

MINUTES
CARBONDALE PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
February 12,
2020

Hollis Sutherland called the Carbondale Parks & Recreation Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. on February 12, 2020, in the Town Hall meeting room.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present for roll call:

Members:	Hollis Sutherland, Chair Becky Moller, Member John Williams, Member Ashley Hejtmanek, Member Kathleen Wanatowicz, Member
Absent:	Camy Britt, Alternate Rose Rosello, Vice Chair Tracy Wilson, Member Genevieve Villamizar, Member
Town Staff Present:	Eric Brendlinger, Parks & Recreation Director Jessi Rochel, Recreation Center & Recreation Programs Manager Luis Yllanes, Board of Trustees Representatives Kae McDonald, Boards & Commission Clerk

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion Passed: John *moved* to approve the minutes from the January 8, 2020 meeting with noted corrections. Ashley *seconded* the motion, and it was *unanimously approved*.

ITEMS FROM CITIZENS PRESENT NOT ON THE AGENDA

John Hoffman attended the meeting to present the topic of expanding the RFTA circulator bus service during off-peak hours. The expanded route would be similar to that published in the 2010 RFTA study of the Carbondale Circulator route, which would take between 30 and 35 minutes to complete, and would occur between the hours of 9 AM and 4 PM or 10 AM and 3 PM. Kathleen noted that there is currently a request for proposal published by RFTA for an upcoming Bus Ridership Survey, and that it would be helpful for everyone to watch for the survey and complete it so there is a sufficient sample size.

SENIOR DAY PROPOSAL: CAFCI. SENIOR MATTERS. PARKS & RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Niki Delson, the Co-Chair of the Colorado Age Friendly Community Initiative (CAFCI) presented a proposal for a Senior Day to be sponsored by CAFCI, Senior Matters, and the Parks & Recreation Department. CAFCI is an ad hoc caucus of Seniors with the focus on being visible, vocal, and contributing in all areas both civic and social in the community. CAFCI is run by volunteers and is neither a not-for-profit or government organization. Carbondale is the 13th community in the State of Colorado to be accepted into AARP's network of Age-Friendly Communities which supports healthy aging by aspiring to improve the eight domains of livability:

- Outdoor Spaces and Buildings
- Transportation
- Housing
- Social Participation
- Respect and Social Inclusion
- Civic Participation and Employment
- Communication and Information
- Community Support and Health Services

By fulfilling AARP's criteria for selection, Carbondale has also, by extension, been included in the World Health Organization's global network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities. CAFCI has a website (www.agefriendlycarbondale.org) that details the initiative.

In November CAFCI hosted an Age-Friendly Community Celebration that was well-attended and maxed out the available vendor space. Interest cards promoting the involvement of older people were provided at this event, so that future activities planning was not a footnote, but at the forefront. Out of the cards received back, the three areas of concern are housing, transportation, and social connectivity. Following up on this feedback, Niki met with Hollis and Eric to discuss the celebration and involvement of the older demographic for a quarterly "Senior Day." CAFCI envisions different venues providing activities for the senior population to involve themselves and could include such locations as the Community Center, Carbondale Arts, or the Library. CAFCI is looking for sponsors in order to petition the Garfield County Board of County Commissioners for funding to support this activity. Senior Matters has agreed to be a sponsor and fulfills the Not-for-Profit category. CAFCI is asking the Parks & Recreation Commission if they would agree to be a sponsor as well, and thereby fulfilling the governmental organization category. As a sponsor, the Parks & Recreation Commission would need to provide a letter of support to submit to the Garfield County BOCC. Additional support from the Town/Parks & Recreation Department may include transportation, publicity, and classes (free-of-charge). Eric added that the transportation request would be the most difficult piece for the Town because they would have to account for the vans, staff time, and anyone who rides in the van must have signed a waiver to do so.

Marty Silverstein, Town Trustee and Co-Chair of Senior Matters, provided background information on Senior Matters and how this organization would support CAFCI's proposal for a Senior Day. Senior Matters is a non-profit organization that serves seniors in Carbondale and the Roaring Fork Valley. Located at the Third Street Center, they are funded in part by grants, donations, and fundraisers. One of the concerns that Senior Matters works to resolve is social isolation and food insecurity, and this topic intersects well with CAFCI's proposal for a Senior Day because it would (hopefully) get those in need of social interaction out of their houses. The Senior Day could also function as a way to distribute pertinent information about other programs that could benefit local seniors. Marty added that if CAFCI, Senior Matters, and the Parks & Recreation Commission work together, it would provide a united front when approaching the Garfield County BOCC for funding.

After a brief discussion, the Commissioners are willing to allow Niki to include the Parks & Recreation Department involvement in the letter she will submit to Judy Martin (Manager of Senior Programs, Garfield County) describing the proposal. Niki was encouraged to return to the Parks & Recreation Commission for further updates and if there is a specific proposal for a Senior Day that will involve the Parks & Recreation Department and/or funding.

