

# Strawberry Plant Park – Community Meeting – November 7, 2009

## Flip Chart Notes

*Note: Other than the agenda and ground rules—which were posted during the November 7 meeting—all comments below were recorded at the meeting by outside facilitators on flip charts during the meeting or were written by citizen participants during small group sessions at the meeting.*

### **Agenda**

#### Purpose of November 7 Community Meeting:

To include all members of the community who want to engage in an honest & respectful conversation regarding their interests<sup>1</sup> in the Strawberry Plant Park project and to provide useful input to the Bainbridge Island City Council on ideas to meet these interests.

#### Meeting Desired Outcomes:

- Questions answered about the Strawberry Plant Park project
- Understanding of constraints under which we are operating
- A better understanding of one another's key interests regarding Strawberry Park
- Thoughts about possible ways to meet these interests and possible options for proceeding
- Input for Bainbridge Island City Council
- Understanding of next steps after this meeting

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>
9:00 a.m.	Informal Tour of Strawberry Plant Park
9:30 a.m.	Welcome by the Mayor
9:45 a.m.	Background: Strawberry Plant Park Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Chronology</li><li>• Q &amp; A</li></ul>

<sup>1</sup> The word "interest" is used specifically in this agenda to mean a strong desire, need or concern underlying a person or group's issue or proposed course of action.

10:30 a.m.	Areas of Interest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What have community members said that they care about?</li> </ul>
10:45 a.m.	Break
11:00 a.m.	Key Community Interests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small and large group conversations about community members' desires, needs &amp; concerns about the Park</li> </ul>
12:30 p.m.	Lunch Break
1:15 p.m.	Honoring interests and moving forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small and large group conversations about ways to honor the interests heard</li> <li>• Dialogue with City Council members to provide input</li> </ul>
2:30 p.m.	Where do we go from here? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the next steps from here?</li> <li>• How can the City keep community members informed and involved?</li> </ul>
3:00 p.m.	Closing & adjourn

## Ground Rules

- Share the air: don't withhold or dominate.
- Speak honestly and respectfully.
- Assume that we are all doing the best that we can.
- Listen to understand one another.
- Ask clarifying questions.
- Focus on common ground whenever possible.
- Learn from the past. Focus on the future.
- No distribution of literature by any party.

## Morning Session – Small Group Conversations about Key Interests

- What are your key interests?
- What interests do we all share?
- Where do we differ and why?

*Note: Participants were divided randomly into small groups according to a colored dot placed on their nametags. Following are flip chart notes from all six small groups.*

### **Group # 1 (Blue)**

#### Key Interests

- History
  - Preserved without excavating
- Identity empowering - cannery
- Benches for contemplation
- Retain multi-purpose utility
- Understand what is going on up to date
- Salt-Marsh
  - Help improving ecosystem
  - Check history for salt-marsh area prior to Cannery
- Want to see environment improve
- Safe water access

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No commercial uses</li><li>• Preserve as much as we can</li><li>• History-active</li><li>• Access to water with major impact to environment</li><li>• What was the early use of area (century ago) before settlement?</li><li>• Open Vista, bare shoreline</li><li>• Building for special haul-out</li><li>• Fear it will be over built for too much activity</li><li>• Crew group has no interest in Park</li><li>• A park has historic elements rather than a monument</li><li>• Small history kiosk</li></ul> |  |
|--|--|

## Group # 2 (Light Green)

### Key Interests

- Access to open space that isn't developed
- Quietness
- Safety
- Feeling at ease without cars
- Greatest benefit to most people
- Fiscal conservation
- Respect historical nature of property
- Small boat access
- Fear park will end up exclusive - Just for neighborhood
- Stick with original object of project
- Prioritize that it's a "people-orientated park"
- Environmental
  - Adequately address all environmental concerns
- Balance between fish habitation and people use
- Develop better understanding of restoration
- Quiet, natural place in town
- Do not disturb natural wildlife habitat

- Improve salmonid habitat
- Input from all people on Island to make park useful for entire community vs. just nearby homeowners
- More access to shoreline than proposed

