

MARINA PARK REFERENDUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

Minutes of the Marina Park Referendum Committee, appointed by the North Brevard Commission Parks & Recreation, held Monday, June 23, 2003, at 6 p.m., in the Brevard Room at the Brevard County Government Center-North.

Members Present

Paul Nydam, Chairman
William Horner
Pat Lafferty
Rick Manning
Francis Reilly
Mark Leslie, City Liaison
Ken Carlson, NBCPR Liaison

Members Absent

JiJi Connolly
Tommy Grimes
A&E–Woody Rice, Honeycutt & Associates

City Staff Present

Richard Stillwagon

County Staff Present

Charles Nelson, Parks & Recreation Director
Jack Masson, Assistant Parks & Recreation Director
Cheryl K. Page, North Area Parks Operations Manager
Chuck Mays, Construction Coordinator
Judy Inman, NAPO Administrative Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Paul Nydam called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

At the motion by Francis Reilly, seconded by Bill Horner, the minutes of May 19, 2003, were approved with the addition of Woody Rice representing the A&E in the list of those present, and inserting the words “boating from” and “and” in Mr. Nelson’s recap and the motion on last page of the minutes.

AYE: Horner, Lafferty, Manning, Nydam, Reilly

NAY: None

Carried 5-0

The new wording in the second phrase of the recap and motion now reads: create a southern roadway to isolate boating from Little League (LL) parking and from regular park parking.

III. STAFF REPORTS–None.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Motion by William Horner, seconded by Rick Manning, for the Committee to follow the order as shown on the agenda and abide by the time limits adopted at the first meeting for speakers coming before the Committee. Any speaker that feels they need additional time

can request the same for a short extension and the Committee can consider that and vote on it.

AYE: Horner, Lafferty, Manning, Nydam

NAY: Reilly

Carried 4-1

A. Skate Park

Charles Nelson reported that at the last meeting, the Committee asked staff to look at Marina and other locations for the skate park. Staff does not have the answer as yet, but it has not been designed out. Staff will continue to look for the best location for the skate park.

Chairman Nydam inquired how it would be funded if included in Marina Park. Mr. Nelson responded the determination would need to be made as to what funds are available. It was not funded as a Referendum line item, but could be included if funds are available, or from other sources.

Francis Reilly recommended placing the skate park near Dunn Airpark. There has been more damage at Space View, so he is asking to direct the children away from downtown, closer to schools and where there are more children. Mr. Nelson stated he will take that under advisement, and staff is looking at that area as one of the possibilities. The problem will be dealt with on a series of levels by attempting to find where the children live and working with the skating representative to do a survey of the children. Chairman Nydam reported many arrive at the skate park by cars. Mr. Nelson agreed that may be so for the park, but in other locations, children might be from another area. Mr. Nelson will bring an update to the next meeting.

William Horner stated he would like to have the Committee consider and discuss, as far as the skate board park is concerned, looking at the revised Parks and Recreation/Honeycutt concept drawing that will be considered later for the feasibility of the skate park at Marina Park. He suggested at least a brief discussion of the skate park being located in the NW corner just beyond the stormwater pond so staff has a feel of how the Committee feels. That location would give a sound and visual separation from the LL fields and a much larger buffer for other park elements. One of the purposes in mind is that these young folks do need a place, they are in their teens and twenties and if something isn't given for them to do, they become at risk.

Pat Lafferty noted as was brought up at a previous meeting, the skate park is not in the Referendum project list. In addition, Mr. Lafferty doesn't see safety wise, how they will cross U.S. 1 on the skateboards. The LL experience with skate park at Sand Point, has been one of constantly losing benches and tables which are dragged over to the skate park. He also doesn't see a skate park at either of the other two LL projects.

Francis Reilly made a motion, seconded by Pat Lafferty, not to consider a skate board park in Marina Park. The motion is listed with outcome after the following discussion.

Mr. Horner noted he doesn't have the 11 years experience at Sand Point, however there are a lot of kids who go to Sand Point Park who do not go to the skate park. Some kids will pick up anything that is not nailed to the ground. He doesn't know that all the damage and vandalism can be laid at the feet of the skate board group.

Chairman Nydam suggested not closing the door to the idea as yet and wanted to take comment.

