



Windjammer Park Integration Plan Community Advisory Group Meeting 3 Summary

Tuesday, March 8, 2016

5:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Former Whidbey Island Bank Building

Background

The Windjammer Park Integration Plan (WPIP) will be a long-term plan for Windjammer Park, integrating existing and new elements (such as the Clean Water Facility, currently in construction) in this community space. The WPIP Community Advisory Group (CAG) will provide a forum for community members to inform the future vision of Windjammer Park.

Objectives for the Mar. 8, 2016 third CAG meeting:

- Introduce and review design concepts
- Evaluate park elements as presented in each concept
- Set stage for preferred concept development

A summary of the CAG meeting follows.

Meeting Proceedings

Participants

Jonathan Phillips

Community Advisory Group Members:

Mike Horrobin

Franji Christian

John Fowkes

Karla Freund

David Goodchild

Hal Hovey

Kristi Krieg

Erik Mann

Skip Pohtilla

Melissa Riker

Kara Vallejo

Jes Walker-Wyse

Michael Wright

Project staff:

Steve Powers, City of Oak Harbor

Development Services Director

Gill Williams, GreenWorks

Jennifer D'Avanzo, GreenWorks

Jeff McGraw, MWA Architects

Additional staff:

Brett Arvidson, Project Engineer, Clean Water Facility

Hank Nydam, Operations Manager, Oak Harbor Parks and Recreation

Joe Stowell, City Engineer, Clean Water Facility

Cathy Rosen, Public Works Director

Absent Community Advisory Group

Members:

Cheryl Lueder

Ferd Johns

Greg Goebel

Facilitator:

Erin Taylor, EnviroIssues

Note taker:

Zack Ambrose, EnviroIssues

Welcome and introductions

Erin Taylor, Facilitator, EnviroIssues, called the meeting to order and reviewed the CAG's operating ground rules. Erin introduced the WPIP project team including Steve Powers with the City of Oak Harbor Development Services Department, Gill Williams and Jennifer D'Avanzo, GreenWorks (landscape architecture), and Jeff McGraw with MWA Architects (built architecture/Clean Water Facility architect). CAG members introduced themselves.

Erin recapped the second CAG meeting and discussed the evening's agenda.

Recap priorities established at last meetings

Gill Williams provided an overview of the list of prioritized park elements and recapped previous CAG discussions, including the adjacency matrix completed by the CAG members at the previous meeting. Gill noted that the feedback and information collected to this point has been used to create three design concepts, to be presented this evening.

Question: Will implementation of the park plan be discussed at tonight's meeting?

Response: No. Phasing and implementation options will be shown as part of the preferred concept, and as certain park elements are determined to be feasibly completed as part of the Clean Water Facility's construction.

Question: Will there be a cost estimate?

Response: Cost will be discussed in future meetings, in conjunction with a preferred concept/plan.

Windjammer Park Integration Plan draft design concepts

Gill explained that the design team had developed three concepts based on feedback received from the CAG and members of the public. He also noted:

- Each concept should not be seen as "mutually exclusive"; elements from each concept could be included in an eventual preferred concept.
- Feedback received at this meeting would be incorporated to further refine the preferred concept.
- The next iteration of the design would include various ideas, and likely a hybridized concept would be available for additional comment.

Steve Powers reiterated that the concepts presented represent ideas and should not be interpreted as construction drawings. The concepts show how elements can relate to each other.

Erin distributed a "cheat sheet" (see appendix) for CAG members to take notes as each concept was discussed. Erin asked CAG members to take notes and asked that questions be held until the end of the design presentation.

Gill proceeded to walk through each design concept explaining the various differences and options included in each. The following includes brief descriptions as presented in the presentation and includes plan views, bird's-eye-views, and close-up views of specific elements (see appendix).