### **Group # 3 (Dark Green)**

#### **Key Interests**

- Place to provide boat-building skills – maintain traditional skills
- Nature - want everyone to be able to enjoy the birds & other wildlife that come to that park
- Preserve qualities of the park
  - Beauty, solitude, water
  - Peaceful viewing spot as far out into the water as possible
- Provide habitat for endangered species and others
  - Repair and restore
  - Have a positive impact on the natural ecosystem
- Maximizing usable green space
- Handicap Access (sidewalks already exist)
- Sunny southern exposure
  - Want to have access to sun-now is open
  - Preserve maximum sun exposure
- Easy way to “put in” kayaks and other small watercraft
- Historical preservation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Island culture</li> <li>○ Strawberry industry was huge</li> <li>● Children play at water's edge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tactile (mild) hands-on</li> <li>○ Drift wood</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Access - Ability to get the park (Dock or Shore) from a boat (Kayak, tour/small boat, etc...)</li> </ul>	
---	--

**Group # 4 (Fluorescent Green)**

**Key Interests**

- Parking
  - Parking Attracts Noise (e.g. Wheelies)
- Concrete Re-Bar- liability and safety
- Spending money wisely - Net benefits
- Direct access to water – swimming, boating
  - “Direct” without another structure
  - Functional public/practical access
  - Marine use
- Quiet
  - Aesthetics
  - Peninsula view from pier
  - Watch & hear birds

--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Amplified Sound</li> <li>• Environmentally Sound <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sustainability</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “Recognizing” the story of the area</li> </ul>	
---	--

<p><b>Group # 5 (Red-Orange)</b></p> <p><b><u>Key Interest:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Balance public needs with the immediate neighborhood needs</li> <li>• Attractive destination for non-motorized access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Walking, Biking, Non-motorized boats</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Future plan to accommodate restoration of strawberry creek (a.k.a Weaver creek)</li> <li>• No off-site parking</li> <li>• Maximum access to waterfront <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Non-motorized boats &lt; or = 15’</li> <li>○ Physical access</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Improve environment for fish without taking away total public access</li> <li>• Maximum space available to preserve for current &amp; future generations</li> <li>• Maximize open/sunny space</li> <li>• Clean up existing shoreline for habitat</li> <li>• Maximum habitat protection - Especially for fish</li> <li>• Neighborhood use compatibility—concerned about:</li> </ul>	
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Noise levels</li> <li>○ Commercial use</li> <li>○ Lights</li> <li>○ Parking</li> <li>● Don't lose funding to do habitat restoration</li> <li>● Unobstructed water views</li> <li>● Join public areas along the waterfront</li> <li>● Fear that design will be governed by funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Allow community to decide what it wants</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--

**Group # 6 (Orange)**

Key Interests

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Maritime use</li> <li>● Historic/ culture/ tourism/ educational</li> <li>● Peaceful, natural ambience</li> <li>● Shoreline habitat/ education</li> <li>● Functional ecosystem - functioning for people and fish</li> <li>● Opportunities for youth</li> <li>● Salmon habitat</li> <li>● Historical</li> <li>● Maritime use- reclaim</li> </ul>	
---	--

- Historical use - preserving culture and honor environment - educate
- Business opportunities
- Involve youth w/mentors – getting them into nature, promoting cross generational interaction, and indoor crafting
- Song of birds
- Restoration of shoreline
- Natural sites within city. Allow ecological process to take place. We need to show people what a natural shoreline is. We've lost these places and we owe future generations.
- Kitsap has few natural shoreline – We can provide a place for rest of region
- Maritime access. We need places to put our boats in & protect salmon habitat (non-motorized)
- Provide educational experiences for youth and connection to waterfront
- Educate people about historic uses of property (Japanese history and others)
- Creating opportunities (maritime and natural) for youth
- Keeping it in its current state, maintaining natural ambience
- Maintain peacefulness for neighbors
- Make it all-encompassing for Bainbridge Island residents
- Create a place for you to row a boat
- Tourism- People will come to cultural interests. Attract tourism.