Susan Canada stated she understands the frustration for the LL because things are not nailed down, but with ball fields fenced and picnic tables bolted down it might be different. In looking at the Sand Point Referendum list, other things came up later on. As for Marina Park, these kids need some place to go. There are a lot of kids that don't know there is a skate board park at Sand Point. To just shut the door on them is not right, particularly with fencing. Locking the gate to Marina Park at night could also alleviate the problems. She also noted that anywhere the park is located, streets will need to be crossed.

Walter Pine commented that the Referendum document being referred to is a pamphlet, but the Referendum is very general and broad. The money can be spent as the Committee chooses. To eliminate an activity because of a few bad actors, is not appropriate. He would rather give the skate boarders a place to go, than to just complain about their actions. It would benefit the City to place a skate park there to save destruction to the veterans' memorials. Chairman Nydam asked for a suggestion of a place. Mr. Pine stated that anywhere is good since the Committee hasn't selected a plan.

Motion by Francis Reilly, seconded by Pat Lafferty, not to consider a skate board park in Marina Park.

AYE: Lafferty, Manning, Reilly

NAY: Horner, Nydam

Carried 3-2

B. County Plan

Mr. Nelson reported the Committee approved moving a plan forward with additional design changes which are being presented tonight. He stated the boat ramp area may have been shorted a few spaces as Mr. Leslie wanted 30-40. It is up to 25 now and it may be possible to pick up another few, but will target 30 spaces in the same general vicinity.

Chairman Nydam asked about funding for boat parking. Mr. Nelson stated the intention would be from the boat registration dollars that come back to the County, not from the Referendum.

Mr. Horner asked if the 10 or 12 vehicular parking spaces on the east of the trailer parking is for people visiting the gazebo on the point and if those spaces are within the Referendum funding. Mr. Nelson responded that they are for visitors to the point and could be used by someone parking a car who could go out with a friend on a boat. In effect it could serve both and Mr. Nelson thinks that could be determined at a later date. The same would be true for the rest room.

Mr. Horner asked if Parks and Recreation has asked the City if 30 is what they want. Mr. Nelson responded not yet.

Mr. Nelson continued reviewing the changes, stating, there was discussion about distance from northernmost gazebo, which is now closer to the parking by about 75' based on discussion by the Committee. It can be relocated if desired.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Horner, Messrs. Nelson and Rice indicated the northern gazebo was 100' south of the fence on the May 19 drawing and is now 180' from fence. Woody Rice noted the 11x17 sheet is not to scale, but rather is a half size scale. In response to Mr. Horner's question as to why the gazebo was pulled further south, Mr. Nelson noted discussion at the last meeting regarding the distance of the gazebo from the parking and to look at making it closer.

Mr. Nelson reported there was a little softening of the parking lot east of the smallest field.

Mr. Horner commented that as requested at the last Committee meeting, picnic benches have been added, separate entrance for boat traffic correcting what might have been a safety problem, the entire footprint has been moved north to accommodate boat traffic/parking. He sees that most of the suggestions made at the May 19 meeting have been fulfilled on the sketch being looking at tonight. He suggested the public express their feelings after the Committee has discussed the item.

Chairman Nydam asked if there is a magic formula for the number of potential ball players vs parking spaces. Mr. Nelson responded that typically design is for 25 spaces per field, and more than that was accomplished at this location. Parking is always a premium for tournaments, etc. There are 201 spaces total with the bulk associated with the loop around ballfields.

Chairman Nydam asked if the bleachers on the largest field are large enough. Messrs. Nelson and Masson responded that more stand space is needed for the fields of the younger players.

Mr. Nelson stated that the planning process is now at the point where the Committee needs to decide how things lay out. Some comments from citizens may be very valid; some things are absolutes and some are choices. The Committee has the ability to do what they think is appropriate.

Susan Canada suggested moving the northern gazebo and fishing jut-out further north. She noted the Marina doesn't want the lights from the ballfields and parking shining on their boats and suggested moving everything 5' to 10' north. She stated the Marina is making a lot of money and she doesn't want to impact the boaters.

Walter Pine stated the survey done of Marina by Kugelmann and Associates shows the current road in the NW at the exact corner. On the drawing today there is a significant distance from the corner and asked if a new road is being put in. Mr. Nelson stated that the survey is being completed; the work today is from an aerial. The intent is not to do a new road.