Design Concept 1: Recreation

Element	Concept 1: Recreation
Amphitheater/Stage	<i>Location: Lagoon</i>
Ball fields	<i>Four multipurpose fields. Relocate little league facility.</i>
Beach access	<i>Boardwalk extends off of waterfront promenade.</i>
Event plaza	<i>Smallest, with vehicle access and parking.</i>
Existing wetlands	<i>Enhanced with boardwalks and mounding.</i>
Gateway Entrance	<i>SE City Beach/SE Bayshore Dr.</i>
Interior Trail Network	<i>Through multi-purpose lawn and wetlands, connecting to SE Beeksma Dr. and northern businesses.</i>
Lagoon	<i>Smallest with event steps and central stage.</i>
Landscape and gardens	<i>Fewest formal garden areas. Many trees.</i>
Multi-purpose lawn	<i>Large, separated by pathways.</i>
Parking	<i>Adjacent clean water facility; near west restroom, near water.</i>
Rentable spaces	<i>Two kitchens and a picnic area; informal picnic spaces.</i>
RV Park	<i>A 20-space park includes green space on west side.</i>
Vehicular access	<i>Access via SE City Beach St. Parking off SW Beeksma Dr. Downtown via SE Bayshore Dr.</i>
Waterfront promenade	<i>Straight</i>
Windmill	<i>Relocated to the beach in the middle of the park.</i>

Design Concept 2: Naturalistic

Element	Concept 2 Naturalistic
Amphitheater/Stage	<i>Location: Windmill Plaza</i>
Ball fields	<i>Three formal baseball fields (similar to existing).</i>
Beach access	<i>Mid-park path leading to beach.</i>
Event plaza	<i>Large, relocated parking, integrated splash pad, lawn, and playground.</i>
Existing wetlands	<i>Enhanced, bordering landscaped gardens and plaza.</i>
Gateway Entrance	<i>SW Beeksma Dr. and SW Bayshore Dr.</i>
Interior Trail Network	<i>Multiple trails throughout the park and frames great lawn.</i>
Lagoon	<i>Reshaped and reduced with access steps.</i>
Landscape and gardens	<i>Formal gardens near wetlands, multi-purpose lawn and windmill.</i>
Multi-purpose lawn	<i>Graded lawn for events and performances.</i>
Parking	<i>Near ballfields, playground and kitchen on the beach; near west playground and rentable space.</i>
Rentable spaces	<i>Three wooded picnic shelters, one kitchen.</i>
RV Park	<i>Not included. Relocate to adjacent site.</i>
Vehicular access	<i>SE City Beach St. access only to facility. SE Bayshore Dr. connects to parking lot via new entry drive.</i>
Waterfront promenade	<i>Meandering</i>
Windmill	<i>Slightly relocated to the middle of the park.</i>

Design Concept 3: Civic

Element	Concept 3: Civic
Amphitheater/Stage	<i>Location: Windmill Plaza</i>
Ball fields	<i>One multi-purpose ball field. Relocate little league facility.</i>
Beach access	<i>Via Boardwalk.</i>
Event plaza	<i>Large, between hill and splash park with limited parking and drop-off area.</i>
Existing wetlands	<i>Smallest, mixed with formal gardens.</i>
Gateway Entrance	<i>SW Beeksma Dr. and SW Bayshore Dr.</i>
Interior Trail Network	<i>Multiple trails throughout the park and frames great lawn.</i>
Lagoon	<i>Slightly reduced with access steps to plaza and windmill.</i>
Landscape and gardens	<i>Formal gardens, near lawn and possible community center site.</i>
Multi-purpose lawn	<i>Smaller, graded lawn for events and performances.</i>
Parking	<i>Included near ballfield and east playground, clean water facility, the kayak campsite and the possible community center.</i>
Rentable spaces	<i>One shelter/kitchen.</i>
RV Park	<i>Not included. Relocate to adjacent site.</i>
Vehicular access	<i>Major streets connect directly to parking. SE City Beach St. also connects to facility.</i>
Waterfront promenade	<i>Straight</i>
Windmill	<i>Remains in current location.</i>

Questions and answers regarding concepts

Erin asked the CAG for clarifying questions for the design team. The following questions have been organized by concept:

Concept 1: Recreation

Question: How big is the stage in Concept 1? Has it been executed elsewhere?

Response: It is approximately 60 feet wide and similar-sized stages have been created in other parks.

Concept 2: Naturalistic

Question: In Concept 2, is there room for the road along Bayshore Drive?

Response: Yes, this concept assumes the existing ballfields are located closer together.

Question: Are the kitchens on the east side of the park in Concept 2?

Response: Yes.

Concept 3: Civic

Question: Would the water feature (using reclaimed water) in Concept 3 outfall to the bay?

Response: The water feature would have to be separate due to reclaimed water regulations.

Question: Regarding the potential North Park Development, where would the road go?

Response: The road would extend from Pioneer Avenue. In Concept 3, the buildings shown

represent the density that could be built and the connection to the park, and are conceptual, based solely on what zoning is currently permitted in this area of Oak Harbor.

