housing development contractors in Camas are disappointing because they are unusable due to their steepness or their too-sharp switchbacks (which can lead to being washed out). If possible, I could find plenty of volunteers from the mountain biking c+A84ommunity, as well as some with landscaping knowledge, who would gladly volunteer their time to building sustainable dirt trails. P.S. *I feel compelled to point out that we (including our local biking community) are polite mountain bikers; we yield to hikers and runners, stay on the trail, and most of all, frequently rebuild and maintain the trails.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

RESPONSE:

The County has been working with the City of Camas on development of the Green Mountain area, and plans for this area do include plans for trails.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS
<p>One issue of concern for us downtown (Esther Short Park) is the number of skaters that violate city ordinances against skating in our downtown parks — Esther Short and Turtle Place, for examples, in addition to their illegal use of private property. When asked, these violators often cite two issues: skate parks are unsafe from gang activities and bullying; skate parks are located too far away the city center to use. I'd urge you to consider making the existing parks safer and consider expanding skate parks into areas where skaters can access them more easily. I don't know where all the skate parks are located, but if you have a map/grid, perhaps you can see where the gaps exist and consider plugging where you see a major gap. And, if you do consider developing additional skate parks — please be sure to do so only with local resident input as, the last thing we need is a skate park located in a residential area where the boards can be heard day and night slamming on pavement. There are industrial areas and buffer greenspace areas downtown where placing such a skate park would not be a residential or small business disturbance and I'd urge you to consider these kinds of locations. Call me if you have questions.</p>
<p>My biggest concern for parks is that there is a safe walking route to the park for the kids/families to get there, which means sidewalks. For those not close enough to walk, enough parking for several cars at one time. Otherwise, they tend to park where it is dangerous.</p>
<p>Thank you for your email and I have already did your survey and helped in the search for the County Parks. I will add by law, Counties only purchase lands and once you are annexed into the City do you get a fully developed park. For years we have watch the County sell the land that were deemed for future parks. 'Parks are not a need!!' The Budget money should not fund these to fully developed parks nor should these be maintained by those doing time. One should check out the RCW that govern parks and what the counties can do. Also the liability of those they make an agreement for maintenance, such as soccer groups or neighborhood assn. Beside it's been a proven fact and history, <u>these places are where drug dealers go.</u></p>
<p>Regarding the Comprehensive Plan for Parks. 1)You need to hire a lot more boots on the ground, i.e., maintenance and grounds keepers. You need blue collar workers to provide the services to the community by keeping up the parks that you already have, and improving hiking and biking trails, and extending them where it makes sense to do so, to connect the major parks throughout the county. (Use Whatcom County as a fine example to pattern after. Whatcom is much smaller in population, yet has highly developed and well maintained trail system and really nice parks). 2)You should NOT sell any lands that are currently owned by parks. Whatever you paid for them when you bought them was a bargain compared to what you would have to pay now or in the future. I feel compelled to let you know that the county park I visit daily, Lucia Falls Park, is uncared for and in terrible shape. There is invasive species (ivy) taking over the entire wooded areas, climbing the trees, and generally killing off native plants. It just looks like hell. Limbs have been down for months even years in some areas there, with no apparent effort to even move them to the side. The signage is falling apart. The trails appear unkempt, no new media having been added since before the Great Recession started. Charlie's untimely death didn't help matters any. But Clark County Parks has dropped the ball, at just simply keeping the park neat and in presentable condition. Its not uncommon to see men fishing in the rocks just beneath the falls, totally illegal, with none trying to stop them. It's sad, the poor condition that this beautiful park has sunk. I also have had occasion to walk past a park in the Minnehaha area that appears to be totally unimproved, been that way for twenty years, as long as I remember. But there has been housing development all around it. Yet there it sits, a nice wooded area, perfect for a picnic area, yet with really no improvement whatsoever, for a decade or more. There is no way around it, these examples, and I'm sure there are many more, are a disgrace for the entire community. I realize the certain ideologues control the county for now, and have set out to starve your budget, and it seems to be working. But when something like this happens, you have to spread the word that you need more budget not less, but in the meantime, you got to get back down to the basics and provide the fundamentals, which is really what 80% or more of folks want anyway. Boots on the ground—maintenance and grounds keepers.</p>
<p>We think you should put the fee back on Lewisville park, because it was kept up better then.It is a shame to let a nice park like this go down hill, and it seems like there has been more vandalism since they took it off.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)

I would like to see: A) Maintenance of existing parks before building new ones. B) more off leash parks. I think the one of 18th in east vancouver is County, but it is used by hundreds of people every week. C) more parks dedicated to high density housing, i.e. apartments or R-* developments. D) a dedicated lap pool on the east side. E) a dedicated tennis center on the east side F) low maintenance grass seed (Korean grass) that never needs mowing.

RE: Fazio Neighborhood park,

We have noticed that signs have been set along NW 21st Avenue by this park, advising park visitors (and others) not to park on the pavement. Well, that's great and it's certainly safer than parking there and trying to get your children out with traffic close by, so where are they going to park?

We suggest that a parking area be made out of the southernmost part of the park, adjacent to NW 96th Street. Access would be from NW 21st Ave to NW 95th Street and NW 23rd Ct. There could easily be room for 6-8 vehicles.

PS. Many vehicles daily are ignoring the signs to "do not park on pavement".

Re: Sorenson Neighborhood Park (Felida)

The Great Clark County Parks 2005 levy promised the development of county parks, which included Sorenson Neighborhood Park. We want to know the current schedule for completing the parks, since 2012 wasn't possible. In March 2014, our e-mail was answered by Heath Henderson, David Madore, and Jeff Mize. Heath Henderson said that all of their staff are excited to continue building the parks and it is a very rewarding process for the staff to see the neighborhoods appreciate their new parks. Sorenson Park is slated for 2016. Help make this plan work. Sorenson Park has gone through the master-planning process (2011) and the next step is to initiate the design process. As a voter and as a neighbor to Sorenson Park (Felida neighborhood) for 28 years, we are committed to seeing this park developed. Your help is truly appreciated by many families. Florence (Flossie) B. Wager believed in our parks, too.

Thank you for accepting our comments on Clark County's comprehensive parks plan update. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the process and request that you please place us on any notice list involving the County's parks plan update process. We own property located at 7703 NE 129th Street Vancouver, WA 98662, adjacent to land designated for the Curtin Creek Community Park within the Greater Clark Parks District. We believe that the parks plan update is an appropriate time for the County to reconsider the future use of the Curtin Creek Community Park. The 38.5 acre parcel was originally designated for a future community park. But today, a significant portion of the property is now being used for a wetland enhancement and compensatory mitigation site, subject to a perpetual conservation easement to protect and maintain the ecological functions of the area. There is also a fire station on the property. Given the change in use of this property, we believe it is no longer suitable for a community park, which is a high-intensity use requiring a large, permanent footprint.