Mr. Pine pointed out that with the way the parking is dispersed throughout the property, the ADA parking is not sufficiently distributed throughout the park. As to the roads being split out with different entrances, softball has been there for years and no incident is on record with Titusville Police Department. He stated concern for the cost of spending just because of being afraid of something that isn't documented. He suggested pervious surfaces might cost less, and suggested getting "ballpark" costs for that.

Mr. Horner noted the separate entrance for vehicles towing trailers and boats, and the entrance a little to the north for vans and vehicles most of which will have children in them. Mr. Pine agreed. Mr. Horner recalled discussion at the May 19 meeting that boating traffic near the LL would be a safety hazard. Mr. Horner asked Mr. Pine where he thinks the handicapped parking should be located. Mr. Pine responded it should be placed throughout the park. Mr. Horner noted that unless there is some ADA standard, he thinks the A&E is doing his best, but perhaps there is an alternate such as two at the North, two center, etc. Mr. Pine stated there are two issues: (1) distributed evenly as Mr. Horner mentioned, and (2) whatever the limit is for the parking placards the spaces should be so they can reach each baseball stand as well as the park itself. Mr. Horner noted parking is on the east and south. Mr. Pine said to keep in mind what people are trying to access. He would put it to the western most edge of the parking area. As regards to parking in general, Mr. Pine stated there are sections of the park inaccessible to persons with disabilities. Unless there is some evidence as to the safety, the Committee has the responsibility to check it out.

Bea Polk asked why space is being wasted in the NE and NW corners. Mr. Nelson responded that the reason the pavilion was pulled closer was to place it closer to the parking. Moving it north would place it closer to Sand Point Inn. Ms. Polk suggested moving disabled parking to NE corner. Mr. Nelson stated he would agree to add some closer to the NE gazebo. Ms. Polk thinks the rest of the property should be utilized.

Chairman Nydam stated that from the last meeting, he thought there would be more parking added rather than moving the gazebo. Mr. Nelson stated some parking can be added and asked how many additional spaces were desired. He noted the facility requirements have been met and asked if more than what is typical is desired by sliding it some or add more parking. Chairman Nydam asked if the open area would be for landscaping. Mr. Nelson responded there is a 25' landscape buffer so there is room to play with. It was determined that the center to center measurements from the fence to the northern gazebo were 100' on the May 19 plan and 180' on the June 23 plan to be closer to parking, playground, and rest room. Mr. Nelson cautioned about being up against another land use and noted the need to create a good park experience. He suggested the Committee might want to consider horseshoe pits associated with the gazebo, and grass or sand volleyball. Those items are not always shown on all the plans.

At Mr. Horner's request, Mr. Nelson explained the difference between the drawing distributed on June 20 and the June 23 drawing is the expansion of boat parking and added handicap parking by the entrance. Boating now has 25 spaces which Mr. Nelson believes can be expanded to 30.

Chairman Nydam suggested moving the north fishing dock north of the gazebo to separate the playground from the fishing area. Mr. Nelson explained, basically it is a wooden structure over the water which could be for fishing or not.

Mr. Nelson asked for direction for the location of the gazebo. Chairman Nydam thinks it is fine, but would like the jut-out moved further from the playground.

Mr. Nelson asked as to additional parking and parking as it relates to the gazebo, if the Committee wants to increase the number of parking spaces, or move it closer to the pavilion.

Chairman Nydam suggested just adding a couple of handicap spaces at the end. At Mr. Horner's request, it was calculated the distance from northern most point of the parking lot to the gazebo is 240' to mid-gazebo, and the distance from the south gazebo to parking 220'.

In response to Mr. Horner's question about built-in barbecues, Mr. Nelson stated the intent is to have grills on pedestals. Chairman Nydam suggested making the distances from parking to gazebos the same.

In response to Mr. Reilly's inquiry about handicap parking requirements, Mr. Rice stated it is one to 25, 12' wide with crosshatch area which can be between two handicap spaces. If not, it must be 12' plus 5'.

Mr. Nelson reported the City staff prepared a plan which can be considered, but is not intended to be a competition between the County and City plans. Rather, the intent is for the Committee to review the plan to see if there are things to be included in the plan ultimately approved.

Chairman Nydam asked if the City plan would be under new or old business.

C. Walter Pine's Plan

Mr. Horner stated he has difficulty with Mr. Pine's plan because it is not to scale. Chairman Nydam stated he wants to give it full consideration.