Questions/Comments:

Becky: There was a recent segment on NPR about youth teaching seniors technology—this might be a possible activity.

Ron Kokish (Audience Member): Both CAFCI and Senior Matters represent grassroots organizing to get something done. WE equals ME equals boots on the ground.

Niki: It is interesting that as I talk to a lot of the seniors in Carbondale that go to the Recreation Center for exercise classes and other programming, they mention that they go not only for the exercise but for socializing, as well. It is really unfortunate that there isn't a space that they could hang out in after the exercise classes.

Marty: The Senior Center at Third Street is more than many communities have.

AQUATICS FACILITY MASTER PLAN NEXT STEPS

Eric provided an update on the Aquatics Facility Master Plan. He noted that the minutes from the first Working Group meeting are included in the packet; the next meeting is scheduled for the first week of March. The primary public outreach for the master plan will occur during April's First Friday "Spring into Wellness." Other items discussed during the Working Group meeting included a high-level mapping and site review SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) - analysis, possible funding paths, and the timeline for project completion (anticipated in November 2020).

Questions/Comments:

John: My understanding is that the two main locations being considered are the current location and behind the recreation center. If it is behind the recreation center, will the entrances tie-in together or be separate?

Eric: A shared entrance would make the most sense, but would require a re-design of the existing recreation center.

Becky: The RFP didn't provide for specific locational analysis--I thought that would be an additional cost.

Eric: This is a high-level analysis right now. If we need to have a more detailed locational analysis, it would require a change in the scope.

INTEGRATED WEED MANAGEMENT PLAN 2020

Eric directed the Commission's attention to the memo for the 2020 Town of Carbondale Integrated Weed Management Plan. He highlighted the Discussion portion of the memo and attached spreadsheets that detail the weed management techniques for each park. The purchase of a steam machine for weed eradication is in process now, and should be ready for use this spring. There are three locations that have problem areas including Gateway RV Park, the baseball field infields, and North Face Bike Park. Chemical weed treatment is not recommended for Gateway or the baseball infields, but is being recommended for the two-acre irrigated dirt area at North Face Bike Park. The plan for Gateway is to use Avenger, a natural burn down herbicide, and/or weed burning techniques, and test the effectiveness of the steam machine weed control methods prior to opening to the public on May 1st. Last year bind weed was manually removed to a depth of 6 inches at the baseball field in-field; the area will be monitored to see if this technique was effective. Chemical weed control is being proposed for the North Face Bike Park because there is a weed from the Colorado Noxious Weed A-list (*Tansy Ragwort*) and a B-list weed (*Hoary Cress*) that have not responded favorably to the existing techniques for weed mitigation and are established in specific areas adjacent to the riding surfaces in the bike park. Per the protocol established in the Integrated Weed Management Plan, the Parks & Recreation Department staff is seeking approval from the Parks & Recreation Commission for the use of a chemical herbicide at the North Face Bike Park. This recommendation would be presented to the Environmental Board for additional review and to the BOT for the final decision. As part of the protocol, a log documenting weed management efforts has been started and is included as part of the packet.

Questions/Comments:

Becky: Will you be using Avenger and testing the effectiveness of the steam machine at the same time?

Eric: We have used Avenger quite a bit, but you have to re-apply. We are going to try the steam machine first, the follow-up with the Avenger.

John: Would the steam machine work at the bike park? Are you going to try that first?

Eric: Because the two weeds mentioned above are on the Colorado Noxious Weed list, we are mandated to eradicate them, and that is why we are going to the chemical herbicide.

Motion Passed: Kathleen *moved* to approve the 2020 Town of Carbondale Integrated Weed Management Plan as presented. John *seconded* the motion, and it was *unanimously approved*.

GARFIELD COUNTY FEDERAL MINERAL LEASE DISTRICT SPRING 2020 MINI-GRANT PROPOSAL

Eric directed the Commission's attention to the memo for the Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District (GCFMLD) Spring 2020 mini-grant application for Gianinetti Park Playground Improvements and Renovation and Fall 2020 mini-grant application Colorado Meadows Playground Element Replacement. Because the total project costs are less than \$25,000, a match from the TOC is not required. If the grant is awarded, the project proposals would be brought back in front of the Commission for approval.

At Gianinetti Park, the project would replace a dilapidated and irreparable playground element—a bent metal arch climber—with a spinning element that is ADA compatible. The project also proposes to renovate and repair the existing ADA playground elements and shade structure. The main playground structure and swing set are both in great shape structurally, so a replacement of the sun damaged plastic slide elements, a new color scheme paint job, and an addition of a partner swing will complete the playground enhancements.

The project at the Colorado Meadows Playground proposes to improve and replace the metal slide, and the antiquated swing set. Replacement will be with free-standing elements that will include a free-standing three direction slide and a two-to-three bay swing set that offers infant, youth, and a disc or platter swing experience. The platter swing is at the height of an ADA transfer station so it would be compatible for this use.