At this point, it seems better appropriated for a different use. We suggest that the County re-designate the Curtin Creek land from community park to a natural area as a part of the comprehensive parks plan update. A natural area or open space designation is consistent with the long-term protection of the wetland enhancement and mitigation site. A natural area park is managed for both natural and ecological value and light-impact recreational use, which provides for nature-based recreation like bird-watching and low-impact environmental education activities to the extent such activities are consistent and compatible with the restrictions and goals of the required conservation easement. Further, designating the land as a natural area park effectively places the land into reserve for future mitigation projects, which in turn provides the County with its own banking mechanisms for future public works projects. Using this land for dual purposes offers a long-term opportunity for the County that would otherwise be unavailable. Also, there simply is not the demand for a community park in this area, as indicated by the lack of funding and lower than average population growth in this area of the county. The designated park land is also not very visible or accessible from the road given the fire station is in front of the property and the fact that other park sites may be more accessible to higher population densities and be more appropriate. Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to discussing these comments with you further. We believe there are opportunities to work collaboratively to address the future use of the Curtin Creek park site.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)
<p>Just took the parks survey and have additional comment. I would prefer there be a charge for parking and access to Vancouver Lake and other parks (like there used to be) because it feels unsafe to go there. We bring our kayaks and no longer feel we can park car with expensive car top carrier in the parking lot. Lots of untrustworthy people hanging out now. It used to be much safer place to go, especially as women. Also, that might help with how much we have to spend on parks. Thanks.</p>
<p>I noticed the time was running out on sending in comment on the Clark County Parks Comp Plan. I just wanted to highlight Foley Community Orchard in the Felida neighborhood park. The partnerships between, then VCP, Clark Public Utilities and Urban Abundance. Its long term partnerships between public agencies and volunteer driven nonprofits. Here is a well written article about the project: http://www.columbian.com/news/2014/sep/03/volunteers-pick-pounds-of-parks-pears/ We look forward to discuss how Urban Abundance can partner with CCP in the future to develop more Community Orchards.</p>
<p>What happened to the gazebo that was supposed to be built at Covington Park off NE 94th Avenue? We lost out on part of the park when NE 90th Avenue had to be extended from NE 68th Street through to NE 71st Street, did we lose this too? Thank you</p>
<p>Is it true we already have over 7,000 acres set aside for park land ????? enough already, socialist programs only work, until you run out of other people's MONEY!!!!</p>
<p>Greetings, I would like to see: A) Maintenance of existing parks before building new ones. B) more off leash parks. I think the one of 18th in east vancouver is County, but it is used by hundreds of people every week. C) more parks dedicated to high density housing, i.e. apartments or R-* developments. D) a dedicated lap pool on the east side. E) a dedicated tennis center on the east side F) low maintenance grass seed (Korean grass) that never needs mowing.</p>
<p>This is great to see people participating in the survey! As an after thought, I should have specifically stated my preference to a 'Regional Park' as something more akin to Gresham's Blue Lake Park. There is a park that really provides a lot of interaction for individuals, families, small & large groups AND offers some ways to allow funding back into the park by parking fees and facilities rentals. Just a thought! Thanks!</p>
<p>Maybe some things to consider when planning future parks -parks for Seniors??? -parks for those with little or no access to yards and safe places to play. -parks with more benches and smaller sheltered picnic areas—kind of like at rest stops along the freeways. We have made many cross-country trips and always found those rest areas so pleasant—yes, noisy because of freeway traffic—but most have 3-4 single picnic tables with a roof! Sometimes they even have wind breaks. -clean bathrooms This afternoon we checked out Felida Community Park—looks very nice with some of the amenities that would be good for Seniors.</p>
<p>As a resident of the West Minnehaha neighborhood, I can attest to the desirability of these “pocket” parks as our grandchildren have grown up using them and making them a priority stop whenever they visit us from their home in Snohomish. Keep up the good work! I am concerned, however, about their maintenance and their susceptibility to tagging and other destructive activities. Knowing Park personnel are stretched thin, I suggest that you promote volunteer assistance through the neighborhood associations for basic upkeep (such as weeding and picking up wind-downed branches) and security (security patrols such as Neighborhood Watch and maybe videocam surveillance so police can be notified of problem activity). Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
<p>A disc golf course would be great! I currently pay Oregon State Park fees because I play at Dabney, Rooster Rock, McIver, Champoeg, etc. I would love to make such contributions to the Clark County Parks if there were courses to play.</p>
<p>I am the field scheduler and administrator for Salmon Creek Soccer Club. We serve about 1000 children each year from the county. With the formation of many new sports such as flag football, ultimate frisbee, and lacrosse competition for school fields is at an all time high. We are struggling to find place for our players to practice without destroying the fields that they have to play on. Numbers of soccer players each season is also going up and finding enough fields to accomodate all of the games each weekend is difficult. Especially with the league shortening our season and adding double headers. I believe that working on improving the drainage in the fields that we have and creating some new fields, the young soccer players in the community would be well served. Many sports can play anywhere there is a flat patch of grass but soccer is harder. We need space of a specific size and certain types of grass hold up to the abuse of cleats better. I hope that you will take this into consideration when developing your long range plan and help the youth soccer players here in Clark County.</p>
<p>Hi, I am e-mailing in regards to the County's long term planning for parks. We really need more turf soccer fields in the Vancouver area and esp. here in NW Vancouver. Soccer is a growing sport in Washington and we need more turf (possibly multi-use like Lacrosse, football) to play on. We are outgrowing our ability to provide field space. Grass fields can only be played on so much (when they are really wet) before it kills the grass and just becomes a big mud pit. In dry weather grass fields are great, esp. when it is really hot out- since turf can make you feel 10 degrees hotter on a hot day. In order for Advanced teams to remain competitive they also need to practice on turf. Thanks for your time :)</p>
<p>Clark County Parks Department, I am a Little League coach for Salmon Creek Little League and a resident of Salmon Creek. Our family primarily uses Luke Jensen Sports Park over all other County parks. Here are my suggestions, also suggested by my league president: 1) Multi-use Turf Fields - Salmon Creek Little League pushed for 100% Turf fields at LJSP - Using Field 1 and Field 4/5 at LJSP as a models - both are designed for multiple sports, they are used year round, have lower maintence costs, and given our weather are playable in light rain. F1 came with an initial cost of about \$1 million, and depending wear has about a 10 year life. Compare annual maintenance costs of natural grass vs the \$100k annual replacement budget, and that gap closes. 2) Lights - extend the day year round so the fields can be used longer year round. 3) Plenty of Parking - Distribute parking around the entire facility 4) Revenue model - LJSP is the first park in the County that uses a revenue model to offset the costs to run the field. This should continue, and let the funds from taxes for Parks be used to develop parks that hopefully stand on their own going forward. LJSP is a great example where users are not bashful about paying for great facilities, and there's no reason to limit development of these facilites to the taxes raised. 5) Develope large enough facilities that multi sport tournaments can be run - Other cities in our region have annual tournaments that the sport communities learn about and plan to return to each year. The business side of that brings outside funds into our parks, and also fills local hotels, restaurants, etc. 6) Joint Partnerships - County & Public - Salmon Creek Little League has wanted to join forces with the county and get the best of both worlds, but the county has been reluctant to form these. There is a huge pool of volunteers in our group and others who want to do things for their respective organizations. It's just another way to extend the tax dollars they have to work with, and getting more value from that initial investment.</p>
<p>There is a VERY large, and growing, interest in Clark County, an surrounding areas, for Pickle Ball. This sport is so popular that Firstenburg Community Center has expended the number of courts availability and times to accommodate the growing interest. Washougal recently converted old tennis courts that were not being used into 6 Pickle Ball courts and they are being used every day by large numbers of players. Clark County is the home of The Columbia River Pickle Ball Club that was form just a few years ago and has tripled in members and has hosted several sanctions tournaments drawing players as far away as Phoenix and Northern California. I would like to suggest that the County provide more Pickle Ball courts, or re-vamp old un-used tennis court, into Pickle Ball Courts. If you would like more information regarding the size and scope of Pickle Ball in Clark County, you can contact Michael Wolfe at wolfemike@aol.com. Mr. Wolfe has been instrumental in promoting Pickle Ball in Clark County. At the moment the Pickle Ball enthusiast in Clark County are playing where ever they can find available courts.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS
<p>Trail maintenance for hikers, bicycles, and horses are my main concern. And bathrooms!</p> <p>I would like to see more natural areas that horseback riding is allowed in such as Whipple Creek Regional Park and allow a trail obstacle use area at the west side of fairgrounds park. there is one already submitted to the county for the property that joins Whipple Creek Regional Park east of 11th Ave making it possible for all users to learn how to use the trails correctly. Not all children play ball. some enjoy nature and can learn better from the natural environment please consider more connecting horse trails that can be used to enjoy nature. this allows many elder people to get outside and excerise. More parking areas that are graveled and larger for trailers to use. maintain existing trails for the future. save wooded areas and plant more for the future. Maintain the Mill area at Whipple creek. allow the restoration of the old bridge Mill & water wheel and the Gazebo area which already are in the park. support a restroom area for the Whipple Creek Regional Park users. please consider a larger parking area as our trailers are larger now and more people walk at the park also need parking. keep things rustic but safe and maintainable, no pavement at all. Interconnecting trails at Daybreak for equestrian use would also help natural trails, less pavement and concrete.</p>
<p>One thing I didn't have a chance to comment on in the survey is lack of parking at some trails. I don't know if it is Clark County Park or not, but there is a newer trail head on Fruit Valley Road near Vancouver Lake. When they last improved this trail head they closed off street parking. I still don't understand why that was done. The trailhead isn't really within walking distance of many homes and they got rid of the parking. ?????? Also restrooms are very important to us older people. I hate to admit it, but I have sometimes had to find a tree while out walking on some of the trails. I really try to make sure I am not offending anyone, but I fear getting cited for indecent exposure.</p>
<p>I'd like to see more available single track mountain bike trails in the parks. I have no problem going and helping with trail work at various parks if that would help. Having trails closer to home makes it easier to get the whole family out riding and we all like more rugged trails than the current wide gravel paths. A bike park in the county would be an awesome idea to get everyone out as well. Something like what Castle Rock has</p>
<p>It has come to my attention there are some upcoming open forums on use of open spaces for parks. I may not be able to attend any of them due to my work schedule. So I wanted to express my interest in the need for BMX tracks to be included in the design of any parks. Someone may recall that a Vancouver resident & bmx racer has done some extensive communication with the Parks Department in the past in regards to this very topic . He did spark an interest and we were going to get the go ahead for the space located out off Andresen but we were told the grant fell through. The sport of BMX racing is & has been a very family friendly sport and would go over quite well in our neighboring communities.</p>
<p>Good morning, I missed the open houses. I would just like to say as a horse trail rider and hiker, my family and I hope all future projects include multi use trails and horse trails. Thank you for all that is done to encourage a love of nature and enjoying this beautiful land.</p>
<p>Hi! I read with great interest the article on Updated Parks Plan in the Works in the Columbian newspaper. I have completed the survey and I appreciate the opportunity you give us to share feedback/priorities. I want to bring to your attention that the trail by the Quarry off on 192 Ave, just north of SR 14 (exit 10) is very nice but incomplete. Can the extension of the walking/bicycling trail to Goodwin Street (new Breckenridge subdivision) and connecting NW 18th Ave. (also SE 40th St) be considered in Clark County plan? It will create a complete great walking loop, great for those who want walking and exercising. We had a very successful HOA meeting last Saturday and our members supported this concept wholeheartedly. I would be more than happy to meet with you in person to explain further. Thank you very much.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS (CONT'D)

I completed the online survey and attended the Camas open house where I put some dots on the boards, but I did not fill out a comment card. On both the survey and the boards, I voiced my preference for trails and open space as a priority over other facilities such as sports fields. These comments provide further information on my preferences as the County updates its parks plan.

I would like the updated parks plan to provide for acquisition of new regional park land and open space and development of walking and hiking trails. I walk for exercise and would like more natural areas to walk in, like those I enjoy at Lacamas Park. When I am in that park, I enjoy walking along the water, hearing the birds singing, and seeing what native plants are in bloom. In addition to my enjoyment, the park provides habitat for wildlife. Having habitat for wildlife in parks results in more wildlife in neighborhoods and backyards, such as my backyard where I have bird feeders. I think it is important to have a network of trails and open space for wildlife and for people to enjoy nature. I live close to Lacamas Heritage trail and would walk there more but the parking lot is often full. It would be nice to have more areas like it and Lacamas Park in Clark County. It would also be nice if there was more interconnection between parks and trails for better movement of wildlife and so those areas don't become isolated islands surrounded by development. Whipple Creek is also a nice park to enjoy nature in but unfortunately horses turn the trails into a muddy mess. I don't think the County needs to provide more places for riding horses, which are owned by a small percentage of County residents. Mountain biking also needs to be limited so trails aren't torn up by their tires. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the parks plan update.