Walter Pine stated that since that was brought up, he was required to put his plan under public presentation, and the City's plan is coming in under new business in a completely different manner. He asked to be rescheduled to present his plan.

Mr. Horner stated he would like to see something a bit more definitive for comparison. Mr. Pine noted that Mr. Nelson offered to have Honeycutt draw it up. Mr. Horner noted Mr. Pine had talked about expenses, and stated if there was a guarantee that would be the plan used, but the project could end up with three, six or nine plans drawn.

Mr. Reilly suggested asking for any other old business, then ask for new business, and pick it up. Mr. Nelson stated any plan discussion would be under old business, considering all different options.

D. City Plan

Mr. Horner stated if this is the first time the Committee has seen the City plan, he would not feel comfortable making any decisions of a brand new plan just getting into the hands of the Committee. Mr. Nelson stated the Committee is not under the gun to make a decision tonight, and that Mr. Horner's point is well taken.

Chairman Nydam asked about the time frame for a decision. Mr. Nelson stated it has moved pretty far along, possibly the next meeting or so.

Mark Leslie related the history of the City's plan. After the last meeting, he sat down and cut up pieces of the puzzle. He has concern with the "y"ing off and the Vectorworks issue. City

Council is very interested in facilitating that. He sat with Mr. Crawford to draw a plan roughly, considering the boat ramp, baseball fields and switching ball fields, moving parking north. There are 40 spaces for boaters. It was noted normally the design is not for peak needs, but for average. Mr. Leslie is concerned where boaters will park when there are more boaters than spaces. He stated that with the new Manatee Protection Plan, if we limit ourselves now, we will never get the spaces back. He moved the parking lot to the north which he believes looks better, and yes, does accommodate Vectorworks. He stated it is ultimately a decision between the elected officials. Personally, he doesn't think it is right to put it on the shoulders of a volunteer committee. This design has the ability to accommodate all the needs. It moves the park further north which takes care of the lighting issues. The drawing is very crude which Mr. Rice could dress up.

Mr. Horner observed the new County plan increases parking in SE corner. Mr. Leslie stated the County has 25-30 spaces for boaters, the City has 40. Mr. Leslie suggested grass parking for boats and to go for everything possible. There is ample space for 50 spaces and improvement later would require a permit. Mr. Horner compared the parking in the County and City plans and suggested if the City boat/trailer parking in the south were eliminated in favor of the County boat/trailer parking in the SE, the boat/trailer parking in the north wouldn't be needed. Mr. Leslie stated he would disagree on the numbers, and holds firm on the number of spaces needed for boats. He noted the skate park wasn't in the Referendum, but neither was the boat parking. He stated once the boat/trailer parking is gone, it is gone.

Pat Lafferty inquired if lighting has been an issue on the softball fields. Mr. Leslie stated he has heard some complaints, but it hasn't been a major issue.

Mr. Lafferty asked if the parking at north end would be shared with Vectorworks. Mr. Leslie stated that is not the intent of the plan. Vectorworks' use is a legislative issue. This set up will work either with or without Vectorworks. Mr. Lafferty asked if it turns out it is shared, would there be any legal issues with the parking 10 to 15 years down the road. Chairman Nydam and Mr. Leslie stated that is beyond the Committee's scope. Mr. Leslie stated if it is doable, make it happen.

Mr. Reilly asked if the County's plan is fully funded. Mr. Nelson stated he couldn't commit because it isn't cost out before the master plan is determined. Mr. Reilly noted there is a very good chance it will be over budget before starting. What he likes most about the plan is the perimeter road almost all the way around, which could be complete if the two parking lots were connected. He noted Vectorworks is offering to pay for the entire parking and retention needed. He thought the Committee should take a good look at keeping the parking in that area, and stated pervious surface could be used for boat parking and regular parking on the point. Mr. Leslie noted considering fishing tournaments on the point and spoke of radius for boat parking. Mr. Reilly asked about widening the road for street parking for overflow boat and other parking. Mr. Nelson stated certainly overflow parking could be on-street parking, which is basically wide enough now. Mr. Nelson noted that on the City plan, almost 50% is being used for parking. He sympathizes with boaters as he is one, but from a land use perspective, this did not start out as a boating project. It started out as a LL and park project. If more boating spaces are desired, maybe there is a better way. The Committee needs to tell staff if they want more than 30 boat

parking spaces. While he loves tournament fishing, that is a use of that space for parking a couple times a year. He suggested the Committee keep in mind there are pluses and minuses. Boating can be addressed, but it will take away some passive elements such as picnicking. He asked the Committee to let staff know what elements they would like incorporated in the plan from a park perspective, rather than from an engineering perspective.

