

AGENDA

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **Review Preliminary Results – Public Open House and Input**
 - Open House Meetings
 - # Attendees - Fieldhouse (48) / MARC (29) /Ice Arena (62) /Total (139)
 - # Comments - 73 input forms, 26 written on pads, 2 comments written on maps
 - Project website/ email/ telephone/Project Facebook
 - # Comments - 92 (6AM May 6th/25 additional by 3Pm, and COMING!)
 - “I prefer/I vote for” comments versus process comments (new criteria/ revised criteria)
3. **Review Schedule: Next Key Dates**
 - Committee Meeting #3 – Monday, May 20th
 - Purpose: Review revised matrix
 - Draft Plan Open House – Wednesday, May 29th (Location/Time TBD)
 - Purpose: Review revised matrix
 - Draft Plan Direction
 - Committee Meeting #4 – Monday, May 10th
 - Purpose: Review Draft Strategic Action Plan
 - Final Strategic Action Plan Due – June 19th

COMPLETED TASKS

- Task I: Kick-off Meeting**
- Task II: Park and Recreation Facilities and Site Assessments**
- Task III: Open Space and Trails Assessment**
- Task IV: Vision and Strategy**
 - A. Community Visioning Process: Preliminary Projects and Prioritization Criteria Matrix
 - B. Community Based Prioritization
Public Meeting No. 1: (results under analysis)

UPCOMING TASKS

Public Meeting No. 2: Working with the Agencies and the Strategic Plan Committee we will refine the data and information contained in the matrix to develop a Draft Prioritization Matrix and Community Recreation Strategic Action Plan. The result will be a vision that is realistic, with achievable targets and actions items incorporated into a timeline. Again, this more refined prioritization will be presented to the public in an open house format where their input can be gathered, documented, analyzed, and incorporated as directed by the Strategic Plan Committee.

- C. Development of the Community Recreation Strategic Action Plan: The results and discussion following the second public meeting will be developed into the Community Recreation Strategic Action Plan. The plan will include recommendations for achievements and milestones for the next five years, evaluation criteria for tracking progress, and will include a GIS map of all major recreation and park facilities, and locations for new facilities and vacant land.

4. Key Questions to Consider/ Committee Brainstorm

- What do you think about the results of the preliminary matrix/criteria? Is it fair?
- Should certain criteria be rated higher than others? If so, which ones, and why? How much higher?
- How should “low hanging fruit/low-cost improvements” be dealt with in the Action Plan?
- Many of the comments received to date indicate support for one or more facilities or programs. The opinion survey and needs assessment have already indicated which facilities/programs are needed and desired. How should this new level of input be utilized to create an action plan that is fair and responsive?
- Several members of the public stated that they believe prioritizations should not be separated from budget resources. What do you think?
- Some members of the public indicate that facilities and programs such as climbing are at a disadvantage because of the nature of the activity and the personality of the individuals who participate. Is this a fair assessment?
- The following are some new criteria that have been suggested to be included in the assessment, or which should be modified to create a more fair assessment? What do you think?

New criteria to consider

- something/facility not already found here
- public facility that provides a typically/usually private role
- Financial self-sustainability
- Public/Private Partnership (think they are better and should be prioritized)
- Return on Assets
- Citizens served
- Recruit visitors, build outsider revenues
- Carry PC brand outside the County
- Youth programming
- Existing facility used at maximum capacity

Wrongly Applied Criteria?

- The survey and demand study results should dictate what gets prioritized. Don't think current criteria should be applied separately.
- Under criteria for 'available elsewhere in the region', the indoor ice rink should be a 2 or 3, not a 1, since it is not available elsewhere in the region (within 15 miles.)
- Evaluation criteria for flexibility is out of order – 1 should be 'cannot accommodate unrelated, non-related recreational activities', 2 should be maybe/possible, 3 should be yes.