Hi, I would like to see the bike path completed between Battle Ground Lake State Park and Battle Ground. There is a beautiful path started from Battle Ground Lake that dead ends in the middle of nowhere. In the Battle Ground area, there are few paths for walking or bicycling, in fact, other than Lewisville Park there are absolutely no county parks close to Battle Ground, third largest city in Clark County. To complete this path would give residents access to Battle Ground Lake, one of the treasures in Clark County. Currently we have to drive to the Lake or ride on county roads with high speed traffic and narrow shoulders. I always dreaded taking my kids for a bike ride to the lake. Not much incentive to get exercise that way! Thanks for reading and I hope you can take some positive action to get this path done. It would be a feather in Clark County's and north county's cap.

COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLICATION OF DRAFT PLAN (WITH RESPONSES)

PARKS

We do not need any more county parks. Right now there are 4 within 1 square mile of where I live. And nobody ever talks about the maintenance costs we pay for these parks that are almost always empty. We need more funds sent to the fire departments that are understaffed for this fire season

RESPONSE:

Provision of Parks is determined by a needs assessment, discussed on page 21 of the plan

What is it that we as a community can do to ensure the area referred to as Green Mountain in Camas/Vancouver remains under the guidance of Clark County?

We are very concerned about the lack of vision and what that will mean as far as impact to our communities livability.

RESPONSE:

The Green Mountain Property is under the custodianship of Clark County's Department of Environmental Service's Legacy Lands Program. Pat Lee is the Legacy Lands Manager. This property is identified to be a future Regional Park which is detailed in both the Conservation plan and Parks Plan. The planned development along the south side of Green Mountain is within the jurisdiction of the City of Camas. The County plans to partner with Camas to make some significant trail connections that will eventually link Green Mountain to Lacamas Lake Regional Park. Another trail is also planned to link Green Mountain to Camp Bonneville in the future.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)
<p>Will equestrian use be a factor in the parks development? <u>RESPONSE:</u> Yes. Equestrian use will definitely be a part of the development scope for the Parks Master Plan, including connecting trails. Projects in the Capital Facilities Plan include trails with an equestrian component.</p>
<p>Hello, I participated in the Parks Plan open house at 3 Creeks Library. I would like to reemphasize my comment about restrooms in the parks. Restrooms are needed by ALL parks users, regardless of what activity they came to the park for. Restrooms are especially needed by kids and older people. Restrooms are a basic human need. I just wanted to share my input that restrooms are a very important factor when it comes to enjoying time at the park. Please have restroom access as much as possible, even if it means using port-a potties. <u>RESPONSE:</u> Neighborhood parks usually do not have restrooms because they are designed for people who live nearby to visit for short periods of time.</p>
<p>Greetings, I would like to know the plans of what type of facilities the county is developing at the Curtin Creek Community Park. Will there be sport fields developed there? I hope that the area will be used for trails to view the wetlands and the diverse eco- system around the creek. I am very interested in the plan, because I am a landowner on the creek. Could you please direct me to where I may find out the tentative proposal for Curtin Creek Community Park? Thank you for your help. <u>RESPONSE:</u> I've attached the three concept plans and all three do show sports fields. There is a conservation covenant for the riparian area (also attached) around the creek so that area will be used for passive recreation only such as a trail that meanders along the riparian area toward NE 119th street as a connection and for wildlife/ wetland viewing. Our trails plan shows a trail that follows Curtin Creek with the intent of connecting the Salmon Creek Greenway to Padden Parkway. The park and trail system are both listed in appendix A of the draft Parks Comprehensive Plan which is currently on our parks page. Here is the link. http://www.clark.wa.gov/publicworks/parks/index.html Please let me know if you have any other questions and I'll do my best to answer them. Thank you for your inquiry.</p>
<p>Thank you for your quick information on the Sorenson Neighborhood Park (Felida). Since I can see you have concerns regarding the County Councilors funding to maintain the parks, I will continue to have concerns, too. We voted for the parks and maintaining them, too. Also, everyone knows we continue to pay for this vote, since we did think this was our responsibility, too. I hope the County Councilors see that their follow through is important to the success of the parks for families here. It is not a waste of money to fund our park. I will see at the Sept. 8th meeting. <u>RESPONSE:</u> There is an open house planned for Sorenson Park on Tuesday September 8th at Fire District 6. Scot Brantley will be the project manager and McKay & Sposito will be there to unveil some playground designs for the community to choose from. The mailers will be going out I believe around August 11th so you should get one. I plan to be there as well and hope to see you. As for PIF, we are now at \$782,442,000 which is a few thousand short of our goal but I anticipate we should hit it around next month. The only hurdle left is to be sure we have funding to maintain it once built and I have been discussing this with our County Councilors. If they provide us the funding we need at the beginning of 2016, we will be able to start construction in May of 2016. Looking good so far.</p>
<p>I believe serious consideration should be given to extending park hours so they are open earlier in the day, especially during the summer months. An opening time of 7AM when the sun rises well before 6AM does not make a lot of sense. I pass by Pacific Park throughout the year between 6 and 7AM. There are frequently a number of cars parked on the street because the gate is not unlocked until 7 or later. Restroom facilities are also not available to park users until the OFFICIAL opening time of 7AM. Let's take action to get these parks open at a more reasonable time for the benefit of us citizens. <u>RESPONSE:</u> This issue is discussed in Chapter 10 or the implementation chapter of the Parks Master Plan</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)

The Clark County Aging Services Readiness Plan includes several recommendations regarding County Parks. They are as follows:

Parks as meeting places: Develop creative ways to use parks as meeting places for community groups or neighborhood associations by installing shelters, gazebos and low lighting for neighborhood gatherings. The groups using the facilities could help maintain the parks.

Expand programs to encourage development of more neighborhood pocket parks and community gardens: Smaller, flexible, close-to-home parks could include informal natural play areas, community gardens, restored creeks and landscaping with trees, shrubs and flowers.

Provide safe, accessible public facilities such as commons, parks, especially near concentrations of older adult's homes.

Construct interpretive heritage trails: The health benefits of walking are well established and extremely important in addressing not only health but social equity issues for seniors, in particular. Clark County is rich in local and regional history, but many residents are not familiar with it. Development of heritage trails would encourage walking and other activities while giving residents an innovative way to learn about the area. Existing or new trails, sidewalks and pathways could have exhibits and/or art interpreting the area's history.

RESPONSE:

Goals 4 & 7 of the plan addresses the concerns of the Commission on Aging. Also, page 25 of the plan.

The last time I spoke with you was at the open house at Three Creeks Community Library on March 5th. I have written comments and did the online survey. But most importantly, have we been heard and has our vote counted for our neighborhood park?

We want to hear that the funding for the Sorenson Neighborhood Park (Felida) has a green light to proceed. Will this happen in 2016? I hope you appreciate hearing from us again. We will appreciate your commitment, too.

RESPONSE:

I just heard yesterday that there is an open house planned for Sorenson Park on Tuesday September 8th at Fire District 6. Scot Brantley will be the project manager and McKay & Sposito will be there to unveil some playground designs for the community to choose from. The mailers will be going out I believe around August 11th so you should get one. I plan to be there as well and hope to see you. As for PIF, we are now at 782,442,000 which is a few thousand short of our goal but I anticipate we should hit it around next month. The only hurdle left is to be sure we have funding to maintain it once built and I have been discussing this with our County Councilors. If they provide us the funding we need at the beginning of 2016, we will be able to start construction in May of 2016. Looking good so far.

The Great Clark County Parks 2005 Levy promised the development of county parks, which included Sorenson Neighborhood Park. Currently Sorenson Park is slated for 2016. Sorenson Park has gone through the master-planning process (2011) and the design process is almost complete. Our taxes have been collected since this levy and as a neighbor to Sorenson Park (Felida neighborhood) for 28 years, we are committed to seeing this park developed. Help make this process work. Florence (Flossie) B. Wager believed in our parks, too.

Also, we would like to have a cost sheet for Sorenson Park, so we can better understand where the money for this park is going. We do appreciate our neighborhood park. Also, it would be interesting to see how much is spent on each park project. The development of county parks is very interesting. We believed in them enough to vote for them in 2005.

RESPONSE:

There is an open house planned for Sorenson Park on Tuesday September 8th at Fire District 6. Scot Brantley will be the project manager and McKay & Sposito will be there to unveil some playground designs for the community to choose from.

As for PIF, we are now at 782,442,000 which is a few thousand short of our goal but I anticipate we should hit it around next month. The only hurdle left is to be sure we have funding to maintain it once built and I have been discussing this with our County Councilors. If they provide us the funding we need at the beginning of 2016, we will be able to start construction in May of 2016. Looking good so far.

Detailed information regarding parks projects is included in Appendix A of the Capital Facilities Plan of the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space plan.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

This looks like you have put considerable work into developing a new plan for my county park systems. Where are the pools? What about a recreation center for our youth? These weren't even an option to choose when you proposed what new facilities we wanted/needed. 48% of the respondents mentioned that swimming was high on their list of activities. That is a pretty high percentage, but the options for swimming in our county are severely limited. For those of us in the north end of the county, there aren't any. I fully support the growth for hiking/walking trails, but should that eliminate our option for a pool or a rec center?. We have in our city a skate park, public park, and a ballfield. Few options for our kids to have activities if they are not into skateboarding or baseball. The skate park is frequently used for drug use and teenagers use the buildings on the ballpark to sneak away from school and engage in non-age appropriate activities. Please consider the option of a recreation center for our youth that includes a pool.

RESPONSE:

Goal 1 of the Parks Master Plan discusses a Community Center and Goal 4: Water Access is also included.

Hi, I am e-mailing in regards to the County's long term planning for parks

We really need more turf soccer fields in the Vancouver area and esp. here in NW Vancouver. Soccer is a growing sport in Washington and we need more turf (possibly multi-use like Lacrosse, football) to play on. We are outgrowing our ability to provide field space. Grass fields can only be played on so much (when they are really wet) before it kills the grass and just becomes a big mud pit. In dry weather grass fields are great, esp. when it is really hot out- since turf can make you feel 10 degrees hotter on a hot day. In order for Advanced teams to remain competitive they also need to practice on turf. Thanks for your time ;)

RESPONSE:

Goal 5: Provide all-season designs for sports fields.