Mr. Reilly reminded the Committee that FIND will probably give a grant. Mr. Nelson noted that boating may be more of a space/use issue than funding issue. Mr. Leslie suggested that with Woody's softer touches, the plan would look better. Along the roadway, at the dock west of boat ramp, people hook lines on boats. He also noted most fishing use is on the point.

Mr. Reilly noted Vectorworks will buy a parking lot. FIND will pay for the boating parking. If the parking lots were connected, driving could continue through the park. There will be no additional boat parking in the future. More handicapped parking is needed. Think grass-cement isn't needed everywhere.

Mr. Horner inquired if the City drawing was done on a computer. Mr. Leslie responded, yes, but he wasn't sure how Mr. Crawford put it on the paper. Mr. Horner noted the County has wet retention on the north, the City has it on the south. Mr. Leslie explained that when he cut the piece out, he cut the retention with it. Mr. Leslie confirmed the same is true for the dry retention. Mr. Horner observed the City wants the large ball field on the south. Mr. Leslie stated he wouldn't want the large ball park on north, noting the south is a shorter distance to walk.

Mr. Horner observed the County has no parking on the point. The City has about 25-30 spots which takes up 300'-400' of lagoon frontage. For the Marina parking, the County has 37 spaces, the City has only 29. Mr. Leslie stated that is because he was working with straight lines.

Chairman Nydam noted that until the perk tests are received, it won't be known where the wet and dry retention is needed. Mr. Nelson stated that the concept used is the dry retention is for a conveyance of water to wet retention, which is an alternative to using a lot of concrete pipe. Mr. Rice stated that if it doesn't perk, it will have to be wet rather than dry. However, a lot is dictated by the ground water level. It is mainly a conveyance; perk is an additional benefit. If proposing dry retention, the perk test, may dictate an increase in size some, if another area doesn't perk well. The seasonal high water table is the concern. Geo-tech information will determine size and exact location. Sizing is based on experience, so there will be some tweaking. That is why it is call a conceptual plan.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Horner, Mr. Rice agreed that on the County plan, the depictions of the stormwater is designed to handle only the stormwater requirements of Marina Park, noting the road is an existing road.

Mr. Horner observed that on the City plan it has been alluded to that at least half or a little more of the entire waterfront of this park is used for parking and he is not sure it is the best practice.

Mr. Reilly noted that as far as the parking on the point, if the two parking areas were connected to complete a perimeter, the parking on the point could be eliminated. Staff pointed out the

problem that would create where some spaces would be facing the wrong direction making boat parking impossible and the concerns over flow of traffic. Mr. Nelson suggested the Committee let staff know how many spaces they desire. As to the through road, Mr. Nelson stated that typically would be used only for special events so it wouldn't be open all the time.

Mr. Reilly gave Sand Point Park as an example of budget shortfall and noted he expects this project will also be over budget, therefore it makes sense to him to go with the City plan and use money from Vectorworks and FIND.

Mr. Horner stated he thinks the Committee is going to get mired down with all kinds of concepts and proposals, and suggested after discussion of an idea, voting so staff and the A&E know what to do. Chairman Nydam stated he thinks it is too soon to narrow it down. Mr. Horner stated staff isn't getting clear enough direction from the Committee to know what to do. Chairman Nydam stated he thinks it is pretty good. Mr. Horner disagreed.

Mr. Reilly made a motion to make a peripheral road around the entire project. Chairman Nydam noted the need to hear from the public. Mr. Reilly withdrew his motion.

Mr. Horner, asked what the Committee is supposed to do with the City plan. Chairman Nydam responded to discuss it and called for public comment on the City plan.