Questions/Comments:

Kathleen: I would hate to see the climber be removed—it provides an element of risk taking for the kids. I don't think we need the same spinning element as that in Sopris Park.

Becky: There is a big boulder for kids to climb on that provides quite a bit of height.

Ashley: There are different kinds of balance features that could be challenging. I like the idea of this park being a little more inclusive. It already has a good start on the ADA elements, and I would like to see the replacement features satisfy those requirements.

Kathleen: Something to consider would be to include some Senior fitness elements, as well.

MEM PROJECT: NATURE PARK SPONSOR AGREEMENT, WORK PLAN AND DRAFT SURVEY

Eric began the discussion by detailing the evolution of this project. The then-outgoing Bike, Pedestrian, and Trails Commission Chair asked if there could be a budget item for trail maintenance at the Nature Park. When that idea was brought to the attention of the Town Manager during the budget meetings, and because that area wasn't part of an existing master plan, he wanted additional public outreach and feedback prior to budgeting for and implementing what could be a fairly large change. At the same time Genevieve was working on her Master's in Environmental Management project and approached Eric to be a sponsor of her schoolwork, and it started to mesh with our needs for a public outreach process. It took some time to get the language correct in describing what it was—finally settling on a research project. The public outreach piece was part of the requirements for her project. Once the public outreach piece was part of the project, that was when my involvement as the Parks & Recreation Director became necessary. For Eric's part, the motivation to have the project completed is what it could provide (600 hours of a graduate student's time) at no cost to the P & R budget and how it adds value to his job with the public outreach, a more definitive idea of how the space is used, and a history of the park--line up the data so that the P & R Department can eventually move forward on the implementation of needed park improvements/stewardship. There were bumps in the road given the original larger scope of the project, but it has been reduced to a more functional size. There are now five objectives and twelve deliverables that can provide valuable information for moving forward on this piece of property that we are mandated to take care of. I want the Commission to really think about that. This project has been distilled into a more useable essence—some of it has been controversial—but we will now get some public opinion on how the park is used and a solid history of when, and how the park was acquired, and why it received the designation it did. After the last meeting, the sponsor agreement, work plan, and draft survey was submitted to the Parks & Recreation Commissioners for review. A lot of the requested changes were adopted, and Eric and Hollis met with John because he had some concerns about the document and how/why some of the requested changes were or were not integrated into the document. Eric and Hollis also asked if Becky wanted to meet prior to the meeting, but she preferred to talk about it in the meeting. We also got some feedback from members who were part of the original stakeholders group—even though the formation of that was rather disorganized, there was some feedback from that group, as well. Because that group never formed and functioned the way it was intended, the language to describe that group has changed to "Interested Citizens Data Collection." The objective tonight is to reach a decision on this research project.

Questions/Comments:

John: If the "Stakeholders" has been changed to "Interested Citizens," where is that in the Work Plan? The first line item that mentions stakeholders didn't really happen.

Eric: She tried to organize it, but it didn't really come together as planned.

John: But the meeting listed on the 19th was called an "informational" meeting, not a stakeholder meeting.

Hollis: Genevieve had also reached out to people via e-mail to attend, and she referred to it as a stakeholder meeting in the email. I know there are some people that are stuck on what happened in December, but the timeline is presented as is, so Genevieve can report to her school on how things happened. What this whole project boils down to is the five objectives (listed in the Sponsor letter) and the eleven deliverables (April bulletpoint) listed on the work plan.

Becky: But it still isn't clear.

Kathleen: Can I suggest that we take public comment, and then go around one by one and comment, otherwise we will be here all night.

Alan Harvey (Member of Public): I live on Wheel Circle loop in Carbondale. I have owned three dogs over the last twenty years and have enjoyed the Delaney Nature Park. I do share the concerns over the disorganization of the stakeholder list, but I also think there is an opportunity to learn something from this project. As a dog park user, I've heard calls for shade, requests for part of park to be not for dogs and enjoy it for its nature—because that was one of the larger uses emphasized in the first survey in 2004/2005. People don't want to see a lot of development. My experience as both an elected official and as a user, there is an opportunity to look at things and ask the community about them. If there are big changes contemplated, there does need to be a rigorous public engagement and process.