TRAILS

We spoke about ideas and the desire to have a mountain-bike specific trail nearby Battle Ground. I had called to express an interest in working with Clark County to design/create/maintain bicycle specific trails accessible from town and usable by riders of all skill levels. I do know there is a demand for off-road cycling because I see the turnout of riders at various trails in the area such as Cold Creek or Lacamas Lake any given day of the week. It is true that we have a lot of excellent riding in the SW WA region already. But this requires packing up a vehicle and driving an hour or more to reach the trail. These amazing trails are typically rated intermediate to advanced levels in terms of physical or technical difficulty and the equipment required. Entry level (or family friendly) options are typically packed with joggers, horses, dog walkers, children, cars, etc. - which can often lead to unfavorable or even dangerous interactions amongst these various user groups. It's a great feeling to coast back to the house after a satisfying evening ride. And to introduce new riders to the sport and see them progress. I believe there are properties in the immediate area with potential and we have a healthy community of riders that are eager to support this effort. I would love to keep this conversation going with you. Please keep us in mind.

RESPONSE:

Goal 4: Trail System; Goal 5: BMX/Pump Track

Goal 3: Implement Trails & Bikeways Plan

I'm writing in regards to the proposed county parks plan. I like your idea of connecting parks and green spaces with trails. I urge you to keep the trails more "natural." This means single and double track that is either dirt or gravel. Paved paths are nice for road bikes and strollers but we also need some natural, less compacted surfaces that are more suitable for off road cyclists and runners and walkers. Thank you for taking the time to involve the community in this process.

RESPONSE:

Our public involvement talked a lot about connecting trails and parks

Goal 3: Implement Trails & Bikeways Plan

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS (CONT'D)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan. WTA's mission is to preserve, enhance, and promote hiking opportunities in Washington state through collaboration, education, advocacy and volunteer trail maintenance. With the support of over 600 members in Southwest Washington we speak for hikers and welcome the chance to further our mission through the planning process. Survey data and public comments summarized in the draft plan reflect what we hear from our constituents. Hiking and walking are very popular activities and that pedestrians prefer trails in a natural setting. In addition to the high percentage of participants engaging in hiking and walking, your survey respondents also ranked trails as their highest priority to address in the plan. We echo their support for more hiking opportunities in Clark County.

We also support trail construction and maintenance through our volunteer programs. Last year we completed more than 2,400 hours working on the new trail at Vancouver Lake and restoring trails at both Whipple Creek and Lacamas Parks. Thus far in 2015 we've done over 1,200 hours with much more planned.

We support many of the goals and objectives laid out in the draft plan. In particular we support the goal of connecting neighborhoods to parks with pedestrian and bicycling trails to reduce reliance on cars to access hiking trails (concurrently reducing parking lot congestion at trailheads). We also strongly support the addition of new staff resources to enable efforts on collaborating, planning and revenue generation. Without recreation staff like Karen Llewellyn, Roger Anderson and Terry Riggs we could not complete the work that we do.

To improve the plan we would like to see more emphasis placed on serving the demand for trails in a natural setting that provide a high quality hiking experience. The proliferation of user-created paths at Whipple Creek Park, Lacamas Park and many other facilities is strong evidence of an unmet demand for soft-surface trails in a natural setting that form loop options. The concept of connectivity is prominent throughout the draft plan; we would like to see equal emphasis placed on the "pearls" connected by the "string" of regional trails. Although one could argue that individual Park's Master Plans are the place to highlight such local and primitive trails, we believe these trails deserve a prominent place in a comprehensive plan given the overwhelming support for them and so that the plan offers a truly comprehensive overview of what the park system should become.

While it is tempting to simply adopt user-created trails into the system these paths are rarely designed and built to modern standards for user safety and sustainability, often leading to greater problems in the long term. Similarly, using old road corridors for trails often creates erosion problems and doesn't provide the same experience of single track that is heavily favored by hikers, mountain bikers and equestrians alike. It would be a tragic mistake to ignore the serious design pitfalls of road corridors and user created trails in developing trail systems at Green Mountain, Camp Bonneville and other Clark County parks.

Thank you again for the opportunity to engage in this important planning process. We look forward to working together to make Clark County a great place to hike.

- Sincerely, Ryan

Ryan Ojerio

SW Washington Regional Manager Washington Trails Association

www.wta.org

RESPONSE:

A follow-up implementation strategy for the Parks Advisory Board should be to consider language for planning for trails and not automatically assuming an old road or right-of-way would be appropriate for a soft-surface trail.

TRAILS (CONT'D)

The City of Ridgefield has the following comments on the Draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan.

Regional Sports Complex Along I-5 Corridor:

The City of Ridgefield, in collaboration with the Ridgefield School District, is developing a regional sports complex near the city limits and we see this as a strong candidate project for agency partnering. A regional sports complex along the I-5 corridor is included in the County's Draft 6-Year Regional Systems Plan under Special Facility Development/Acquisition, with acquisition scheduled for 2019 and development scheduled for 2021. Ridgefield's sports complex site is located in close proximity to I-5, within two miles of interstate access, and appears to "qualify" for this project. In 2015/2016 the City will be preparing a market assessment, acquiring property from the developer, developing a design and preparing construction documents. Development (i.e. construction) of the facility is scheduled to occur in 2017, pending securement of funding. We would like to discuss this partnering opportunity with Clark County and potentially move this project ahead in the County's 6-Year Plan.

Regional Trails Development:

The Regional Trails Map included at the end of Appendix B of the Draft Plan shows three regional trail connections to the Ridgefield area: an east trail connection along the I-5 corridor, a central trail connection along Lake River, and a west trail connection through the Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge. Only one of these trail connections is included in the 20-Year Plan and we would like to see all three included. The Ridgefield community is highly supportive of multi-model travel and we are interested in collaborating on each of these projects, as each would both provide travel options and promote healthy living for Ridgefield.

Thanks you for allowing the opportunity to comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Respectfully yours,
Timothy C. Shell, P.E.
Public Works Director
City of Ridgefield
tim.shell@ci.ridgefield.wa.us
www.ci.ridgefield.wa.us
(360) 857-5023

RESPONSES:

Sports Complex: Goal 5 of the master plan discusses expanding sports facilities.

Trails: The two trails referenced in this email will be included in the final version of the PROS

Since I won't be able to attend your upcoming Board of County Councilors Hearing for Parks Master Plan on Tuesday September 22nd, I would like to express my family's love for our local parks. My husband, Will, and I moved to Clark County in the fall of 2002. We wanted to be in Camas due to the excellent schools and library, as well as to the proximity to LaCamas Park. Since then, we have run, hiked and mountain biked* there several times a week. I can't tell you how much I LOVE that park...! More recently, we have included our two girls on our bike rides there. Also, I will take about 5 of our kids' friends for a (loud) hike to LaCamas Park. They all love it. No one can accuse our neighborhood kids of having Nature Deficit Disorder. Additionally, our family likes to ride our bikes and hike in nearby areas, such as Thrillium on Larch Mountain. However, due to hav+A84ing a full family schedule, we don't get to go to these farther off places more than a few times a year. It would be wonderful to have closer parks in which to hike and ride our bikes. Having beautiful settings in which to recreate and rejuvenate is such a vital element to a healthy community, and I hope you will consider including more parks where we can bike. I understand that there will be a new development in the Green Mountain area; I hope you will include a park with dirt trails that are properly planned for hiking and mountain biking. Recent "trails" that have been built by housing development contractors in Camas are disappointing because they are unusable due to their steepness or their too-sharp switchbacks (which can lead to being washed out). If possible, I could find plenty of volunteers from the mountain biking c+A84ommunity, as well as some with landscaping knowledge, who would gladly volunteer their time to building sustainable dirt trails. P.S. *I feel compelled to point out that we (including our local biking community) are polite mountain bikers; we yield to hikers and runners, stay on the trail, and most of all, frequently rebuild and maintain the trails.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

RESPONSE:

The County has been working with the City of Camas on development of the Green Mountain area, and plans for this area do include plans for trails.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS
<p>One issue of concern for us downtown (Esther Short Park) is the number of skaters that violate city ordinances against skating in our downtown parks — Esther Short and Turtle Place, for examples, in addition to their illegal use of private property. When asked, these violators often cite two issues: skate parks are unsafe from gang activities and bullying; skate parks are located too far away the city center to use. I'd urge you to consider making the existing parks safer and consider expanding skate parks into areas where skaters can access them more easily. I don't know where all the skate parks are located, but if you have a map/grid, perhaps you can see where the gaps exist and consider plugging where you see a major gap. And, if you do consider developing additional skate parks — please be sure to do so only with local resident input as, the last thing we need is a skate park located in a residential area where the boards can be heard day and night slamming on pavement. There are industrial areas and buffer greenspace areas downtown where placing such a skate park would not be a residential or small business disturbance and I'd urge you to consider these kinds of locations. Call me if you have questions.</p>
<p>My biggest concern for parks is that there is a safe walking route to the park for the kids/families to get there, which means sidewalks. For those not close enough to walk, enough parking for several cars at one time. Otherwise, they tend to park where it is dangerous.</p>
<p>Thank you for your email and I have already did your survey and helped in the search for the County Parks. I will add by law, Counties only purchase lands and once you are annexed into the City do you get a fully developed park. For years we have watch the County sell the land that were deemed for future parks. 'Parks are not a need!!' The Budget money should not fund these to fully developed parks nor should these be maintained by those doing time. One should check out the RCW that govern parks and what the counties can do. Also the liability of those they make an agreement for maintenance, such as soccer groups or neighborhood assn. Beside it's been a proven fact and history, <u>these places are where drug dealers go.</u></p>
<p>Regarding the Comprehensive Plan for Parks. 1)You need to hire a lot more boots on the ground, i.e., maintenance and grounds keepers. You need blue collar workers to provide the services to the community by keeping up the parks that you already have, and improving hiking and biking trails, and extending them where it makes sense to do so, to connect the major parks throughout the county. (Use Whatcom County as a fine example to pattern after. Whatcom is much smaller in population, yet has highly developed and well maintained trail system and really nice parks). 2)You should NOT sell any lands that are currently owned by parks. Whatever you paid for them when you bought them was a bargain compared to what you would have to pay now or in the future. I feel compelled to let you know that the county park I visit daily, Lucia Falls Park, is uncared for and in terrible shape. There is invasive species (ivy) taking over the entire wooded areas, climbing the trees, and generally killing off native plants. It just looks like hell. Limbs have been down for months even years in some areas there, with no apparent effort to even move them to the side. The signage is falling apart. The trails appear unkempt, no new media having been added since before the Great Recession started. Charlie's untimely death didn't help matters any. But Clark County Parks has dropped the ball, at just simply keeping the park neat and in presentable condition. Its not uncommon to see men fishing in the rocks just beneath the falls, totally illegal, with none trying to stop them. It's sad, the poor condition that this beautiful park has sunk. I also have had occasion to walk past a park in the Minnehaha area that appears to be totally unimproved, been that way for twenty years, as long as I remember. But there has been housing development all around it. Yet there it sits, a nice wooded area, perfect for a picnic area, yet with really no improvement whatsoever, for a decade or more. There is no way around it, these examples, and I'm sure there are many more, are a disgrace for the entire community. I realize the certain ideologues control the county for now, and have set out to starve your budget, and it seems to be working. But when something like this happens, you have to spread the word that you need more budget not less, but in the meantime, you got to get back down to the basics and provide the fundamentals, which is really what 80% or more of folks want anyway. Boots on the ground—maintenance and grounds keepers.</p>
<p>We think you should put the fee back on Lewisville park, because it was kept up better then.It is a shame to let a nice park like this go down hill, and it seems like there has been more vandalism since they took it off.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)
<p>I would like to see: A) Maintenance of existing parks before building new ones. B) more off leash parks. I think the one of 18th in east vancouver is County, but it is used by hundreds of people every week. C) more parks dedicated to high density housing, i.e. apartments or R-* developments. D) a dedicated lap pool on the east side. E) a dedicated tennis center on the east side F) low maintenance grass seed (Korean grass) that never needs mowing.</p>
<p>RE: Fazio Neighborhood park, We have noticed that signs have been set along NW 21st Avenue by this park, advising park visitors (and others) not to park on the pavement. Well, that's great and it's certainly safer than parking there and trying to get your children out with traffic close by, so where are they going to park? We suggest that a parking area be made out of the southernmost part of the park, adjacent to NW 96th Street. Access would be from NW 21st Ave to NW 95th Street and NW 23rd Ct. There could easily be room for 6-8 vehicles. PS. Many vehicles daily are ignoring the signs to "do not park on pavement".</p>
<p>Re: Sorenson Neighborhood Park (Felida) The Great Clark County Parks 2005 levy promised the development of county parks, which included Sorenson Neighborhood Park. We want to know the current schedule for completing the parks, since 2012 wasn't possible. In March 2014, our e-mail was answered by Heath Henderson, David Madore, and Jeff Mize. Heath Henderson said that all of their staff are excited to continue building the parks and it is a very rewarding process for the staff to see the neighborhoods appreciate their new parks. Sorenson Park is slated for 2016. Help make this plan work. Sorenson Park has gone through the master-planning process (2011) and the next step is to initiate the design process. As a voter and as a neighbor to Sorenson Park (Felida neighborhood) for 28 years, we are committed to seeing this park developed. Your help is truly appreciated by many families. Florence (Flossie) B. Wager believed in our parks, too.</p>
<p>Thank you for accepting our comments on Clark County's comprehensive parks plan update. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the process and request that you please place us on any notice list involving the County's parks plan update process. We own property located at 7703 NE 129th Street Vancouver, WA 98662, adjacent to land designated for the Curtin Creek Community Park within the Greater Clark Parks District. We believe that the parks plan update is an appropriate time for the County to reconsider the future use of the Curtin Creek Community Park. The 38.5 acre parcel was originally designated for a future community park. But today, a significant portion of the property is now being used for a wetland enhancement and compensatory mitigation site, subject to a perpetual conservation easement to protect and maintain the ecological functions of the area. There is also a fire station on the property. Given the change in use of this property, we believe it is no longer suitable for a community park, which is a high-intensity use requiring a large, permanent footprint. At this point, it seems better appropriated for a different use. We suggest that the County re-designate the Curtin Creek land from community park to a natural area as a part of the comprehensive parks plan update. A natural area or open space designation is consistent with the long-term protection of the wetland enhancement and mitigation site. A natural area park is managed for both natural and ecological value and light-impact recreational use, which provides for nature-based recreation like bird-watching and low-impact environmental education activities to the extent such activities are consistent and compatible with the restrictions and goals of the required conservation easement. Further, designating the land as a natural area park effectively places the land into reserve for future mitigation projects, which in turn provides the County with its own banking mechanisms for future public works projects. Using this land for dual purposes offers a long-term opportunity for the County that would otherwise be unavailable. Also, there simply is not the demand for a community park in this area, as indicated by the lack of funding and lower than average population growth in this area of the county. The designated park land is also not very visible or accessible from the road given the fire station is in front of the property and the fact that other park sites may be more accessible to higher population densities and be more appropriate. Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to discussing these comments with you further. We believe there are opportunities to work collaboratively to address the future use of the Curtin Creek park site.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)
<p>Just took the parks survey and have additional comment. I would prefer there be a charge for parking and access to Vancouver Lake and other parks (like there used to be) because it feels unsafe to go there. We bring our kayaks and no longer feel we can park car with expensive car top carrier in the parking lot. Lots of untrustworthy people hanging out now. It used to be much safer place to go, especially as women. Also, that might help with how much we have to spend on parks. Thanks.</p>
<p>I noticed the time was running out on sending in comment on the Clark County Parks Comp Plan. I just wanted to highlight Foley Community Orchard in the Felida neighborhood park. The partnerships between, then VCP, Clark Public Utilities and Urban Abundance. Its long term partnerships between public agencies and volunteer driven nonprofits. Here is a well written article about the project: http://www.columbian.com/news/2014/sep/03/volunteers-pick-pounds-of-parks-pears/ We look forward to discuss how Urban Abundance can partner with CCP in the future to develop more Community Orchards.</p>
<p>What happened to the gazebo that was supposed to be built at Covington Park off NE 94th Avenue? We lost out on part of the park when NE 90th Avenue had to be extended from NE 68th Street through to NE 71st Street, did we lose this too? Thank you</p>
<p>Is it true we already have over 7,000 acres set aside for park land ????? enough already, socialist programs only work, until you run out of other people's MONEY!!!!</p>
<p>Greetings, I would like to see: A) Maintenance of existing parks before building new ones. B) more off leash parks. I think the one of 18th in east vancouver is County, but it is used by hundreds of people every week. C) more parks dedicated to high density housing, i.e. apartments or R-* developments. D) a dedicated lap pool on the east side. E) a dedicated tennis center on the east side F) low maintenance grass seed (Korean grass) that never needs mowing.</p>
<p>This is great to see people participating in the survey! As an after thought, I should have specifically stated my preference to a 'Regional Park' as something more akin to Gresham's Blue Lake Park. There is a park that really provides a lot of interaction for individuals, families, small & large groups AND offers some ways to allow funding back into the park by parking fees and facilities rentals. Just a thought! Thanks!</p>
<p>Maybe some things to consider when planning future parks -parks for Seniors??? -parks for those with little or no access to yards and safe places to play. -parks with more benches and smaller sheltered picnic areas—kind of like at rest stops along the freeways. We have made many cross-country trips and always found those rest areas so pleasant—yes, noisy because of freeway traffic—but most have 3-4 single picnic tables with a roof! Sometimes they even have wind breaks. -clean bathrooms This afternoon we checked out Felida Community Park—looks very nice with some of the amenities that would be good for Seniors.</p>
<p>As a resident of the West Minnehaha neighborhood, I can attest to the desirability of these “pocket” parks as our grandchildren have grown up using them and making them a priority stop whenever they visit us from their home in Snohomish. Keep up the good work! I am concerned, however, about their maintenance and their susceptibility to tagging and other destructive activities. Knowing Park personnel are stretched thin, I suggest that you promote volunteer assistance through the neighborhood associations for basic upkeep (such as weeding and picking up wind-downed branches) and security (security patrols such as Neighborhood Watch and maybe videocam surveillance so police can be notified of problem activity). Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

A disc golf course would be great! I currently pay Oregon State Park fees because I play at Dabney, Rooster Rock, McIver, Champoeg, etc. I would love to make such contributions to the Clark County Parks if there were courses to play.

I am the field scheduler and administrator for Salmon Creek Soccer Club. We serve about 1000 children each year from the county. With the formation of many new sports such as flag football, ultimate frisbee, and lacrosse competition for school fields is at an all time high. We are struggling to find place for our players to practice without destroying the fields that they have to play on. Numbers of soccer players each season is also going up and finding enough fields to accomodate all of the games each weekend is difficult. Especially with the league shortening our season and adding double headers. I believe that working on improving the drainage in the fields that we have and creating some new fields, the young soccer players in the community would be well served. Many sports can play anywhere there is a flat patch of grass but soccer is harder. We need space of a specific size and certain types of grass hold up to the abuse of cleats better. I hope that you will take this into consideration when developing your long range plan and help the youth soccer players here in Clark County.