Walter Pine said a question was asked about legal aspect to changes. The dedication is from 1963 and the laws that were in effect at that time are part of that contract. This is State property, deeded to the State with a dedication to the City for maintenance and use. Permission would have to be requested from the State for use by Vectorworks or any other commercial operation. Then the dedication would be changed to the current law. Under the current laws, anyone with vested interest in the property could immediately apply to the State for the land to be put on the surplus list and then purchase the property. He stated this could be confirmed with Ed Wood, Director of State Lands and Title. He suggested getting an agreement with Vectorworks to relinquish all vested rights in that property. Mr. Pine stated if that isn't done, he represents a consortium of fishermen who wish to buy commercial vested rights in the other end of the park at the ramp and parking area and will match Mr. Gray's or Vectorworks price. He stated, either protect it or "we're" going to split it up, one of the two.

Mr. Pine stated as far as the City's plan, he thinks the peripheral road is a good idea to accommodate a variety of park patrons as well as the elderly. He noted nobody says one only has to do the minimum of what is required, but Committee has the right to do more than what is required. He thinks the City's plan has unspoken interests of Vectorworks which is a not a good precedence to set.

Thelma Roper stated she saw the City's plan at the City Council meeting. She stated the City is taking it to the County Commission and asked why time was being wasted discussing the plan here. She stated there are a lot of other ideas and she is really sick of the whole thing because of the fighting for over two years on this Vectorworks parking. She would like to see something somewhere from someone other than the pamphlet that says Marina Park is for the LL. To give all consideration to one group is wrong. All the citizens of North Brevard are paying for this and

all the citizens should have the greatest benefit of use for this. As far as she is concerned, the Committee should throw away the City's plan as it is already on the agenda for the County Commission. If Mr. Gray is allowed use, there is a vested interest. She stated that the City wants to give away this whole park.

Bea Polk stated she agrees with Thelma. The City went over Committee's head to go to the County Commission. She asked if all who own property with Mr. Gray would sign an oath they would not take vested rights for the property. She stated they need this property, not just for parking, but to sell. Sometime she wonders if the Committee is interested in everyone's interest. She stated she would also like some of the property and stated Disney World is dying for that property. She stated concern over the officials in this City trying to give away the last riverfront the public has, and it is taking a big chance on what will happen in going to the State. She noted if the public fights enough, it really comes out on top.

Susan Canada pointed out anyone here to represent the City of Titusville, should be here for the interest of the entire community. She noted with the ballpark so close, the lights would be closer to the boats. If the road is continuous, children would be crossing the road to get to the playground. As to vested interest, there are more than share holders. Should Vectorworks go under, lenders have the right to all contracts past, present and future. Grass parking produces a lot of ruts and mud. She noted things were dumped on the property in 1970 and wondered what would be found when digging begins. As to vested rights, even if Mr. Gray says no vested rights, PMI lending has the right to take the property that is \$150,000 behind in taxes.

Jeff Gray stated PMI is not his lender. The lender has no vested rights. He is not \$150,000 behind in taxes. All he is asking is for the ability of his employees to park during the day. He will sign whatever to say he wants it for parking during the day for as long as the business lasts. He agreed with Mr. Pine as he looked up traffic records, and there have been no accidents in the park. With the deed dedication, there is no fear the public will lose any land. If it is done without permission from the State, you get in trouble. He stated he likes the City plan as place for employees to park. It is a great plan and resolves issues some of the other plans don't. If Vectorworks blew away, there would still be a good park. He noted he keeps hearing the City wants to give it away. He asked if the Municipal Marina is losing money due to lights. Mark Leslie stated there isn't much of an issue with nighttime launching, and this design eliminates people parking facing the marina. Mr. Leslie spoke of the City plan, and noted combinations of City and County plans might be good. He stated, if you build a nice ramp, they will come. If you build a nice ramp you'll fill 40 spaces each weekend. He noted it is not a great ramp as it is now.

Chairman Nydam inquired if Mr. Gray is offering to pay for that parking in the north area and for stormwater retention. Mr. Gray stated yes. Chairman Nydam asked who would pay for it, or would the area be dropped if Mr. Gray agrees to pay for this and the funding falls through. Mr. Nelson stated that based on that plan, parking for the Little League would be inadequate. Mr. Gray stated that if the funding is a concern, he would escrow the money. Chairman Nydam asked if the zoning would need to be changed if there is a business use with shared parking. Mr. Leslie stated he asked that question and was told no. Mr. Rice stated that the worst case would be going to the City for a variance, as it is recreation now. Chairman Nydam, asked who would

pay for the parking lot if the State says no shared use. Mr. Nelson stated the project would not go to bid until all those items are locked down.