Melissa Sumera (Member of Public): I live on Maroon Drive in Carbondale. As someone who did agree to be part of the stakeholder group, the fact that I am sitting in this room before I learned that there is not a stakeholder component—it's been changed to a concerned citizens list, which changes the role of the public—just feels very inappropriate. I don't know how much of this is Genevieve as a Masters student, or how much of this is the Town's role in this process. I think that its inaccurate to use the term stakeholder in the documents that go forward. It's not like it was utilized, and now it's being changed to something else. I could very strongly argue that to say that there was ever a stakeholder meeting is inaccurate, and to say that the stakeholders formulated the draft survey questions is also inaccurate. I could go through the numerous emails to track the timeline, but I just can't be bothered—but there is so much at stake. I think that to provide the public perception via a survey that there is a larger view going towards the park—whether there are eventual changes or not. When information is being gathered, people assume it has a purpose--and in a way it does have a purpose--because it's going to get assimilated into some kind of report by Genevieve. Based on how this previous process has been handled, it makes me very nervous. I question Genevieve's ability to remain neutral—her personal interests have shown through in the months leading into this. If ongoing trails management is the purpose of the project, there is nothing related to trails in any of the survey versions, and I think that that is a missed opportunity. For the record, I would prefer the survey not move forward. If you compare her project to that of the pool project, where there is a clear timeline and clear intent for improvement or action to be taken, for this to sit on the shelf for five or ten years before anything is done—there is a danger to that.

Marty Silverstein (Member of Public): Eric expressed concern that the park is loved to death, which I think is a legitimate concern in how you manage that. However, there really has not been much public involvement considering the role of the park. A Masters project can be a great tool, but there has not been the same degree of visibility and openness compared to the Aquatics Facility Master Plan. Whatever terms are used, they must be defined. If it's a research project, that is fine, but the survey should say that it is a research project, and not give any bias that the Town or the Parks & Recreation Department is going to use this for the next Master Plan or how they are going to manage the park. It is a trade-off—we are getting valuable information from her time and energy, but we have to be crystal clear on where this is going. Based on what I have observed, I don't hear that clarity in the statements. It must be clear cut.

Hollis: How do we clarify this—Eric and I have worked on this at least four times? This has been a very messy process.

Eric: In 2009 it was designated as an off-leash dog park.

Hollis: Eric really thought about what does he need to know to do his job. That is really what he is asking for is permission to work with Genevieve, so he's got the information compiled and then he can figure out how to take care of the trails and how to get rid of the weeds.

Kathleen: I appreciate everyone's comments. I don't, however, think that is fair to compare Genevieve's project with that of the Aquatics Facility Master Plan—which is a funded project and is being undertaken by a professional consulting group. I don't think the Nature Park is threatened by this process, and I do think the park could use some work. This whole project is about someone who lives in the community, is going to school and trying to

learn how to do a project and collect data. Maybe we should be okay with what is being presented. The survey is not going to be statistically significant, and the questions on the survey don't threaten the current uses at the Nature Park. I have 100% confidence in Eric, and we will get to vote on the work product and what happens to it.

John: I am not so positive about the project, there have been lots of changes to this project--it has evolved so much. The major use of the park is as an off-leash dog park, and there was a lot of pushback on her ideas for a "wild child" or youth component to the park. If the primary objective of this project is weed management, then Genevieve should be able to complete her project by studying the flora and fauna, and compiling the history of the park, and eliminate public outreach. The uses are fairly evident—a survey is not needed until there is something that needs to be accomplished. Some of the questions on the survey are redundant, and I don't think some of them are needed. In my opinion, some of the objectives are redundant, and some of the deliverables are already done--it just seems like this was haphazardly put together.

Luis: I agree with a lot of what John has said, and I disagree a little with Kathleen—I know we all appreciate Genevieve's time, but I think we can all agree that this got started off on completely the wrong foot. The public input/the survey portion, I agree with Melissa. I think it is a disservice to put it out at this point, especially knowing that we will be reaching out to the public about the pool. She could probably do the first four objectives, and maybe not include anything that has to do with reaching out to what's going to be an incomplete assessment of the park. It is unfortunate that it has become so contentious and wasted so much time for this Commission.

Becky: My concern is over the stakeholder group, which has now been changed in terminology, but we are leaving it in December as a stakeholder meeting. I have an issue with that, because I don't think that several of the items listed as complete in December actually happened. I am unwilling to approve this document because it is untrue and incomplete. The other issue I have is that Melissa put a lot of time and energy into this. She offered to help draft the survey questions, but Genevieve did not follow through. I don't feel like the stakeholder process rose to the level of Masters' work, and I don't see how we can say that this is a Masters-level project with the survey questions. I think she can go forth and do the weed management plan and all of the other deliverables in here, but I do not want the survey to go out, or to be very clear that this is only being done as a Masters Project Survey Questionnaire. We have to be very clear with the public process as far as what we want, otherwise we end up with people who are very upset and very unhappy. She has had two months to deal with, and if you aren't committed to your Masters project, and it has to be everybody else doing it, I don't think we should reward her and let this move forward. I also don't think that the questions on the survey are going to provide the information that Eric has said he needs on the park.

Ashley: Genevieve could add the school's logo to the survey, which would help clarify that it is a school project.

Eric: I go back to my original statement about why we looked to partner with her on the MEM project. I do need some public outreach on the upkeep and maintenance of the park.