Hi, I am e-mailing in regards to the County's long term planning for parks.
We really need more turf soccer fields in the Vancouver area and esp. here in NW Vancouver. Soccer is a growing sport in Washington and we need more turf (possibly multi-use like Lacrosse, football) to play on. We are outgrowing our ability to provide field space. Grass fields can only be played on so much (when they are really wet) before it kills the grass and just becomes a big mud pit. In dry weather grass fields are great, esp. when it is really hot out- since turf can make you feel 10 degrees hotter on a hot day. In order for Advanced teams to remain competitive they also need to practice on turf.
Thanks for your time :)

Clark County Parks Department,
I am a Little League coach for Salmon Creek Little League and a resident of Salmon Creek. Our family primarily uses Luke Jensen Sports Park over all other County parks. Here are my suggestions, also suggested by my league president:
1) Multi-use Turf Fields - Salmon Creek Little League pushed for 100% Turf fields at LJSP - Using Field 1 and Field 4/5 at LJSP as a models - both are designed for multiple sports, they are used year round, have lower maintence costs, and given our weather are playable in light rain. F1 came with an initial cost of about \$1 million, and depending wear has about a 10 year life. Compare annual maintenance costs of natural grass vs the \$100k annual replacement budget, and that gap closes.
2) Lights - extend the day year round so the fields can be used longer year round.
3) Plenty of Parking - Distribute parking around the entire facility
4) Revenue model - LJSP is the first park in the County that uses a revenue model to offset the costs to run the field. This should continue, and let the funds from taxes for Parks be used to develop parks that hopefully stand on their own going forward. LJSP is a great example where users are not bashful about paying for great facilities, and there's no reason to limit development of these facilites to the taxes raised.
5) Develope large enough facilities that multi sport tournaments can be run - Other cities in our region have annual tournaments that the sport communities learn about and plan to return to each year. The business side of that brings outside funds into our parks, and also fills local hotels, restaurants, etc.
6) Joint Partnerships - County & Public - Salmon Creek Little League has wanted to join forces with the county and get the best of both worlds, but the county has been reluctant to form these. There is a huge pool of volunteers in our group and others who want to do things for their respective organizations. It's just another way to extend the tax dollars they have to work with, and getting more value from that initial investment.

There is a VERY large, and growing, interest in Clark County, an surrounding areas, for Pickle Ball. This sport is so popular that Firstenberg Community Center has expended the number of courts availability and times to accommodate the growing interest. Washougal recently converted old tennis courts that were not being used into 6 Pickle Ball courts and they are being used every day by large numbers of players. Clark County is the home of The Columbia River Pickle Ball Club that was form just a few years ago and has tripled in members and has hosted several sanctions tournaments drawing players as far away as Phoenix and Northern California. I would like to suggest that the County provide more Pickle Ball courts, or re-vamp old un-used tennis court, into Pickle Ball Courts. If you would like more information regarding the size and scope of Pickle Ball in Clark County, you can contact Michael Wolfe at wolfemike@aol.com. Mr. Wolfe has been instrumental in promoting Pickle Ball in Clark County. At the moment the Pickle Ball enthusiast in Clark County are playing where ever they can find available courts.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS
<p>Trail maintenance for hikers, bicycles, and horses are my main concern. And bathrooms! I would like to see more natural areas that horseback riding is allowed in such as Whipple Creek Regional Park and allow a trail obstacle use area at the west side of fairgrounds park. there is one already submitted to the county for the property that joins Whipple Creek Regional Park east of 11th Ave making it possible for all users to learn how to use the trails correctly. Not all children play ball. some enjoy nature and can learn better from the natural environment please consider more connecting horse trails that can be used to enjoy nature. this allows many elder people to get outside and excerise. More parking areas that are graveled and larger for trailers to use. maintain existing trails for the future. save wooded areas and plant more for the future. Maintain the Mill area at Whipple creek. allow the restoration of the old bridge Mill & water wheel and the Gazebo area which already are in the park. support a restroom area for the Whipple Creek Regional Park users. please consider a larger parking area as our trailers are larger now and more people walk at the park also need parking. keep things rustic but safe and maintainable, no pavement at all. Interconnecting trails at Daybreak for equestrian use would also help natural trails, less pavement and concrete.</p>
<p>One thing I didn't have a chance to comment on in the survey is lack of parking at some trails. I don't know if it is Clark County Park or not, but there is a newer trail head on Fruit Valley Road near Vancouver Lake. When they last improved this trail head they closed off street parking. I still don't understand why that was done. The trailhead isn't really within walking distance of many homes and they got rid of the parking. ?????? Also restrooms are very important to us older people. I hate to admit it, but I have sometimes had to find a tree while out walking on some of the trails. I really try to make sure I am not offending anyone, but I fear getting cited for indecent exposure.</p>
<p>I'd like to see more available single track mountain bike trails in the parks. I have no problem going and helping with trail work at various parks if that would help. Having trails closer to home makes it easier to get the whole family out riding and we all like more rugged trails than the current wide gravel paths. A bike park in the county would be an awesome idea to get everyone out as well. Something like what Castle Rock has</p>
<p>It has come to my attention there are some upcoming open forums on use of open spaces for parks. I may not be able to attend any of them due to my work schedule. So I wanted to express my interest in the need for BMX tracks to be included in the design of any parks. Someone may recall that a Vancouver resident & bmx racer has done some extensive communication with the Parks Department in the past in regards to this very topic . He did spark an interest and we were going to get the go ahead for the space located out off Andresen but we were told the grant fell through. The sport of BMX racing is & has been a very family friendly sport and would go over quite well in our neighboring communities.</p>
<p>Good morning, I missed the open houses. I would just like to say as a horse trail rider and hiker, my family and I hope all future projects include multi use trails and horse trails. Thank you for all that is done to encourage a love of nature and enjoying this beautiful land.</p>
<p>Hi! I read with great interest the article on Updated Parks Plan in the Works in the Columbian newspaper. I have completed the survey and I appreciate the opportunity you give us to share feedback/priorities. I want to bring to your attention that the trail by the Quarry off on 192 Ave, just north of SR 14 (exit 10) is very nice but incomplete. Can the extension of the walking/bicycling trail to Goodwin Street (new Breckenridge subdivision) and connecting NW 18th Ave. (also SE 40th St) be considered in Clark County plan? It will create a complete great walking loop, great for those who want walking and exercising. We had a very successful HOA meeting last Saturday and our members supported this concept wholeheartedly. I would be more than happy to meet with you in person to explain further. Thank you very much.</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS (CONT'D)

I completed the online survey and attended the Camas open house where I put some dots on the boards, but I did not fill out a comment card. On both the survey and the boards, I voiced my preference for trails and open space as a priority over other facilities such as sports fields. These comments provide further information on my preferences as the County updates its parks plan.

I would like the updated parks plan to provide for acquisition of new regional park land and open space and development of walking and hiking trails. I walk for exercise and would like more natural areas to walk in, like those I enjoy at Lacamas Park. When I am in that park, I enjoy walking along the water, hearing the birds singing, and seeing what native plants are in bloom. In addition to my enjoyment, the park provides habitat for wildlife. Having habitat for wildlife in parks results in more wildlife in neighborhoods and backyards, such as my backyard where I have bird feeders. I think it is important to have a network of trails and open space for wildlife and for people to enjoy nature. I live close to Lacamas Heritage trail and would walk there more but the parking lot is often full. It would be nice to have more areas like it and Lacamas Park in Clark County. It would also be nice if there was more interconnection between parks and trails for better movement of wildlife and so those areas don't become isolated islands surrounded by development. Whipple Creek is also a nice park to enjoy nature in but unfortunately horses turn the trails into a muddy mess. I don't think the County needs to provide more places for riding horses, which are owned by a small percentage of County residents. Mountain biking also needs to be limited so trails aren't torn up by their tires. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the parks plan update.

Hi, I would like to see the bike path completed between Battle Ground Lake State Park and Battle Ground. There is a beautiful path started from Battle Ground Lake that dead ends in the middle of nowhere. In the Battle Ground area, there are few paths for walking or bicycling, in fact, other than Lewisville Park there are absolutely no county parks close to Battle Ground, third largest city in Clark County. To complete this path would give residents access to Battle Ground Lake, one of the treasures in Clark County. Currently we have to drive to the Lake or ride on county roads with high speed traffic and narrow shoulders. I always dreaded taking my kids for a bike ride to the lake. Not much incentive to get exercise that way! Thanks for reading and I hope you can take some positive action to get this path done. It would be a feather in Clark County's and north county's cap.

COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLICATION OF DRAFT PLAN (WITH RESPONSES)

PARKS

We do not need any more county parks. Right now there are 4 within 1 square mile of where I live. And nobody ever talks about the maintenance costs we pay for these parks that are almost always empty. We need more funds sent to the fire departments that are understaffed for this fire season

RESPONSE:

Provision of Parks is determined by a needs assessment, discussed on page 21 of the plan

What is it that we as a community can do to ensure the area referred to as Green Mountain in Camas/Vancouver remains under the guidance of Clark County?

We are very concerned about the lack of vision and what that will mean as far as impact to our communities livability.

RESPONSE:

The Green Mountain Property is under the custodianship of Clark County's Department of Environmental Service's Legacy Lands Program. Pat Lee is the Legacy Lands Manager. This property is identified to be a future Regional Park which is detailed in both the Conservation plan and Parks Plan. The planned development along the south side of Green Mountain is within the jurisdiction of the City of Camas. The County plans to partner with Camas to make some significant trail connections that will eventually link Green Mountain to Lacamas Lake Regional Park. Another trail is also planned to link Green Mountain to Camp Bonneville in the future.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)
<p>Will equestrian use be a factor in the parks development? <u>RESPONSE:</u> Yes. Equestrian use will definitely be a part of the development scope for the Parks Master Plan, including connecting trails. Projects in the Capital Facilities Plan include trails with an equestrian component.</p>
<p>Hello, I participated in the Parks Plan open house at 3 Creeks Library. I would like to reemphasize my comment about restrooms in the parks. Restrooms are needed by ALL parks users, regardless of what activity they came to the park for. Restrooms are especially needed by kids and older people. Restrooms are a basic human need. I just wanted to share my input that restrooms are a very important factor when it comes to enjoying time at the park. Please have restroom access as much as possible, even if it means using port-a potties. <u>RESPONSE:</u> Neighborhood parks usually do not have restrooms because they are designed for people who live nearby to visit for short periods of time.</p>
<p>Greetings, I would like to know the plans of what type of facilities the county is developing at the Curtin Creek Community Park. Will there be sport fields developed there? I hope that the area will be used for trails to view the wetlands and the diverse eco- system around the creek. I am very interested in the plan, because I am a landowner on the creek. Could you please direct me to where I may find out the tentative proposal for Curtin Creek Community Park? Thank you for your help. <u>RESPONSE:</u> I've attached the three concept plans and all three do show sports fields. There is a conservation covenant for the riparian area (also attached) around the creek so that area will be used for passive recreation only such as a trail that meanders along the riparian area toward NE 119th street as a connection and for wildlife/ wetland viewing. Our trails plan shows a trail that follows Curtin Creek with the intent of connecting the Salmon Creek Greenway to Padden Parkway. The park and trail system are both listed in appendix A of the draft Parks Comprehensive Plan which is currently on our parks page. Here is the link. http://www.clark.wa.gov/publicworks/parks/index.html Please let me know if you have any other questions and I'll do my best to answer them. Thank you for your inquiry.</p>
<p>Thank you for your quick information on the Sorenson Neighborhood Park (Felida). Since I can see you have concerns regarding the County Councilors funding to maintain the parks, I will continue to have concerns, too. We voted for the parks and maintaining them, too. Also, everyone knows we continue to pay for this vote, since we did think this was our responsibility, too. I hope the County Councilors see that their follow through is important to the success of the parks for families here. It is not a waste of money to fund our park. I will see at the Sept. 8th meeting. <u>RESPONSE:</u> There is an open house planned for Sorenson Park on Tuesday September 8th at Fire District 6. Scot Brantley will be the project manager and McKay & Sposito will be there to unveil some playground designs for the community to choose from. The mailers will be going out I believe around August 11th so you should get one. I plan to be there as well and hope to see you. As for PIF, we are now at \$782,442,000 which is a few thousand short of our goal but I anticipate we should hit it around next month. The only hurdle left is to be sure we have funding to maintain it once built and I have been discussing this with our County Councilors. If they provide us the funding we need at the beginning of 2016, we will be able to start construction in May of 2016. Looking good so far.</p>
<p>I believe serious consideration should be given to extending park hours so they are open earlier in the day, especially during the summer months. An opening time of 7AM when the sun rises well before 6AM does not make a lot of sense. I pass by Pacific Park throughout the year between 6 and 7AM. There are frequently a number of cars parked on the street because the gate is not unlocked until 7 or later. Restroom facilities are also not available to park users until the OFFICIAL opening time of 7AM. Let's take action to get these parks open at a more reasonable time for the benefit of us citizens. <u>RESPONSE:</u> This issue is discussed in Chapter 10 or the implementation chapter of the Parks Master Plan</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

PARKS (CONT'D)

The Clark County Aging Services Readiness Plan includes several recommendations regarding County Parks. They are as follows:

Parks as meeting places: Develop creative ways to use parks as meeting places for community groups or neighborhood associations by installing shelters, gazebos and low lighting for neighborhood gatherings. The groups using the facilities could help maintain the parks.

Expand programs to encourage development of more neighborhood pocket parks and community gardens: Smaller, flexible, close-to-home parks could include informal natural play areas, community gardens, restored creeks and landscaping with trees, shrubs and flowers.

Provide safe, accessible public facilities such as commons, parks, especially near concentrations of older adult's homes.

Construct interpretive heritage trails: The health benefits of walking are well established and extremely important in addressing not only health but social equity issues for seniors, in particular. Clark County is rich in local and regional history, but many residents are not familiar with it. Development of heritage trails would encourage walking and other activities while giving residents an innovative way to learn about the area. Existing or new trails, sidewalks and pathways could have exhibits and/or art interpreting the area's history.

RESPONSE:

Goals 4 & 7 of the plan addresses the concerns of the Commission on Aging. Also, page 25 of the plan.

The last time I spoke with you was at the open house at Three Creeks Community Library on March 5th. I have written comments and did the online survey. But most importantly, have we been heard and has our vote counted for our neighborhood park?

We want to hear that the funding for the Sorenson Neighborhood Park (Felida) has a green light to proceed. Will this happen in 2016? I hope you appreciate hearing from us again. We will appreciate your commitment, too.

RESPONSE:

I just heard yesterday that there is an open house planned for Sorenson Park on Tuesday September 8th at Fire District 6. Scot Brantley will be the project manager and McKay & Sposito will be there to unveil some playground designs for the community to choose from. The mailers will be going out I believe around August 11th so you should get one. I plan to be there as well and hope to see you. As for PIF, we are now at 782,442,000 which is a few thousand short of our goal but I anticipate we should hit it around next month. The only hurdle left is to be sure we have funding to maintain it once built and I have been discussing this with our County Councilors. If they provide us the funding we need at the beginning of 2016, we will be able to start construction in May of 2016. Looking good so far.

The Great Clark County Parks 2005 Levy promised the development of county parks, which included Sorenson Neighborhood Park. Currently Sorenson Park is slated for 2016. Sorenson Park has gone through the master-planning process (2011) and the design process is almost complete. Our taxes have been collected since this levy and as a neighbor to Sorenson Park (Felida neighborhood) for 28 years, we are committed to seeing this park developed. Help make this process work. Florence (Flossie) B. Wager believed in our parks, too. Also, we would like to have a cost sheet for Sorenson Park, so we can better understand where the money for this park is going. We do appreciate our neighborhood park. Also, it would be interesting to see how much is spent on each park project. The development of county parks is very interesting. We believed in them enough to vote for them in 2005.

RESPONSE:

There is an open house planned for Sorenson Park on Tuesday September 8th at Fire District 6. Scot Brantley will be the project manager and McKay & Sposito will be there to unveil some playground designs for the community to choose from.

As for PIF, we are now at 782,442,000 which is a few thousand short of our goal but I anticipate we should hit it around next month. The only hurdle left is to be sure we have funding to maintain it once built and I have been discussing this with our County Councilors. If they provide us the funding we need at the beginning of 2016, we will be able to start construction in May of 2016. Looking good so far.

Detailed information regarding parks projects is included in Appendix A of the Capital Facilities Plan of the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space plan.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
<p>This looks like you have put considerable work into developing a new plan for my county park systems. Where are the pools? What about a recreation center for our youth? These weren't even an option to choose when you proposed what new facilities we wanted/needed. 48% of the respondents mentioned that swimming was high on their list of activities. That is a pretty high percentage, but the options for swimming in our county are severely limited. For those of us in the north end of the county, there aren't any.</p> <p>I fully support the growth for hiking/walking trails, but should that eliminate our option for a pool or a rec center?. We have in our city a skate park, public park, and a ballfield. Few options for our kids to have activities if they are not into skateboarding or baseball. The skate park is frequently used for drug use and teenagers use the buildings on the ballpark to sneak away from school and engage in non-age appropriate activities.</p> <p>Please consider the option of a recreation center for our youth that includes a pool.</p> <p><u>RESPONSE:</u> Goal 1 of the Parks Master Plan discusses a Community Center and Goal 4: Water Access is also included.</p>
<p>Hi, I am e-mailing in regards to the County's long term planning for parks</p> <p>We really need more turf soccer fields in the Vancouver area and esp. here in NW Vancouver. Soccer is a growing sport in Washington and we need more turf (possibly multi-use like Lacrosse, football) to play on. We are outgrowing our ability to provide field space. Grass fields can only be played on so much (when they are really wet) before it kills the grass and just becomes a big mud pit. In dry weather grass fields are great, esp. when it is really hot out- since turf can make you feel 10 degrees hotter on a hot day. In order for Advanced teams to remain competitive they also need to practice on turf. Thanks for your time :)</p> <p><u>RESPONSE:</u> Goal 5: Provide all-season designs for sports fields.</p>
TRAILS
<p>We spoke about ideas and the desire to have a mountain-bike specific trail nearby Battle Ground. I had called to express an interest in working with Clark County to design/create/maintain bicycle specific trails accessible from town and usable by riders of all skill levels. I do know there is a demand for off-road cycling because I see the turnout of riders at various trails in the area such as Cold Creek or Lacamas Lake any given day of the week.</p> <p>It is true that we have a lot of excellent riding in the SW WA region already. But this requires packing up a vehicle and driving an hour or more to reach the trail. These amazing trails are typically rated intermediate to advanced levels in terms of physical or technical difficulty and the equipment required. Entry level (or family friendly) options are typically packed with joggers, horses, dog walkers, children, cars, etc. - which can often lead to unfavorable or even dangerous interactions amongst these various user groups.</p> <p>It's a great feeling to coast back to the house after a satisfying evening ride. And to introduce new riders to the sport and see them progress. I believe there are properties in the immediate area with potential and we have a healthy community of riders that are eager to support this effort.</p> <p>I would love to keep this conversation going with you. Please keep us in mind.</p> <p><u>RESPONSE:</u> Goal 4: Trail System; Goal 5: BMX/Pump Track Goal 3: Implement Trails & Bikeways Plan</p>
<p>I'm writing in regards to the proposed county parks plan. I like your idea of connecting parks and green spaces with trails. I urge you to keep the trails more "natural." This means single and double track that is either dirt or gravel. Paved paths are nice for road bikes and strollers but we also need some natural, less compacted surfaces that are more suitable for off road cyclists and runners and walkers. Thank you for taking the time to involve the community in this process.</p> <p><u>RESPONSE:</u> Our public involvement talked a lot about connecting trails and parks Goal 3: Implement Trails & Bikeways Plan</p>

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS (CONT'D)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan. WTA's mission is to preserve, enhance, and promote hiking opportunities in Washington state through collaboration, education, advocacy and volunteer trail maintenance. With the support of over 600 members in Southwest Washington we speak for hikers and welcome the chance to further our mission through the planning process. Survey data and public comments summarized in the draft plan reflect what we hear from our constituents. Hiking and walking are very popular activities and that pedestrians prefer trails in a natural setting. In addition to the high percentage of participants engaging in hiking and walking, your survey respondents also ranked trails as their highest priority to address in the plan. We echo their support for more hiking opportunities in Clark County.

We also support trail construction and maintenance through our volunteer programs. Last year we completed more than 2,400 hours working on the new trail at Vancouver Lake and restoring trails at both Whipple Creek and Lacamas Parks. Thus far in 2015 we've done over 1,200 hours with much more planned.