Question: Would the kitchens in Concept 3 be the same size as they are now?

Response: Yes, they would be of similar size.

Question: Would the waterfront path in Concept 3 be a hardscape?

Response: Yes, the path would be a hardscape and wider than what currently exists.

Question: The North Park Development is zoned as community commercial, can this be changed?

Response: From planning perspective, zoning can be changed to a certain degree. However, mixed-use commercial, including residential units, seems to be the best fit for this area.

Question: Have other parks been designed using various 'rooms' as presented in Concept 3?

Response: Yes, other parks include spaces that are broken up by sidewalks that delineate spaces that could be rented for events. Or, a large event could rent all of the spaces.

Comment: The big issue is access for cars and people who may not be able to walk long distances.

Response: Concept 3 has been designed with transportation hubs that include various elements surrounding each hub to maximize access.

General Questions / Comments

Question: Would the path on the west side of the Clean Water Facility remain in all the design concepts?

Response: Yes, the path would remain regardless of the design concept and extend to Pioneer Avenue through a new parking area and include a 15 foot promenade lined with trees. This is assumed as part of the Clean Water Facility plan and construction.

Question: Would there be vehicular access to the park near the People's Bank building?

Response: No, the proposed path is 14 feet wide and would be for pedestrians only.

Question: How much maintenance is required for forested / planted areas?

Response: Typically for a park like this, forested areas would have high canopy trees and grass underneath. A maintenance plan will have to be developed for the park.

Question: Will open spaces have semi-truck access for load/unload for events?

Response: Yes, paths will be wide enough and have load bearing to accommodate truck access for events.

Question: Which design concept has the largest amphitheater?

Response: Concept 3 has the largest amphitheater and formal seating could accommodate approximately 180 people.

Question: Is there a need for additional soccer fields during all seasons?

Response: These concepts are for space illustration purposes only and multi-use fields could be included.

Question: How much space would a carnival occupy?

Response: The total amount of space would depend on the type of carnival.

Concept preferences discussion

Erin walked the CAG members through the preference elements exercise. Erin asked the CAG members to focus on specific treatments of individual elements that they preferred. CAG members received one dot for each of the elements and were instructed to place them on the element treatment that they preferred between the three concepts. For example, a “lagoon” dot could be placed on one of the three concepts. The tallies below show the results of this exercise.

	Concept 1: Recreation	Score	Concept 2: Naturalistic	Score	Concept 3: Civic	Score
Amphitheater/Stage	<i>Location: Lagoon</i>	5	<i>Location: Windmill Plaza</i>	0	<i>Location: Windmill Plaza</i>	7
Ball fields	<i>Four multipurpose fields. Relocate little league facility.</i>	0	<i>Three formal baseball fields (similar to existing).</i>	6	<i>One multi-purpose ball field. Relocate little league facility.</i>	3
Beach access	<i>Boardwalk extends off waterfront promenade.</i>	0	<i>Mid-park path leading to beach.</i>	5	<i>Via Boardwalk.</i>	5
Event plaza	<i>Smallest, with vehicle access and parking.</i>	2	<i>Large, relocated parking, integrated splash pad, lawn, and playground.</i>	3	<i>Large, between hill and splash park with limited parking and drop-off area.</i>	4
Existing wetlands	<i>Enhanced with boardwalks and mounding.</i>	6	<i>Enhanced, bordering landscaped gardens and plaza.</i>	0	<i>Smallest, mixed with formal gardens.</i>	3
Gateway Entrance	<i>SE City Beach/SE Bayshore Dr.</i>	2	<i>SW Beeksma Dr. and SW Bayshore Dr.</i>	0	<i>SW Beeksma Dr. and SW Bayshore Dr.</i>	8
Interior Trail Network	<i>Through multi-purpose lawn and wetlands, connecting to SE Beeksma Dr. and northern businesses.</i>	3	<i>Multiple trails throughout the park and frames great lawn.</i>	2	<i>Multiple trails throughout the park and frames great lawn.</i>	3
Lagoon	<i>Smallest with event steps and central stage.</i>	4	<i>Reshaped and reduced with access steps.</i>	4	<i>Slightly reduced with access steps to plaza and windmill.</i>	4
Landscape and gardens	<i>Fewest formal garden areas. Many trees.</i>	2	<i>Formal gardens near wetlands, multi-purpose lawn and windmill.</i>	1	<i>Formal gardens, near lawn and possible community center site.</i>	4
Multi-purpose lawn	<i>Large, separated by pathways.</i>	3	<i>Graded lawn for events and performances.</i>	4	<i>Smaller, graded lawn for events and performances.</i>	4
Parking	<i>Adjacent clean water facility; near west restroom, near water.</i>	0	<i>Near ballfields, playground and kitchen on the beach; near west playground and rentable space.</i>	1W 1E	<i>Included near ballfield and east playground, clean water facility, the kayak campsite and the possible community center.</i>	1(P/v) 7(Crescent) 2W
Splash Park	<i>Located east of lagoon. Largest</i>	5	<i>Located south of plaza</i>	3	<i>Located east of lagoon. Smaller</i>	4
Rentable spaces	<i>Two kitchens and a picnic area; informal picnic spaces.</i>	0	<i>Three wooded picnic shelters, one kitchen.</i>	8 1W	<i>One shelter/kitchen.</i>	1w
RV Park	<i>A 20-space park includes green space on west side.</i>	3	<i>Not included. Relocate to adjacent site.</i>	0	<i>Not included. Relocate to adjacent site.</i>	0
Vehicular access	<i>Access via SE City Beach St. Parking off SW Beeksma Dr. Downtown via SE Bayshore Dr.</i>	1	<i>SE City Beach St. access only to facility. SE Bayshore Dr. connects to parking lot via new entry drive.</i>	2	<i>Major streets connect directly to parking. SE City Beach St. also connects to facility.</i>	2 Beeksma 4 newdrive
Waterfront promenade	<i>Straight</i>	3	<i>Meandering</i>	7	<i>Straight</i>	2
Windmill	<i>Relocated to the beach in the middle of the park.</i>	6	<i>Slightly relocated to the middle of the park.</i>	2	<i>Remains in current location.</i>	2

