

**Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Minutes
October 16, 2003**

Item 1: Meeting Called to Order by Chairman Bernie Goss at 12:22 p.m.

Roll Call

Board Members Present: Bernie Goss
 Dennis Derrieux
 Bob Cron
 David Detwiler
 Tom Fisher
 Reford Theobold
 Cindy Enos-Martinez (Ex-Officio)

Board Members Absent: Dale Hollingsworth

Staff Present: Joe Stevens, Director
 Don Hobbs, Assistant Director
 Tressa Fisher, Administrative Specialist
 Travis Bunkelman, Golf Pro
 Mari Steinbach, Recreation Superintendent

Guests Present: Beth Campbell
 Ken Scissors

Item 2: Approve Minutes

Bob Cron notified the Board of corrections that need to be made to the September 17, 2003 minutes. On page 3, Other Business – Riverfront signs – The sentence should read “The signs are designed and ready for fabrication” and the following sentence should be deleted.

Bob Cron moved to approve the September 17, 2003, minutes after the above correction is made. Tom Fisher seconded the motion.

Motion adopted by Parks and Recreation Advisory Board: Yes 6 No 0

Item 3: Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) Presentation

The Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) video was shown in its entirety. Joe Stevens briefly discussed the Department’s priorities for the next couple of years.

Mr. Stevens stated he recently received a letter from the Bluffs Homeowner’s Association requesting a partnership with the City in hopes of developing a neighborhood park. Joe Stevens stated the information was presented to City Council on Wednesday, October 15, 2003, and staff was given a “green light” to start the dialogue and begin researching the possibility.

Joe Stevens reported that City Council has requested the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board make recommendations for a school park model. The Parks & Recreation staff will put together examples and present them at the December Board meeting for review.

Item 4: Dog Park Discussion and Recommendation

Beth Campbell, representative for the dog park committee, stated that the citizens who have signed the petitions still want a dog park; however, they do not want it to be at the proposed Blue Heron Lake location. The group has several concerns with the Blue Heron location, including unsafe and/or unclean water, no grass - location lacks the ability to grow grass, and the fact that the site is relatively secluded. Beth Campbell stated it seems like a waste of time, money and effort to continue pursuing the Blue Heron location. Bob Cron asked if there was an alternative site she would like to recommend. Ms. Campbell stated she likes the Horizon site; however, it does not have a body of water for the dogs to play in, and it is surrounded by houses.

Ken Scissors, representing dog owners who currently use Canyon View Park, introduced himself. Mr. Scissors stated he agrees with Beth Campbell, in terms of the sentiment of the people who want a dog park, stating the Blue Heron site is lacking essential elements. Ken Scissors stated the group very strongly feels the Canyon View Park location should be entered into the equation, stating it can easily be sectioned off, would not require any new land purchases, and would require minimal maintenance. Mr. Scissors stated the current users at Canyon View Park are willing to fund the improvements themselves and are willing to raise the money for fencing, in order to offer this solution at no additional expense to the City. Ken Scissors distributed a “draft” version of a map that illustrates possible fencing. (See attached) Cindy Enos-Martinez asked if the patrons plan to start leashing their dogs until they are inside the dog park. Since Canyon View Park continues developing, the issue of unleashed dogs will need to be addressed prior to an incident occurring. Cindy Enos-Martinez also questioned the City’s liability if an “official” dog park were designated. Mr. Scissors responded that the area would be self-policed, however, stated anytime you have dogs there is potential for a fight, regardless if they are on or off a leash. Mr. Scissors said it was very unusual for someone to bring an aggressive dog to a dog park setting. Joe Stevens stated the City’s liability is similar to skate parks, golf courses, etc. Mr. Stevens stated that, although, the Canyon View Park site has merit, the ponds were not designed for this type of usage. He also stated if the area is fenced in and advertised, there could be a significant impact on the site that “would” require additional maintenance. Another concern is fencing the Canyon View site; the fencing would block the sidewalks and/or entrances from people who currently walk, skate or jog around the park. Reford Theobald stated, that while he appreciates the concept of self-policing, aggressive dogs tend to have aggressive owners. Beth Campbell stated that statistics of incidents in dog parks are very low and organizations such as, Mesa County Animal Control and the Roice-Hurst Humane Society, both, support dog parks. Ms. Campbell stated it would be essential for the fencing to have double gates, which would also help deter small children from entering the fenced area. Ms. Campbell stated the site will also need two separate sections inside the fenced area, one for small dogs and one for the large dogs. Cindy Enos-Martinez stated a dog park is not a part of Canyon View Park’s master plan. Ken Scissors stated it is very important the proposed sites have a body of water for the extremely large population of retrievers in the Grand Valley. Mr. Scissors stated if a site is developed without water, the dog owners who are currently using Canyon View Park, will continue to use Canyon View Park regardless of park regulations. Reford Theobald stated that as the park continues to grow, stronger enforcement will most likely have to occur. Bob Cron stated the original direction of the sub-committee, assigned to research potential dog park locations, was instructed NOT to consider Canyon View Park as a possible site.