Mr. Gray stated the retention area on north end of property perks the best.

Pat Lafferty asked why the City decided to go directly to the County Commission and not this committee first. Mr. Leslie stated City Council was in tune with the Committee meeting, and felt they didn't have input on who was put on the Committee, and wanted to make a strong statement that it wasn't handled correctly. Mr. Leslie had intended to bring the plan to the Committee.

Mr. Horner asked if he understands the City Council is upset because they did not have a hand in the makeup of this Committee. Mr. Leslie stated he is not sure, and it's not fair for him to make that statement. Mr. Horner stated he volunteered, and he believes all the others did as well. The call went out from Parks and Recreation for committee volunteers. Mr. Horner stated he also has heard statements made that this is a stacked committee. There are multiple representatives from an organization, but he gets peeved because he and others volunteered. Mr. Leslie stated to be honest, he's not sure other than they want to proceed.

Mr. Reilly pointed out the City went both ways. Mr. Reilly volunteered, but was on a standby list because Committee was full. He stated he has to take issue that the plan has been presented to this Committee. This is the first time Mr. Reilly has heard about it as a Committee member.

Chairman Nydam called for public input.

Joan Wheeler this park started out as LL fields and a park. LL doesn't use it all year. The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) voted to design it as a park, then consider other issues. She wants what is stated to be verified. She wonders why the City won't give the public a Referendum on what the City wants. There is the claim this plan meets all the needs of the park and Vectorworks. She wonders if when City staff made this, did they have a disc from Honeycutt to make this plan. Mr. Nelson explained the City had requested a copy of the plan. Honeycutt transmitted it by email as a CAD file and as a result they were able to take that and make changes. Mr. Nelson didn't know it would be used for that purpose. The CAD file will be provided to anyone who wants it. Mrs. Wheeler continued by saying Vectorworks paying gives special rights from morning to 3:30 in the afternoon. The FIND grant is a maybe. The City has ended up paying the bill in the past. She asked if the dry retention is like the one at Sand Point Park. She stated the LL should not be involved or be stating it is a win-win situation. They don't have any business sticking their nose in it and endorsing it unless they have a special deal with Vectorworks.

Bea Polk stated the Committee has no right to even bother with the City plan. The City didn't ask the Committee. They asked the BOCC and in so doing, they overrode all the Committees. She suggested going to the County Commissioners and maybe thereby getting something straight.

Mr. Horner stated he is concerned about these meetings, and is getting more concerned. He asked how many times the members of the public are going to address this. He thought the

Committee received public discussion, but there seems to be public discussion on just about everything, and as a result, the meetings do get rather lengthy. He thinks the Committee needs to stick to the agenda and the time lines determined at the very first meeting as he suggested at the beginning of this meeting. Chairman Nydam stated he thinks it's important to get various aspects.

Jeff Gray stated he completely agrees with Bill Horner on time. He stated Vectorworks only wants the right to park in the parking lot. He stated he is hearing an absolutely remarkable change in what people are saying. Three of the same people who said you have to do exactly what the Referendum says are now fighting against the LL. He stated don't mess with the plan for the LL.

Mr. Horner stated in looking at the City plan there are 88 spaces in the parking on the north. He recalls that the requirement Mr. Gray had at one time was over 200. Mr. Gray stated he asked for 150-200 spaces, but since then looked for space along the road and within the facility. He thinks that with cooperation from the City it will squeak by. Mr. Gray stated his understanding of the City's plan, it is for the park, and if 88 is what is left, he'll do what he needs to do for the balance.

Walter Pine stated he is one of those who said he believes the Committee is very biased and the County is very biased. He feels there is no consideration being given to the public benefit. His problem with Mr. Gray having the right to park there is vested rights. He stated he asked for copies of meeting tapes and the quality was terrible. He further stated the ADA coordinator can get the tapes copied, but no one asked. He has many problems with how this has been handled. His email address is pine_w@bellsouth.net and he wants a copy of the email. As to legal requirements, it's staff's job to give the Committee the legal requirements.

Mr. Horner noted conflicting requirements with ADA.