## Large Group Conversation: What are our shared interests?

- We see this park as a special place.
- We want non-motorized boating there.
- We want visual water access (views).
- We want actual water access.
- We want to balance the needs of all Islanders with the needs of the neighbors.
- We see this as a waterfront park with woodlands.
- We want a functional ecosystem for people and wildlife.
- We want educational opportunities for children.
- We want to honor the history of the site

## Afternoon Session- Brainstorming: How can we honor the interests we heard this morning?

*Note: After lunch, participants once again moved into their small groups where they brainstormed ways of honoring the needs, desires & concerns they heard in the morning, particularly the shared interests. Participants placed their ideas on large “post-it” notes under each shared interest. After the meeting, facilitators placed together all post-it note ideas from the small groups. Accordingly, the following participant comments were all written during small group sessions.*

### The Park is a special place

- Yes, for all of Bainbridge Island
- Re-make this park as a welcoming, natural experience within a healthy ecosystem. Minimize focus on the former industrial uses.
- No idea what “park as a special place” means
- No boat building/repair facility
  - This is an ideal area for retention of existing use of shoreline
- Picnic area & viewing area to keep same view over water
- Park should be passive rather than active

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove both “Peninsulas” in keeping with proposed plan and remove at least half of parking area</li> <li>• I just would like a quiet place to sit near the water and listen and watch nature. The adjacent aquatic conservancy is a unique opportunity to do this.</li> <li>• Current uses should be tuned and continued: a)observation of surroundings; b) launching kayaks and canoes; c) swimming.</li> <li>• Define special place for a greater number of Island individuals</li> <li>• Maintain beautiful view up Sunday Cove; support sitting on point; save tall trees.</li> </ul>	
--	--

**Non-Motorized Boats**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bathrooms are needed for kayakers etc... Make easy to get from water to bathroom</li> <li>• But no boat building</li> <li>• Non-mucky kayak/small-boat launch</li> <li>• Launch area for non-motorized small boats</li> <li>• Keep it as it is now</li> <li>• Boat ramp in city plan provides good access for non-motorized boats -- This property is not the place for boat buildings</li> <li>• No pier-- too much negative impact on ecosystem function</li> <li>• Boat access should be limited to non-motorized, but not limited to kayaks. For example, rowing dinghies, shells, small (under 15') sail boats. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Parking must be provided for the vehicles/trailers which deliver the boats</li> </ul> </li> <li>• I like the City preferred plan for the non-motorized boat ramp but would explore whether it can be longer to allow launching at lower tide levels.</li> </ul>	
--	--

## Water Views -Visual Water Access

- Why not build view platform on top of the east Jetty? It would be a lot cheaper and less destructive of the beach
- I like the City's preferred plan with an over water structure so people can stand, sit or picnic at the end of the pier with unobstructed water views
- No trees added to park along shore
- Unobstructed water views -- Maintain current quiet, peaceful atmosphere on water and shoreline - consistent with existing uses to the west
- Fix rebar and other safety problems and cover "Peninsula" to preserve them
- Keep the waterfront sunny and open --Do not block the view with trees
- No float with or without shoreline--No pier
- Implement current plan to use fill to raise land level 4' for better water viewing in a landscaped and beautiful way
- There needs to be more reasonable access for people in Phase I
- Yes, keep it as it is
- No Pier, no floating dock, keep view unencumbered
- Low shrubs not trees on shoreline
- Lots of benches
- Leave site alone
- Peninsula jutting out (albeit concrete) already exist. Great view spot! Why spend money to tear it out and lose precious ground (literally and figuratively). Let's not cut off our nose despite our face (Sorry). Simply beautify existing structure.
- Preserve raptor trees- Especially two firs by meeting room
- Extend proposed land pier by 20'-30'