Becky: We have a Friends of the Dog Park, and we will put together survey questions that will gather that information. But I don't think that this project does that.

Kathleen made a motion to direct Eric to work with Genevieve on this project, as well as to add the school logo to the documents, and to approve the sponsor letter, work plan, and survey.

Ashley: I know it's just semantics, but I would like to propose changing the survey to a questionnaire.

Kathleen: I would also like to see in the December and January work plan line items some notes inserted that there was strong discussion with the Parks & Recreation Commission that the Stakeholder list was not completed, or was not robust.

Becky: If we are really going to go forward with the survey, I think that under Question #1, the "If No, Why Not" should be removed. I am okay if it is changed to a questionnaire and the school logo is added. My concern comes back to the fact that Eric says he needs this information, so once again we are sending mixed messages to the public.

Kathleen: I am pretty sure that whatever comes out of this will be coming back to the Commission for us to deliberate on.

Motion Passed: Kathleen *moved* to approve the three documents comprising Genevieve Villamizar's Master in Environmental Project including the Sponsor Letter of Support, the Work Plan Outline, and 6 Question Survey with five caveats:

1. Change the survey to a questionnaire;
2. Add the Western Colorado University logo to the questionnaire;
3. Add a point of contact to the questionnaire;
4. Add specific notes under the December and January Work Plan outline that the Stakeholder outreach was incomplete.
5. Eric Brendlinger (Parks & Recreation Department Director) will supervise Genevieve on behalf of the Parks & Recreation Commission

Ashley added two additional caveats:

1. The Work Plan Outline should note in the December 2019 Status Update that attempts were made to develop a Stakeholders Committee, but the outreach was incomplete;
2. Under third bullet change wording to: With input from interested citizens, a draft of survey questions was completed.

Ashley *seconded* the motion, and it was passed with Hollis, Kathleen, and Ashley voting in favor and John and Becky dissenting.

APPOINTMENT RECOMMENDATION FOR KATHLEEN WANATOWICZ FROM ALTERNATE TO FULL MEMBER REPLACING TRACY WILSON ON PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

Because of current time restraints, Tracy Wilson has asked to be considered for an Alternate Member position. Kathleen Wanatowicz would take her place as a full member on the Commission.

Motion Passed: Becky *moved* to recommend approval of Tracy Wilson as an Alternate Member and of Kathleen Wanatowicz as a Member of the Parks & Recreation Commission to the Carbondale Board of Trustees. John *seconded* the motion, and it was *unanimously approved*.

REPORT & UPDATES: STAFF AND COMMISSION MEMBERS

Eric Brendlinger, Parks & Recreation Director:

30/60/90 Staff Work Plan and Outstanding Project Status Report (it is the last page of the packet):

- Red Hill signage is in production;
- RVR Triangle Park playground equipment demo has started and new equipment ordered;
- Doggie Pots stations at installed at Thompson House and Centennial Park;
- RVR Park Weed Management: can/will they adopt the Town weed plan;
- Nuche Park parking and signage will be funded in 2020;
- Partition options for the women's restroom at Gianinetti Park are being reviewed;
- Sopris Park Playground equipment painting is dependent on warmer weather;
- FMLD Gianinetti Park playground renovation grant due February 28th;
- FMLD Colorado Meadows Park playground renovation grant due in August;
- Phase 2 Electrical upgrades at the Gateway RV Park are in progress with completion anticipated prior to May 2020 opening;
- Electrical upgrades at the Gus Darien Arena are in progress;
- The Aquatic Facility Master Plan is underway.

Kathleen Wanatowicz, Parks & Recreation Commission Alternate:

- Attended the White River National Forest open house for the anticipated new construction and was disappointed and underwhelmed. Although nothing can be done right now, they are keeping the parking lot from future development that could be used for housing.
- Our firm is representing a developer who is in the planning stages of a new development along Highway 133. She wanted to see if the Commission would like them to come to the next meeting to give an update because it does have a trail included.

Becky Moller, Parks & Recreation Commission Member:

- Pointed out that all of the emails containing comments on the questionnaire are part of the open records, and should have been included as part of this meeting's packet (Hollis directed the Boards & Commissions clerk to add these items as an addendum to this meeting's minutes). She also asked that an item be added to the agenda for an upcoming meeting to discuss how the Commission wants to handle having conferences of only a few Commission members. Based on her recent experience with the MEM Project, she feels this takes knowledge of the process away from those members not asked to attend the meeting.

Hollis Sutherland, Parks & Recreation Chair:

- Directed the Commission's attention to the January 31, 2020 article announcing that the Roaring Fork Valley was named an International Mountain Bicycling Association (IMBA) Gold-Level Ride Center--one of only seven locations in the world and the first in Colorado. This designation is a good example of the Master Plan which promotes use of adjacent public lands.