Chairman Goss requested time for the Board members to discuss the new information, explore possibilities, consider alternative locations, etc. Currently City Council is under the assumption that the Blue Heron site has been designated as the proposed location for the dog park and is consistent with sub-committee recommendations. Discussion ensued. Bob Cron stated he supports withdrawing the Blue Heron site, however, recommends keeping the \$5,000 designated for a dog park.

Reford Theobold moved to forward the recommendation to City Council to budget \$20,000, of which \$5,000 is City funds, for the development of a dog park, stating the site is “to be determined”. Tom Fisher seconded the motion.

Motion adopted by Parks and Recreation Advisory Board: Yes 6 No 0

Item 5: Park Hours Discussion and Recommendation

Bernie Goss reviewed the information discussed at the September 17, 2003, Parks & Recreation Advisory Board meeting, stating the categorization of Sherwood Park still needed to be addressed. Chairman Goss stated he was unaware of the complaints the surrounding Sherwood Park residents have had regarding after-hours/late night hours. Don Hobbs stated that Sherwood Park, based on size, does not fit in the neighborhood park category. After discussing the issues with surrounding residents, it was determined there are numerous incidents occurring after dark and the residents are frustrated they have to wait until midnight for any type of enforcement. Bernie Goss questioned whether or not graffiti is a major concern in the park. Don Hobbs responded there is not any more graffiti at Sherwood Park than there is at any of the other parks. Discussion ensued regarding the best categorization for Sherwood Park.

Reford Theobold moved to present the Park Hours listing as a formal recommendation to City Council, including Sherwood Park as a “neighborhood park”. Bob Cron seconded the motion.

Motion adopted by Parks and Recreation Advisory Board: Yes 6 No 0

Item 6: 2004 & 2005 Fees and Charges

Joe Stevens distributed an updated Fees & Charges Policy, stating there were minor changes to the original draft of the policy (See attached). It has been requested that the policy be presented at the City Council budget review scheduled for October 29, 2003. One significant change is the proposed two-tiered fee structure for the golf courses. In 2004, Lincoln Park will increase 4% and Tiara Rado will increase 10%. Season tickets will be the same price at either course, however, the per round fee will be higher at Tiara Rado. Golf courses do not receive sales tax revenue; therefore, if maintenance costs increase, the fees are the only way to offset expenses. Mr. Stevens stated he does not predict golfers objecting to the fee differential, as long as they continue to see the high level of maintenance they are accustomed to. Cindy Enos-Martinez asked how the new fees compared to other golf courses in the area. Travis Bunkelman responded the City’s fees are currently \$2 less per round than the next lowest area courses.

Bernie Goss expressed concern that the “returned check” fee was extremely low. Joe Stevens stated the fee is not determined by individual departments, it is part of the city-wide policy. Chairman Goss would like to encourage Administration Services to increase the fee.

Joe Stevens reported on a few additional changes, such as the incremental increases for park shelters scheduled in 2005. (Total increase of \$5 per rental) Preliminary discussions are taking place with School District #51 regarding playoff games and rental fees for sports facilities with incremental increases projected for 2005.

Bob Cron moved that the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board recommend the City Council adopt the 2004 & 2005 Fees & Charges Policy as presented. Reford Theobald seconded the motion.

Motion adopted by Parks and Recreation Advisory Board: Yes 6 No 0

Item 7: Adjourn

Bernie Goss asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Dennis Derreix moved and Tom Fisher seconded. The meeting was adjourned by acclamation.

Meeting adjourned at 1:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tressa Fisher
Administrative Specialist