## Access to the Water

- Uses which require minimum parking
- The access should provide for more varied use and substantial use by people-- Help with a park like site
- Access issues adequately addressed in City plan
- Visual access is most critical- this will always be a muddy, mucky bottom as are all road ends on Eagle Harbor – so physical access is not as important as visual access.
- I am in favor of the plan presented by the City; if needed, one of the bulkheads could stay but only one.
- Access
  - A few more parking spaces, say 12
  - Basically a walk-in park
  - Bridge access from Leslie Landing depending on neighbors
- Yes, keep it as it is
- Boardwalk over marsh land - Walk on pickle grass and gum weed etc...
- Low-impact foot path or boardwalk over salt marsh if it does not have negative impact on salt-marsh
- Goal: restore shoreline to a natural state. Prevent walking down to water's edge to preserve integrity of biological components. Restrict boating activities to Peninsula. Do not allow fishing from shore.
- Place for kids to play along water
- Low key ramp for launching kayaks etc...
- Keep Peninsulas and fix them and provide "swim ladder" and float for kayak etc... at high tide entry
- Easy boat in/out

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking (5 to 6) spaces as proposed is not adequate for use/demand, or moorage of small non-motorized boats.</li> <li>• 15' of waterfront access is an absolute <u>minimum</u> for waterfront access. As the island population grows – as I believe it will - more access will be necessary. It should be identified now and dedicated now. It is needed for boats as well as children play activities.</li> <li>• I like the City's preferred design <u>so long as</u> there isn't a fence or barrier to prevent adults and children from walking along the water's edge</li> <li>• Design proper walkway for hand launching kayak etc...</li> <li>• Keep access to water for handicap w/existing piers. Keep Peninsula as is (with appropriate clean-up) for visual access. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Have trail access from uplands keeping road to slab allows school bus access, boat trailer etc... (this envisions shoreline clean-up generally)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• As in the current proposed plan, provide non-motorized boat access and pedestrian access through a small pier. Let the rest of the shoreline be restored to a natural state</li> <li>• Parking is needed</li> <li>• Need for non-motorized (or very quiet, occasional motorized [i.e. water taxi]) dock access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Long-term idea: a summer water taxi connecting all parks on shoreline of Eagle Harbor</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Boat access: create and improve</li> <li>• Ramp and float. No foot prints in tidemarks</li> <li>• As in the current proposed plan, provide non-motorized boat access and pedestrian access through a small pier. Let the rest of the shoreline be restored to a natural state.</li> <li>• A float that people can swim out to and sunbathe upon</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>Balancing the concerns of the neighborhood with those of the Island</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No special interests</li> </ul>	

- There needs to be more parking than what is being proposed (only six spaces)
- All activities should be “legal” under residential zoning category
- Strawberry Plant Park belongs to all islanders as such; it must be available for a growing number of users as the Island population grows. Do not restrict the amount of use by artificial limits like extremely few parking facilities etc.
- Allow the Park Board to decide the uses of the Park as they have elsewhere
- Encourage small rowboat or canoe or kayak tourism from downtown Winslow to Internment Memorial, this facility and around bay.
- Grant money should not run our public park planning. The people should have a larger say. We will not get this land back once it’s gone
- This is basically a small parcel of property – this is not a Battle Point Park. Therefore it makes little sense to talk as if this will be a big park. The upland area should be minimally developed -- it is an important wildlife area now and the parcel is surrounded by residential area – so heavy use is not very desirable.
- No campsites but picnic tables
- Trail connection to downtown
- Limited parking for cars
- We do not want to encourage activities that destroy the peace of the neighborhood, which is enjoyed by visitors as well as neighbors.
- Parking on site, not out in neighborhood
- Parking: Whatever parking there is should be as far from waterfront as possible (i.e. near upper street) because:
  - 1) Maximize green space near waterfront
  - 2) Minimize pedestrian – car conflict on park grounds
  - 3) Minimize noise, etc... near waterfront