ADJOURNMENT

The February 12, 2020, regular meeting adjourned at 9:50 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting is set for March 11, 2020, at 7:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Kae McDonald

From: [John Williams](#)
To: [Eric Brendlinger](#); [Rebecca Moller](#)
Cc: [Ashley Allis](#); [Camy Britt](#); [Genevieve Villamizar](#); [Hollis Sutherland](#); [Jessi Rochel](#); [Kathleen Wanatowicz](#); [Kae McDonald](#); [Luis Yllanes](#); [Rose Rossello](#); [Tracy Wilson \(twilson@crms.org\)](#)
Subject: Re: MEM Nature Park draft survey , work plan and sponsor agreement
Date: Tuesday, February 4, 2020 11:25:40 AM

The Parks & Rec has a mandate to do weed mitigation.

So let's do weed mitigation.

The masters student can study the flora & fauna can deliver research results that may be helpful, thus satisfying her program.

It's already stated there will be no changes to the current use of the park. So why are we asking the first four questions, which all deal with uses or changes to the park?

The fifth question deals with something that's already in the works rendering that question unnecessary.

A program in environmental management can be conducted/completed just fine without delving into the other issues this survey brings up besides the environment.

I feel this survey is unnecessary to deal with the issue at hand... which is "weed mitigation".

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Rebecca Moller <becky@rfparalegals.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 4, 2020 7:29:15 AM
To: Eric Brendlinger <ebrendlinger@carbondaleco.net>
Cc: Ashley Allis <aallis@designworkshop.com>; Camy Britt <djsunshines@gmail.com>; Genevieve Villamizar <goodjuju2016@gmail.com>; Hollis Sutherland <hollis.sutherland@gmail.com>; John Williams <bonjon71@hotmail.com>; Jessi Rochel <jrochel@carbondaleco.net>; Kathleen Wanatowicz <glennakathleen@gmail.com>; Kae McDonald <kmcdonald@carbondaleco.net>; Luis Yllanes <lyllanes@carbondaleco.net>; Rose Rossello <happymtnrose@gmail.com>; Tracy Wilson (twilson@crms.org) <twilson@crms.org>
Subject: Re: MEM Nature Park draft survey , work plan and sponsor agreement

On second thought. If this is a master's project, there needs to be research done on what constitutes a good survey and survey questions and the questions put forth need to meet those criteria. We also need to know and put forth what information we are trying to gather.

Rebecca L. Moller, ACP
Advanced Certified Paralegal - Discovery
Roaring Fork Paralegals, LLC
907 Wheel Circle
Carbondale, CO 81623
(970) 319-5703

From: [Rebecca Moller](#)
To: [Eric Brendlinger](#)
Cc: [Ashley Allis](#); [Camy Britt](#); [Genevieve Villamizar](#); [Hollis Sutherland](#); [John Williams](#); [Jessi Rochel](#); [Kathleen Wanatowicz](#); [Kae McDonald](#); [Luis Yllanes](#); [Rose Rossello](#); [Tracy Wilson \(twilson@crms.org\)](#)
Subject: Re: MEM Nature Park draft survey , work plan and sponsor agreement
Date: Monday, February 3, 2020 10:37:57 PM

I agree with John and Melissa regarding their comments regarding the stakeholder group being re-evaluated. The stakeholders were not involved to the extent initially explained. I also agree with John's comment about Genevieve coming to us with a proposed project.

Survey

The third to last sentence in the introductory paragraph should say "potential" improvements like sentence three.

Survey questions 2-4 all seem to be asking the same thing and are leading questions. Questions 2 and 4 are particularly redundant. Also, each of these questions should include "if at all" or "if any." If you just say what issues/problems etc. you could be creating issues in people's minds. Some people may not think any changes are necessary.

Work Plan Outline

December - everything but the last bullet should be taken out. Or, since it's not listed as completed, it needs to move somewhere else.

January - bullets 1 and 2 need to be deleted. Additional items, bullet 3 needs to be deleted. We still have not received the stakeholder list, which is now is likely a moot point. In the last bullet point, the-reference to stakeholders needs to be taken out and the survey questions may need to be updated. The only thing that maybe needs to stay is the outreach bullet, but likely, that should be redone in some manner. None of the additional items bullets are marked as done so they should be moved to another month.

February - what is the survey timeframe?

April - bullet 7 need to say proposed as it does in the sponsor letter.

Sponsor letter

Project Summary

Paragraph 2 - any reference to autumn 2019 planning and outreach should be eliminated.

The reference to stakeholders should also be taken out of the project summary for the sponsor letter. That sentence should read, "Community outreach to the public to document if there are any concerns, issues with the park."

Paragraph 4 - This project was never contemplated by the commission to be anything other than a research project. I believe that was made clear by the commissioners at the beginning of our last meeting. This paragraph should just be taken out.

Last paragraph - take out the reference to stakeholders.