Gill lead the CAG members through a general discussion of each element.

Stage / amphitheater

Question: Gill asked “Is there a need for a small intimate stage and larger venue?”

Response: The CAG responded stating two stages would be preferable and would serve different purposes.

Comment: Concept 1 is interesting, but intimacy is lost.

Comment: On Concept 1, I appreciate the design but it does not look practical. A smaller stage may be more useful.

Comment: Like the lagoon layout but a smaller band/performer may not find much functionality in this venue.

Comment: Not convinced there is a need for two stages and feel that the windmill should be incorporated in the stage design.

Windmill

Question: What is the hardscape around the windmill in Concept 1 and would there be space for street performers?

Response: There would be enough space, but would not be the right location for street performers.

Comment: The windmill is iconic and could be relocated to improve the view corridor depending on the cost.

Comment: The windmill’s maintenance would be an issue if it is moved to the point (closer to the beach); also, erosion might be an issue that needs to be further examined (if placed closer to the shoreline).

Ballfields

Question: If at some future point the ballfields were relocated elsewhere, would removing the ballfields be supported?

Response: The ballfields would not be removed until they could be located elsewhere. (*The CAG was generally supportive of this idea.*)

Question: If the park is designed without baseball fields and it takes 10-20 years to relocate them, have we limited ourselves?

Response: The implementation plan will be dynamic and change based on each city budget year.

Comment: Some of us enjoy watching little league and the close proximity to the playground allows families to play in the area while games are occurring.

Comment: In the future, if the ballfields can be relocated, it should be done to clear the areas for other multi-purpose uses. It is not practical to set up and tear down a temporary baseball field as illustrated in Concept 3.

Response: Temporary fields are very common and can be a lot of work, but a multi-use field could be set up for baseball.

Parking

Comment: Prefer the radial arc parking lot in Concept 3, that has better access to more park elements.

Response: Parking would be appropriately sized for the park and Clean Water Facility.

Comment: Prefer parking in Concept 3, as it does not dominate the park.

Vehicular access

Comment: Prefer no parking on the waterfront but understand the need to locate it near kitchens.

Gateway entrance

Question: The City Beach Street and Bayshore Drive intersection is currently a difficult intersection. Should there be an access point near the Clean Water Facility?

Response: The grand entrance can be a hybrid to emphasize the park's 'front door.' There could also be a major entrance and other minor entrances designated by signage.

Comment: Façade treatment for the north side of the Clean Water Facility has been considered and some improvements to the intersection of City Beach Street and Bayshore Drive could be made if this location were to become the main entrance.