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Note: There should be enough parking to allow people from beyond immediate neighbors to come.</li> <li>• Design to minimize noise and visual pollution</li> <li>• Keep as much of the existing land as possible for future Islanders</li> <li>• No buildings added on site</li> <li>• No parking added away from Park site</li> <li>• Minimal parking and other paving discreetly located.</li> <li>• I think it is important to create the bridge from the trail to make the park more available for people to walk from downtown to the park</li> <li>• Foot path connection to “busy” Waterfront Park</li> <li>• This should be a small, quiet passive use park that does not encourage loud uses that unduly impose on the neighbors. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Waterfront Park downtown is the right location for more intensive facility development and active uses</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Keep parking and give wheelchair access-- Put speed bumps etc... to control traffic problems</li> <li>• Keep existing quiet neighborhood</li> <li>• Quiet use or passive</li> <li>• Place of tranquility, serene</li> <li>• Consider needs of <u>all</u> islanders -Need <u>may</u> be for place to see water - shore</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>It's A Waterfront Park with Woodlands</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep woodlands intact and uncluttered with structures</li> <li>• Undeveloped woodland play area</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees lost for view and building footprint to be planted along stream maybe as buffer to parking lot</li> <li>• I would like to see the woods at the top of the park maintained. –I would hope no trees would be removed from the site.</li> <li>• Clean weeds and undergrowth</li> <li>• Keep it simple</li> <li>• Passive recreation, rather than active</li> <li>• Picnic tables or comfortable benches on viewing pier to sit and talk</li> <li>• Prefer retaining level bridge but understand it may not be compatible with salt marsh</li> <li>• No buildings, or maybe one shelter/ramada like</li> <li>• Maintain integrity of upland forest. Habitat for birds. Flux of nutrients of water</li> <li>• Maintain the woodlands as a healthy natural area with minimal introduction of facilities other than parking needed for public access</li> <li>• The proposed plan seems to be a very good one! It allows physical and visual access to the water, enhances (maybe restores) aquatic habitat. Good plan!</li> <li>• Island citizens need to have parks especially if city planning is designed for 60,000 people on Bainbridge in 2035 based on a scenario run for our ground water study this month</li> <li>• Minimal children’s play structure near woodland</li> </ul>	
<p><b><u>Functional Ecosystem For People And Wildlife</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has there been any assessment as to the recovery rate of fish due to the restoration plan as it now exists?</li> <li>• Don’t compromise ecosystem restoration too far to make it inadequate in meeting the needs of fisheries resources</li> <li>• Move trees to provide an overhang of water source of nutrition for fish and invertebrates. Shading can prevent abnormal high</li> </ul>	

water temperatures

- Clean the existing shore and leave the rest the way it is
- Maybe this isn't the best place for such a large amount of money for habitat restoration when there are so few opportunities for Islanders to have a place enhancing boats usage, boat parking (trailers, etc. (non-motorized)
- Property borders a wildlife preserve on the body of water extending to the head of the bay-tidelands and water should be consistent with the reserve
- Restore the shoreline to a natural state to optimize fish habitat and human enjoyment. Most Islanders do not have waterfront property and should have access to natural beauty
- Retain pier and boat access a 15' opening in marsh to west of pier; replace proposed kayak access with marsh
- Salmon "Restoration": Assuming plan to tear out existing peninsula is to "restore" shoreline and thus salmon, we're giving up a huge chunk of usable land, beautiful viewing spot
- Yes, enhance
- Maximize habitat protection and shoreline restoration
- Take out fill and restore salt marsh; use native plants; make it a restoration
- City plan addresses ecosystem with restoration and salt water marsh
- Restore or create/improve shoreline ecosystem; (west of large pier)
- Create community garden/strawberry patch
- Further, or complete, geologic study or characterization to an adequate depth to properly address the potential disturbance and removal of the built up concrete area that could have been impacted with contaminants based on documented historical use of the site, nearby properties and the Superfund site in the Harbor (5-6' beyond planned excavation is not adequate)
- Remove asphalt and concrete
- Restoration of salmon/fish habitat is a moral obligation!! We must do this on public lands

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treasure the salt marsh</li> <li>• Learning about present design satisfies the shared interests</li> <li>• Wild fantasy</li> <li>• Will a salt marsh sustain itself?</li> <li>• When you remove the existing concrete, berms, etc. make sure you do not create an environmental concern greater than what is there</li> <li>• Enhance marine ecology without digging out an acre of park</li> <li>• The site will revert to mud so no salmon restoration at this site—do restoration in more productive area</li> <li>• Concrete post stable, avoid the replacement of concrete except if danger requires it</li> <li>• Bird nesting habitat</li> <li>• Fix walls or sides of piers</li> </ul>	
---	--