Thelma Roper stated Mr. Gray seems to think we've changed our mind and the Referendum should be built the way it was. She stated what she stated was not LL, but her comments were this is a park, let's not go into business in a park. What she stated tonight is that she thinks the park can be better designed for the public as a whole, rather than the LL having total control of the park. The LL doesn't even use it for the greater part of the year. She stated the reason speakers are asked to use a microphone here is because of her, and she requested that when people speak, do use them.

Susan Canada stated she is not quite as ignorant as Jeff Gray thinks she is. One can pull up loans on the computer and see what was listed. She reported Jeff Rainey stated the reason Vectorworks was behind was because of dispute of taxes. She also stated Jeff Rainey said Vectorworks doesn't need parking, but for possible retail sales. She noted Vectorworks brought in another business, Vectorworks Marine, which needs the parking and is a different corporation. The City's plan is their's to take to the County, not this group's. No matter what the Committee says, they are going to the County. As to vested rights, for the 60,000 sq. ft. building to be built, they need parking and retention. It goes with the building because they paid for it and it couldn't

go in without parking. On the County plan, if the whole section were pushed up there would be parking for 10 more boats for a total of 40.

At this point Chairman Nydam closed public input as all who completed cards had spoken.

Mr. Reilly noted the Committee is only a little part of a big wheel in designing a park. He stated the City has given the Committee a plan to look at, but he is not ready to say tonight that he accepts the plan. What he really likes is the perimeter road, which could be barricaded off for events.

A motion was made by Francis Reilly, seconded William Horner for discussion purposes for a perimeter road be put in the plan and street parking on the access road for any overflow parking.

Chairman Nydam stated concern about boat traffic going all the way through which will create a problem with crossing. Mr. Reilly stated it could be barricaded when ball games are in progress. Discussion ensued over a perimeter road. Mr. Horner cautioned the Committee strongly not to adopt pieces of a plan, and to be extremely cautious about one little piece, while the plan is left up in the air.

Mr. Reilly withdrew his motion.

Mr. Leslie suggested looking at the City plan between now and next meeting. It is to go to the BOCC on July 22. That would give the Committee some time to look at the different plans, or send Mr. Rice with some direction on the County plan. Mr. Horner pointed out confusion about where to start. Mr. Leslie suggested thinking outside the box. It could be something totally different.

Mr. Reilly suggested an on-site meeting to walk the park. Mr. Horner disagreed with the need for that.

Chairman Paul asked if would be possible to do a survey between now and the next meeting. Mr. Nelson pointed out there aren't any accidents when there isn't a road. When a paved surface is created as is required in new development, it changes the use. Picnic elements are not there now, so of course there are no picnickers. The BOCC directed the Committee to design the park and as it is beneficial, plan other uses. The City has the concept of the use. If the Committee thinks that is okay, then staff needs to come up with something that Mr. Reilly was talking about. The reality is to agree with the concepts, or maybe the Committee's work is over. The Committee is at the philosophical point now. Chairman Nydam asked if is it possible to take the City's plan and polish it up for the next meeting. Mr. Nelson asked if he was asking for the parking to be placed on the north end. Mr. Nelson suggested maybe the stopping point is for the Committee to think about it before he changes the plan.

Chairman Nydam passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Lafferty.

Motion by Paul Nydam to adopt the County plan with the following modifications: In the NE corner move the jut-out north of the gazebo, shift the entire plan north as close to the buffer zone as possible, that would allow the equal number of boat parking in the City's plan or close to it (40) in the SE corner.

Mr. Reilly noted there was no second, and suggested cooling it off, setting the next meeting date and calling it a night. **Mr. Nydam withdrew his motion.**

Ken Carlson, as NBCPR liaison, asked if the Committee didn't want to do something before City goes to the County. It was decided July 14 will be the next meeting. Mr. Nelson inquired if anything is to be provided before the meeting. Mr. Horner asked if staff will have a drawing with more trailer parking. Mr. Nelson stated he could put in an additional five to get to thirty spaces.

Motion by William Horner, seconded by Rick Manning, to see the additional five boat trailer spaces on the plan.

AYE: Horner, Nydam, Lafferty, Manning

NAY: Reilly

Carried 4-1

V. New Business--None

VI. Public Input--Throughout the meeting.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at about 10 p.m. at the motion by Francis Reilly, second by Pat Lafferty, carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted

Paul Nydam, Chairman

jbi