Project Timeline summary:

Reference to October and November should be taken out. Nothing was done those months. Who is on the "Mentor Circle" and what has been done with them? There is no reference to them in the work plan and if they have been dropped, they should be dropped from. Also, the share with Trustees should be dropped since the Trustees were told this project was approved by the commission and that was and currently is not the case. Really, unless the Mentor Circle is moving forward, October, November, and December should just be dropped.

January reference should be dropped also. We did not finalize the scope, the survey did not happen. No stakeholder meetings happened.

Outcomes - the reference to stakeholders should be eliminated.

I think this is it but there may be more.

Rebecca L. Moller, ACP
Advanced Certified Paralegal - Discovery
Roaring Fork Paralegals, LLC
907 Wheel Circle
Carbondale, CO 81623
(970) 319-5703

On Wed, Jan 22, 2020 at 12:45 PM Eric Brendlinger <ebrendlinger@carbondaleco.net> wrote:

To Parks & Recreation Commissioners,

Attached is a draft of the Nature Park survey, the revised work plan and outline and the reworked language in the sponsorship agreement with a new scope and deliverables. I am asking the Parks & Recreation Commission to provide feedback on these documents by February 3rd, so that a final version of the three documents can be put into the packet for approval by the commission at our February meeting. Thanks.

Eric Brendlinger

Town of Carbondale Parks & Recreation Director

ebrendlinger@carbondaleco.net

970-510-1277 (office)

970-319-2494 (cell)

On Mon, Feb 3, 2020 at 10:37 PM Rebecca Moller <becky@rfparalegals.com> wrote:

I agree with John and Melissa regarding their comments regarding the stakeholder group being re-evaluated. The stakeholders were not involved to the extent initially explained. I also agree with John's comment about Genevieve coming to us with a proposed project.

Survey

The third to last sentence in the introductory paragraph should say "potential" improvements like sentence three.

Survey questions 2-4 all seem to be asking the same thing and are leading questions. Questions 2 and 4 are particularly redundant. Also, each of these questions should include "if at all" or "if any." If you just say what issues/problems etc. you could be creating issues in people's minds. Some people may not think any changes are necessary.

Work Plan Outline

December - everything but the last bullet should be taken out. Or, since it's not listed as completed, it needs to move somewhere else.

January - bullets 1 and 2 need to be deleted. Additional items, bullet 3 needs to be deleted. We still have not received the stakeholder list, which is now is likely a moot point. In the last bullet point, the-reference to stakeholders needs to be taken out and the survey questions may need to be updated. The only thing that maybe needs to stay is the outreach bullet, but likely, that should be redone in some manner. None of the additional items bullets are marked as done so they should be moved to another month.

February - what is the survey timeframe?

April - bullet 7 need to say proposed as it does in the sponsor letter.

Sponsor letter

Project Summary

Paragraph 2 - any reference to autumn 2019 planning and outreach should be eliminated.

The reference to stakeholders should also be taken out of the project summary for the sponsor letter. That sentence should read, "Community outreach to the public to document if there are any concerns, issues with the park."

Paragraph 4 - This project was never contemplated by the commission to be anything other than a research project. I believe that was made clear by the commissioners at the beginning of our last meeting. This paragraph should just be taken out.

Last paragraph - take out the reference to stakeholders.

Project Timeline summary:

Reference to October and November should be taken out. Nothing was done those months. Who is on the "Mentor Circle" and what has been done with them? There is no reference to them in the work plan and if they have been dropped, they

should be dropped from. Also, the share with Trustees should be dropped since the Trustees were told this project was approved by the commission and that was and currently is not the case. Really, unless the Mentor Circle is moving forward, October, November, and December should just be dropped. January reference should be dropped also. We did not finalize the scope, the survey did not happen. No stakeholder meetings happened.

Outcomes - the reference to stakeholders should be eliminated.

I think this is it but there may be more.

Rebecca L. Moller, ACP
Advanced Certified Paralegal - Discovery
Roaring Fork Paralegals, LLC
907 Wheel Circle
Carbondale, CO 81623
(970) 319-5703

On Wed, Jan 22, 2020 at 12:45 PM Eric Brendlinger <ebrendlinger@carbondaleco.net> wrote:

To Parks & Recreation Commissioners,

Attached is a draft of the Nature Park survey, the revised work plan and outline and the reworked language in the sponsorship agreement with a new scope and deliverables. I am asking the Parks & Recreation Commission to provide feedback on these documents by February 3rd, so that a final version of the three documents can be put into the packet for approval by the commission at our February meeting. Thanks.

