

Parks, Trails and Community Facilities Initiative
Community Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary for March 21, 2018

Attending:

Advisory Committee Members:			
Al Dieckman	√	Jeannie Seil	√
Angelina Benedetti		Jeffrey Kelly	√
Bob Reeder (CAC Vice Chair)		Melody Kroeger	√
Brendan Armstrong	√	Mij Charbonneau	
Brian Kaelin		Mitch Shepherd	√
Colin Walker	√	Rocale Timmons	
Dana Rochex	√	Ted Rodriguez	
Devin Malkin	√	Tim Searing (CAC Chair)	√
Dr. Linda Smith	√		
City Staff and Others:			
Ed Prince		Leslie Betlach	√
Carol Ann Witschi		Steve Brown	√
Jay Covington	√	Stefanie Coleman	√
Kelly Beymer	√	Cailin Hunsaker	√
Jan Hawn	√	Karen Reed	√
Dana Appel		Maryjane Van Cleave	
Misty Baker	√	Mayor Law	

Meeting Commenced: 4:00pm

1. Welcome

Tim Searing welcomed everyone. Agenda was reviewed. Today's meeting will be a discussion on results of the scoring of 87 projects.

2. It was moved and seconded to accept and approve the Meeting 4 Summary.
3. The questions that have been accumulated are compiled on the Questions Tracking sheet. There is no update to this list at this time. Staff are still working to answer one question. Continue to use the 3x5 cards to record any questions that come to mind (include name, will be kept confidential) and turn them in before you leave.
4. Karen explained a quick overview the rating results in Packet #1 and that a second packet will be distributed later in the meeting providing the same data in different ways to look at it.
5. Tim described the packet Summary Sheet that shows some high level facts and totals. It was discovered that the Neighborhood breakdown box is missing East Plateau and Valley totals. Roberta will update the summary sheet. Then Tim oriented the group to the spreadsheet data sets in Packet #1.
 - a. Item 1 – This lists all 87 projects from highest to lowest rating based on Question 1.

- i. It was later asked that the Projected Maintenance costs be added to this spreadsheet(s) and to the Deferred Maintenance projects from this sort and dollar tally.
 - b. Item 2 – This lists all 87 projects from highest to lowest rating based on Question 2.
 - i. – Also shows how each project rated on Question 1; to compare.
 - c. Item 3 – This lists all 87 projects from highest to lowest rating based on Question 3.
 - i. – Also shows how each project rated on Question 1; to compare.
- 6. Karen used a PowerPoint to highlight more data from the project rating results.
 - a. It was asked that a total dollar amount be calculated for Slides 11 and 12.
 - i. **Slide 11: Projects rating in the top 25 of both Ques. 1 and 2: \$49,180,900**
 - 1. Thomas Teasdale Park (AE), Cedar River Park (A), Cedar River Trail (P), Highlands Parks and Neighborhood Center (D), May Creek/MsAskill (R), Sport Courts – Talbot Hill (CH), Lighting Upgrade 2 (no location) (BM)
 - ii. **Slide 12: Projects rating in the top 25 for both Ques. 1 and 3: \$14,108,300**
 - 1. Cedar River Trail Park (P), Tiffany Park (S), Coulon Parking Lot Repairs(BD), Ron Regis Park (B), Dog Parks (Q)
- 7. In groups no larger than 4, they were given 15 minutes to review Packet 1 and write down any questions they have about the data. And then shared out their observations and questions.

Then Karen facilitated discussion on Packet 1, Item 1 and surveyed the whole group for what surprised them from the findings and as a result of what they've learned thus far from the rating exercise what they would tell their neighbor to 'sell them' on this potential ballot measure.

Then she facilitated discussion of Packet 1, Items 2 and 3 and surveyed the group with a hand vote of what types of projects they would want to include in the recommendation. The casual voting showed the following tallies:

- a. Trails & Corridor Projects - 8
- b. Park Projects – 10
 - i. Ball fields / Sport Fields - 10
- c. Community Facility Projects
 - i. New – 0
 - ii. Major Maintenance - 10
 - iii. Expand/Improve Current Asset- 4
 - iv. Special Use – 4
- d. Other Major Maintenance – 11
- e. Quick Wins – 6
- f. Maximize Number of Smaller Projects - 1
- g. Geographic Equity (something in each neighborhood area) – 8

8. Then let the groups of 3-4 were given Packet #2 with additional breakdowns of the rating tool findings to discuss what type of allocation of projects they would like to see in the recommendation.

Q: If some projects could be identified that could potentially be partially funded by grants or alternative funding, could they be added to the list of projects as “possible” add-ons? Depending on how they’re identified, this might be an option.

A: Depending on how they’re identified, this might be an option.

Q: Should we consider the revenue-generating projects (like sports fields, sports complex) as possible funding for the projects?

A:

Comment: There’s no projects on the West Hill of Renton (ie: Earlington Park)

9. Next Meeting Agenda: Meeting #6 will continue the discussion of project allocation, and is scheduled for Wednesday, April 4th, 4:00pm, 7th Floor Conferencing Center.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00pm.

Meeting Summary Approved: _____ Date: _____