We support many of the goals and objectives laid out in the draft plan. In particular we support the goal of connecting neighborhoods to parks with pedestrian and bicycling trails to reduce reliance on cars to access hiking trails (concurrently reducing parking lot congestion at trailheads). We also strongly support the addition of new staff resources to enable efforts on collaborating, planning and revenue generation. Without recreation staff like Karen Llewellyn, Roger Anderson and Terry Riggs we could not complete the work that we do.

To improve the plan we would like to see more emphasis placed on serving the demand for trails in a natural setting that provide a high quality hiking experience. The proliferation of user-created paths at Whipple Creek Park, Lacamas Park and many other facilities is strong evidence of an unmet demand for soft-surface trails in a natural setting that form loop options. The concept of connectivity is prominent throughout the draft plan; we would like to see equal emphasis placed on the "pearls" connected by the "string" of regional trails. Although one could argue that individual Park's Master Plans are the place to highlight such local and primitive trails, we believe these trails deserve a prominent place in a comprehensive plan given the overwhelming support for them and so that the plan offers a truly comprehensive overview of what the park system should become.

While it is tempting to simply adopt user-created trails into the system these paths are rarely designed and built to modern standards for user safety and sustainability, often leading to greater problems in the long term. Similarly, using old road corridors for trails often creates erosion problems and doesn't provide the same experience of single track that is heavily favored by hikers, mountain bikers and equestrians alike. It would be a tragic mistake to ignore the serious design pitfalls of road corridors and user created trails in developing trail systems at Green Mountain, Camp Bonneville and other Clark County parks.

Thank you again for the opportunity to engage in this important planning process. We look forward to working together to make Clark County a great place to hike.

- Sincerely, Ryan

Ryan Ojerio

SW Washington Regional Manager Washington Trails Association

www.wta.org

RESPONSE:

A follow-up implementation strategy for the Parks Advisory Board should be to consider language for planning for trails and not automatically assuming an old road or right-of-way would be appropriate for a soft-surface trail.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

TRAILS (CONT'D)

The City of Ridgefield has the following comments on the Draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan.

Regional Sports Complex Along I-5 Corridor:

The City of Ridgefield, in collaboration with the Ridgefield School District, is developing a regional sports complex near the city limits and we see this as a strong candidate project for agency partnering. A regional sports complex along the I-5 corridor is included in the County's Draft 6-Year Regional Systems Plan under Special Facility Development/Acquisition, with acquisition scheduled for 2019 and development scheduled for 2021. Ridgefield's sports complex site is located in close proximity to I-5, within two miles of interstate access, and appears to "qualify" for this project. In 2015/2016 the City will be preparing a market assessment, acquiring property from the developer, developing a design and preparing construction documents. Development (i.e. construction) of the facility is scheduled to occur in 2017, pending securement of funding. We would like to discuss this partnering opportunity with Clark County and potentially move this project ahead in the County's 6-Year Plan.

Regional Trails Development:

The Regional Trails Map included at the end of Appendix B of the Draft Plan shows three regional trail connections to the Ridgefield area: an east trail connection along the I-5 corridor, a central trail connection along Lake River, and a west trail connection through the Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge. Only one of these trail connections is included in the 20-Year Plan and we would like to see all three included. The Ridgefield community is highly supportive of multi-modal travel and we are interested in collaborating on each of these projects, as each would both provide travel options and promote healthy living for Ridgefield.

Thanks you for allowing the opportunity to comments. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Respectfully yours,
Timothy C. Shell, P.E.
Public Works Director
City of Ridgefield
tim.shell@ci.ridgefield.wa.us
www.ci.ridgefield.wa.us
(360) 857-5023

RESPONSES:

Sports Complex: Goal 5 of the master plan discusses expanding sports facilities.

Trails: The two trails referenced in this email will be included in the final version of the PROS

Since I won't be able to attend your upcoming Board of County Councilors Hearing for Parks Master Plan on Tuesday September 22nd, I would like to express my family's love for our local parks. My husband, Will, and I moved to Clark County in the fall of 2002. We wanted to be in Camas due to the excellent schools and library, as well as to the proximity to LaCamas Park. Since then, we have run, hiked and mountain biked* there several times a week. I can't tell you how much I LOVE that park...! More recently, we have included our two girls on our bike rides there. Also, I will take about 5 of our kids' friends for a (loud) hike to LaCamas Park. They all love it. No one can accuse our neighborhood kids of having Nature Deficit Disorder. Additionally, our family likes to ride our bikes and hike in nearby areas, such as Thrillium on Larch Mountain. However, due to hav+A84ing a full family schedule, we don't get to go to these farther off places more than a few times a year. It would be wonderful to have closer parks in which to hike and ride our bikes. Having beautiful settings in which to recreate and rejuvenate is such a vital element to a healthy community, and I hope you will consider including more parks where we can bike. I understand that there will be a new development in the Green Mountain area; I hope you will include a park with dirt trails that are properly planned for hiking and mountain biking. Recent "trails" that have been built by housing development contractors in Camas are disappointing because they are unusable due to their steepness or their too-sharp switchbacks (which can lead to being washed out). If possible, I could find plenty of volunteers from the mountain biking c+A84ommunity, as well as some with landscaping knowledge, who would gladly volunteer their time to building sustainable dirt trails. P.S. *I feel compelled to point out that we (including our local biking community) are polite mountain bikers; we yield to hikers and runners, stay on the trail, and most of all, frequently rebuild and maintain the trails.

Parks Master Plan
Email Comments

RESPONSE:

The County has been working with the City of Camas on development of the Green Mountain area, and plans for this area do include plans for trails.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A resolution to adopt the Clark County Parks Recreation and Open Space Plan (PROS).

WHEREAS the Clark County Board of County Councilors is a governing body made up of three members, each elected to four-year terms, and provide legislative authority; and

WHEREAS in 2014 the Clark County Board of County Councilors created the Clark County Parks Division, a department of the Clark County Public Works, and Clark County Parks Advisory Board; and

WHEREAS, the Parks Advisory Board is comprised of various community representatives and its role is to make policy recommendations to both the Parks Division and the Board of County Councilors; and

WHEREAS, since October of 2014, the Parks Advisory Board guided the development of the PROS and discussed the PROS on a monthly basis; and

WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A(8) requires Clark County to include a PROS as a part of the County's comprehensive growth management plan; and

WHEREAS, the PROS has the following statutorily required elements: estimates of park and recreation demand for at least a ten-year period; an evaluation of facilities and service needs; and an evaluation of intergovernmental coordination opportunities to provide regional approaches for meeting park and recreational demand; and

WHEREAS, the PROS will serve as the 20-year guiding document for the development of parks, recreation facilities, and trails in unincorporated Clark County; and

WHEREAS, the county parks division held open houses to solicit public input on the PROS on March 3, 4, and 5; and

WHEREAS, the Clark County Board of Councilors held work sessions regarding the PROS on April 22, July 29, and September 2; and

WHEREAS, RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c) requires a State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) determination of non-significance (DNS) be published and is the county's invitation to the public and governmental agencies to comment on the PROS; and

1 WHEREAS, the SEPA determination of non-significance means the PROS will
2 not have a significant, negative impact on the environment; and

3 WHEREAS, the county prepared and published a SEPA DNS regarding PROS
4 on July 15 per state Growth Management Act requirements; and

5 WHEREAS, Clark County did not receive any comments from the public and/or
6 government agencies on the SEPA; and

7 WHEREAS, the Clark County Board of County Councilors appointed the
8 Planning Commission as an advisory board on matters related to physical development
9 of land in the unincorporated county; and

10 WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviews county policy proposals on
11 anything potentially related to land use in the county and gives the Board of County
12 Councilors its recommendations; and

13 WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviews and makes recommendations to
14 the Board of County Councilors on all policy documents with land use and/or Clark
15 County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan implications; and

16 WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly advertised work session
17 regarding the PROS on August 6; and

18 WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly advertised hearing regarding
19 the PROS on August 20th; and

20 WHEREAS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the recommendation
21 to the Board that the PROS be adopted by resolution; and

22 WHEREAS, the Board of County Councilors held a duly advertised hearing on
23 September 22, 2015; and

24 WHEREAS, the State of Washington Recreation and Conservation Office
25 requires local jurisdictions to have adopted parks plans to qualify for grant funding; and

26 WHEREAS, the Parks Division intends to apply for at least two grants with the
27 Washington Recreation and Conservation Office in the next year; and

28 WHEREAS, adoption of an Resolution _____ as proposed will further the
29 public health, safety, and welfare; and

30 WHEREAS, the PROS is consistent with the requirements of the state of
31 Washington Growth Management Act it is now, therefore be it,

1 ORDERED, RESOLVED, AND DECREED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY
2 COUNCILORS OF CLARK COUNTY, STATE OF WASHINGTON, AS FOLLOWS:

3
4 **Section 1. Findings.** The Board finds that the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and
5 Open Space Plan is consistent with the goals and policies within the Clark County
6 Comprehensive Plan.

7
8 **Section 2. Amendatory.** The Board adopts the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and
9 Open Space Plan. The Board directs the Clark County Parks, Recreation, and Open
10 Space Plan be incorporated into the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Growth
11 Management Plan Update as an element required under RCW 36.70A.070 (8)

12
13 **Section 3. Effective Date.** This resolution shall take effect immediately upon adoption.

14
15 **Section 4. Instructions to Clerk.**

16 The Clerk to the Board shall:

- 17 1. Record a copy of this resolution with the Clark County Auditor.
18
19 2. Transmit a copy of this resolution to the state of Washington Department of
20 Commerce within ten days of its adoption pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106.
21
22 3. Cause notice of adoption of this resolution to be published forthwith pursuant
23 to RCW 636.70A.290.

24
25 ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 2015.

26
27 Attest:

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
FOR CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

28
29
30
31 _____
32 Clerk to the Board

By _____
David Madore, Chair

33
34 Approved as to Form Only
35 ANTHONY F. GOLIK
36 Prosecuting Attorney

By _____
Jeanne Stewart, Councilor

37
38
39
40

1
2
3
4
5

By 
Amanda Migchelbrink
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

By _____
Tom Mielke, Councilor