Comment: Prefer some connection to Pioneer Avenue to unify the park with the old town.

Beach access

Comment: Removing the existing non-motorized boat ramp would remove access to the beach over the driftwood. There is a need for an accessible path to the beach.

Comment: Not in favor of the boardwalk due to low-tide issues.

Response: The boardwalk shown in Concept 2 is intended to provide access over the driftwood and onto the beach.

Event Plaza

Question: Would the event plaza in Concept 3 be accessible by vehicles?

Response: The plaza would be accessible for vehicles and would include removable bollards.

Waterfront promenade

Question: How far from the beach are the paths?

Response: The paths are approximately 10-20 feet from the beach.

Comment: The meandering path doesn't provide waterfront views from the entire length of the path.

Comment: Like the idea that the path is not straight and the meandering path is more interesting. However, the dunes may not be practical.

Response: The path's height can be increased to provide views over the dunes, and have a diversity of views throughout the park.

Comment: Runners may prefer the meandering path.

Comment: A meandering path may remove usable park space.

Comment: Prefer the lines and geometry of straight paths.

Interior paths

Preferences were tallied but CAG members did not provide comments on this element.

Landscape and gardens

Preferences were tallied but CAG members did not provide comments on this element.

Wetlands

Comment: Wetlands will have to be addressed regardless of concept.

Multi-purpose lawn

Preferences were tallied but CAG members did not provide comments on this element.

Rentable spaces

Preferences were tallied but CAG members did not provide comments on this element.

Staysail RV Park

Gill asked the CAG to participate in an informal "straw poll" about the future of the Staysail RV Park. Concept 1 is the only concept to include an RV Park. The CAG members voted in the following manner: nine CAG members saw value in removing the RV Park; one member indicated a preference to keep the RV Park, and two members were undecided.

Comment: Do not think the city should be managing an RV Park.

Comment: There should not be an RV Park in the Park.

Comment: Parking north of the Clean Water Facility could be designed to have larger parking spaces.

Response: This is not an option at that location and size constraints/turning radius availability.

Comment: Spaces for larger vehicles should be considered for day-use.

Response: Space already exists along Bayshore Drive and is currently used for this purpose (though not formally).

Comment: Would like to hear from the Chamber of Commerce regarding removing the RV Park.

Comment: The RV Park is unique in that is the only RV Park on Whidbey Island that is on the water.

Question: How often are RV Parks located in parks and are managed by cities?

Response: Very few RV Parks fit this description.

Round robin

Erin facilitated a round robin discussion asking the CAG members the following questions:

1. If you had to pick one design concept, which would it be?
2. If you had one preferred program element treatment, what is it?

CAG member’s responses are as follows:

Preferred Concept	Preferred Element Treatment	Notes
Concept 2	Parking crescent (Concept 3)	
Concept 2	Parking crescent (Concept 3)	
Concept 2	Parking crescent (Concept 3)	
Concept 1	Parking crescent (Concept 3)	
Concept 3	Parking crescent (Concept 3)	
Concept 2	Community space	
Concept 3	Stage (Concept 3)	
Concept 1	Ballfields and plaza	Sees the value of existing RV park
Concept 2 (Western portion)	Eastern part of Concept 3- Event plaza, field, parking lot	
Concept 3	Event plaza Parking crescent(Concept 3)	
Concept 3	Open space (Concept 1) Lagoon (Concept 1)	Assumes the RV park would be relocated nearby

Totals:

- Concept 1 preference: 2
- Concept 2 preference: 5
- Concept 3 preference: 4
- Parking crescent/Concept 3: 6
- Community space/room: 1
- Stage, Concept 3: 1

- Event Plaza: 1
- Eastern portion of Concept 3, including parking crescent: 1
- Lagoon/open space, Concept 1: 1

Jeff McGraw thanked the group for their feedback and explained that the design team would begin creating a preferred alternative based on the feedback received. Steve Powers also thanked the group for their work and noted that the design team will begin to create cost estimates for the elements.

Erin reminded CAG members that the next meeting would be held on Mar. 29 at the Elks Lodge and would be combined with a public open house.

Erin adjourned the meeting.

Appendix A: “Design Concept Cheat Sheet”

CAG members were provided the cheat sheet to refer to during the meeting. This sheet was also used during the preference exercise.