Eric Brendlinger

Town of Carbondale Parks & Recreation Director

ebrendlinger@carbondaleco.net

970-510-1277 (office)

970-319-2494 (cell)

From: [John Williams](#)
To: [Hollis Sutherland](#); [Ashley Allis](#); [Camy Britt](#); [Eric Brendlinger](#); [Genevieve Joelle Villamizar](#); [Jessi Rochel](#); [Kathleen Wanatowicz](#); [Kae McDonald](#); [Luis Yllanes](#); [Rebecca Moller](#); [Rose Rossello](#); [Tracy Wilson](#)
Cc: [Jay Harrington](#)
Subject: Re: REMINDER - Your Feedback Needed by Monday! re: MEM Nature Park draft survey, work plan and sponsor agreement
Date: Sunday, February 2, 2020 1:56:07 PM

In order to have this information to be accurate, since it is to be saved for future use, it should be stated that the master student asked the town staff/commission if she could do this study, not the other way around.

I also agree that the entire stakeholders involvement should be disregarded/eliminated. There has never been an actual meeting/discussion of the stakeholders, nor has a list of stakeholders been provided. The cleanest resolution is to eliminate that concept all together.

FYI..... A list of Friends of the Dog/Nature Park has been created. I am working on finding out what all is involved in creating a 401(C)3 in order to take in donations. I'll present that to the group to see if they want to do this as a group.

John W.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Hollis Sutherland <hollis.sutherland@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020, 6:29 PM
To: Ashley Allis; Camy Britt; Eric Brendlinger; Genevieve Joelle Villamizar; Hollis Sutherland; John Williams; Jessi Rochel; Kathleen Wanatowicz; Kae McDonald; Luis Yllanes; Rebecca Moller; Rose Rossello; Tracy Wilson
Cc: Jay Harrington
Subject: REMINDER - Your Feedback Needed by Monday! re: MEM Nature Park draft survey, work plan and sponsor agreement

Greetings Commissioners Extraordinaire!

This is a friendly reminder that Eric has requested feedback on the revised MEM items by THIS Monday (2/3). Based upon Commission and Public input at the last meeting the MEM plan and outline have been revised and your input is very much needed and appreciated. Below is the email and attachment that Eric sent out on 1/22.

We will be voting on this project at the February Meeting and our goal is to have a product that we can hopefully all agree upon.

To help make our meeting time together as efficient and productive as possible, please send suggested edits, comments and questions to Eric and me by Monday. That will allow us time to get answers to your questions, make any needed changes to the documents and include the updated documents in our February meeting packet.

The Aquatics Steering Committee had a fabulous initial meeting this week - we are looking forward to telling you more about it! Eric and I have started looking at the agenda for February's meeting and I will be calling each of you to talk about what is planned, what else you would like to see included and anything else that is on your mind. If you have a preferred day and time that you would like to talk, please let me know. Another option is to meet for coffee if our schedules align.

Also, Genevieve sent me an excellent interview that aired on the NRPA blog "Open Space Radio". It talks of the importance of being a courageous leader and sometimes having to have the hard conversations with people about what the Parks & Recreation Department can and can't do. Thanks to Becky's leadership, for the past few years we have been talking about caring for and maintaining our parks/facilities and not just chasing the next 'bright shiny object'. After hearing that in the interview, I was proud that our Commission was already on that track. Here is the link if you would like to listen to it - it's only about 16 minutes. <https://www.nrpa.org/blog/what-does-it-take-to-be-a-courageous-leader-february-bonus-episode/> Thank you for sending that on Genevieve!

Have a terrific weekend - looks like we could be getting some good snow! Enjoy!

Hollis Sutherland

Begin forwarded message:

From: Eric Brendlinger <ebrendlinger@carbondaleco.net>
Subject: MEM Nature Park draft survey , work plan and sponsor agreement
Date: January 22, 2020 at 12:45:34 PM MST
To: Ashley Allis <aallis@designworkshop.com>, Camy Britt <djsunshines@gmail.com>, Eric Brendlinger <ebrendlinger@carbondaleco.net>, "Genevieve Villamizar " <goodjuju2016@gmail.com>, Hollis Sutherland <hollis.sutherland@gmail.com>, John Williams <bonjon71@hotmail.com>, "Jessi Rochel" <jrochel@carbondaleco.net>, Kathleen Wanatowicz <glennakathleen@gmail.com>, Kae McDonald <kmcdonald@carbondaleco.net>, "Luis Yllanes" <lyllanes@carbondaleco.net>, Rebecca Moller <becky@rfparalegals.com>, Rose Rossello <happymtrose@gmail.com>, "Tracy Wilson (twilson@crms.org)" <twilson@crms.org>

To Parks & Recreation Commissioners,
Attached is a draft of the Nature Park survey, the revised work plan and outline and the reworked language in the sponsorship agreement with a new scope and deliverables. I am asking the Parks & Recreation Commission to provide feedback on these documents by February 3rd, so that a final version of the three documents can be put into the packet for approval by the commission at our February meeting. Thanks.

Eric Brendlinger
Town of Carbondale Parks & Recreation Director
ebrendlinger@carbondaeco.net
970-510-1277 (office)
970-319-2494 (cell)