**Educational Opportunities For Children & Youth**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boating and swimming programs</li> <li>• Encourage school use; use it for evening and overnight use</li> <li>• Yes, projects</li> <li>• Upland community Park District building for indoor youth and adult activities-maritime oriented</li> </ul> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Considerations: Noise regulations if daily use is a concern vs. preschool hours to 7p.m. and weekends. More than 4 cars parking space with curb or tree barriers to prevent wheelies. Low height lighting in path to building and minimal in parking area (i.e.: Islandwood).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus access—can they park on Shepard if no interior parking space?</li> </ul>	
---	--

- Small groups studying fish habitat improvements
- Classes can monitor plant and animal communities after restoration-- “citizen science”
- Provide interpretive signage about healthy ecosystems
- Encourage schools to use the park for evening and overnight retreats
- Non-intellectual but learn from observing nature, exploring, free play, unstructured time!
- Tide pool life
- Sub tidal wild habitat
- The Island school children should have a healthy salt marsh to study and learn from. Let’s reestablish one here!
- History walking tour with signs
- Plan should adequately address opportunities for children, families and youth including residents who do not have access to waterfront except through Island park use.

### **Honoring the History of the Park**

- Clean existing shoreline and leave the park alone
- What really defines the site’s “history”? Who decides?
- I like the City’s preferred plan and would encourage the Park Board to erect a historical commemorative educational exhibit in the upland area
- Honor the history of the Suquamish Indians by restoring the natural shoreline
- Honor the strawberry processing/packing uses on the site through minimal interpretive techniques
- Bring the waterfront back to its original habitat for fish. Its natural purpose and beauty are more important than honoring the transport of strawberries
- Use vegetation (i.e.: cherry trees, etc.) to incorporate the history of the Japanese community

- Do a cultural history exhibit and possible ghost structure
- Recognition of history with signage
- Restrict “historical” (preservation) to placards
- Trim east pier back partially, but keep enough to recall : The shape of the land tells a story
- Process of discovery--Have meeting
- The project needs to honor what the community defines as history not an agency looking to secure funding for job security

### **Honoring the History of the Site**

- Plaque
- Commemorative structure (nice but not necessary) Informative kiosk would be enough
- Signage at site to note cannery; create cannery display at historical museum
- History kiosk
- Interpretive signs discussing history of site; Museum could conduct tours for interested parties
- There are many “histories” to this site. Preserving asphalt and concrete is not preserving history—early history was a natural shoreline—when the native Americans used this area. Previous histories can be honored by permanent placards that show historic buildings, etc. (like at the foot of Madison)
- Preserve historic and cultural landscape, i.e.: exp. work yard, walkways, earth piers
- Less is more
- Erect an indestructible interpretive signage board similar to those elsewhere on the island explaining the site history
- Subdued kiosk --sturdy, informative; No memorial to concrete dumping in the harbor
- Create cannery outline structure replicating small part of building for some history material and outdoor education uses

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian cultural tourism</li> </ul>	
---	--

<p><b><u>General Thoughts</u></b></p> <p><i><u>Note: The following comments came from one small group whose participants wanted to add comments that did not, in their view, fit into one of the interest areas above. These are not to be read as conclusions reached by anyone other than the participants of this group.</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing “preferred” option best accommodates the community’s diverse ideas and goals for the park’s shoreline</li> <li>• The current 30% design meets all of the common interests identified by this group</li> <li>• The current proposal adequately meets the broad categories of “common interests” identified this morning while allowing ample flexibility for future plans honoring both historic uses and ecological functions</li> <li>• Overall Comments-- The park should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Be for local residents</li> <li>○ Be a natural place</li> <li>○ Have only passive activities</li> <li>○ Be connected to the waterfront trail</li> <li>○ Have a restored shoreline</li> <li>○ Have limited parking at the street</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--

<p><b><u>Large Group Dialogue</u></b></p> <p><i>The day ended with a large group dialogue, covering some of the ideas discussed in the small groups. There was no consensus reached about any of the ideas put forth regarding how to honor the interests participants articulated. It was agreed that the flip chart notes would be typed up, sent to all participants and to the City Council for input into their decision making process.</i></p>	
---	--