	Concept 1: Recreation	Concept 2: Naturalistic	Concept 3: Civic
Amphitheater/Stage	<i>Location: Lagoon</i>	<i>Location: Windmill Plaza</i>	<i>Location: Windmill Plaza</i>
Ball fields	<i>Four multipurpose fields. Relocate little league facility.</i>	<i>Three formal baseball fields (similar to existing).</i>	<i>One multi-purpose ball field. Relocate little league facility.</i>
Beach access	<i>Boardwalk extends off of waterfront promenade.</i>	<i>Mid-park path leading to beach.</i>	<i>Via Boardwalk.</i>
Event plaza	<i>Smallest, with vehicle access and parking.</i>	<i>Large, relocated parking, integrated splash pad, lawn, and playground.</i>	<i>Large, between hill and splash park with limited parking and drop-off area.</i>
Existing wetlands	<i>Enhanced with boardwalks and mounding.</i>	<i>Enhanced, bordering landscaped gardens and plaza.</i>	<i>Smallest, mixed with formal gardens.</i>
Gateway Entrance	<i>SE City Beach/SE Bayshore Dr.</i>	<i>SW Beeksma Dr. and SW Bayshore Dr.</i>	<i>SW Beeksma Dr. and SW Bayshore Dr.</i>
Interior Trail Network	<i>Through multi-purpose lawn and wetlands, connecting to SE Beeksma Dr. and northern businesses.</i>	<i>Multiple trails throughout the park and frames great lawn.</i>	<i>Multiple trails throughout the park and frames great lawn.</i>
Lagoon	<i>Smallest with event steps and central stage.</i>	<i>Reshaped and reduced with access steps.</i>	<i>Slightly reduced with access steps to plaza and windmill.</i>
Landscape and gardens	<i>Fewest formal garden areas. Many trees.</i>	<i>Formal gardens near wetlands, multi-purpose lawn and windmill.</i>	<i>Formal gardens, near lawn and possible community center site.</i>
Multi-purpose lawn	<i>Large, separated by pathways.</i>	<i>Graded lawn for events and performances.</i>	<i>Smaller, graded lawn for events and performances.</i>
Parking	<i>Adjacent clean water facility; near west restroom, near water.</i>	<i>Near ballfields, playground and kitchen on the beach; near west playground and rentable space.</i>	<i>Included near ballfield and east playground, clean water facility, the kayak campsite and the possible community center.</i>
Rentable spaces	<i>Two kitchens and a picnic area; informal picnic spaces.</i>	<i>Three wooded picnic shelters, one kitchen.</i>	<i>One shelter/kitchen.</i>
RV Park	<i>A 20-space park includes green space on west side.</i>	<i>Not included. Relocate to adjacent site.</i>	<i>Not included. Relocate to adjacent site.</i>
Vehicular access	<i>Access via SE City Beach St. Parking off SW Beeksma Dr. Downtown via SE Bayshore Dr.</i>	<i>SE City Beach St. access only to facility. SE Bayshore Dr. connects to parking lot via new entry drive.</i>	<i>Major streets connect directly to parking. SE City Beach St. also connects to facility.</i>
Waterfront promenade	<i>Straight</i>	<i>Meandering</i>	<i>Straight</i>
Windmill	<i>Relocated to the beach in the middle of the park.</i>	<i>Slightly relocated to the middle of the park.</i>	<i>Remains in current location.</i>

Appendix B: Agenda



City of Oak Harbor
Windjammer Park Integration Plan CAG Meeting 3
March 8, 2016
5:30 – 8:30 p.m.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- *Introduce and review design concepts*
- *Evaluate park elements as presented in each concept*
- *Set stage for preferred concept development*

AGENDA

5:30 – 5:40	Introductions	Erin Taylor
5:40 – 5:45	Recap priorities established at last meetings	Gill Williams
5:45 – 6:30	Windjammer Park Integration Plan draft design concepts <i>Presentation to describe draft design concepts</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>Design Concept 1 – Recreation</i>2. <i>Design Concept 2 – Naturalistic</i>3. <i>Design Concept 3 – Civic</i>	Gill, Jeff McGraw
6:30 – 6:45	Q & A regarding concepts <i>Clarification questions regarding concepts</i>	All
6:45 – 6:50	Break: review concepts	All
6:50 – 8:10	Concept preferences discussion <i>Preference exercise about park elements</i> <i>Comparison and discussion of park elements</i>	Erin Erin/Gill/Jeff
8:10 – 8:30	Round robin	Erin/All
	Next steps and adjourn	Erin
