





Graphic created by Ecem Afacan from Noun Project.

**CAG MEETING #1 SUMMARY NOTES
AND AGENDA**





Windjammer Park Integration Plan Community Advisory Group Meeting 1 Summary

Wednesday January 20, 2016

5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

Former Whidbey Island Bank Building

Bryan Shirley, Hoffman Construction, Clean
Water Facility

Erin Taylor, EnviroIssues

Dwight (member of the public)

Note taker:

Zack Ambrose, EnviroIssues

Facilitator:

Welcome and Introductions

Erin Taylor, Facilitator, EnviroIssues, began the meeting and introduced Mayor Bob Severns. Mayor Severns addressed the CAG and thanked them for their commitment to the project to help envision the future of the City of Oak Harbor's downtown waterfront jewel, Windjammer Park. Erin introduced the WPIP project team including Gill Williams and Jennifer D'Avanzo, GreenWorks (landscape architecture), Jeff McGraw with MWA Architects (built architecture/Clean Water Facility architect), and Steve Powers with the City of Oak Harbor Development Services Department. Erin Taylor asked CAG members to introduce themselves and share their homework, "elements of parks that they find inspiring." A general summary follows:

Melissa Riker, Representative of the City Park Board, Whidbey Island Race Director -- She and her child use the park, and family-friendly programs in parks inspire her.

Mike Wright, Chair of City Park Board -- He is inspired by stone and timber accents, similar to those at Fort Nugent Park in Oak Harbor.

Kara Valejo – She is inspired by family-friendly activities and activities that bring people together year-round, including examples like a splash pad and fire pit area.

Jes Walker-Wyse, Representative of the Oak Harbor Planning Commission -- She is inspired by inclusive playground equipment and activities for all abilities, lush native landscaping, and water recreation.

Jonathan Phillips – He is inspired by recreational activities including kayaking, bicycling, paddle boarding, and connecting the park to downtown Oak Harbor.

Greg Goebel – He is inspired by community centers, one example being the Puyallup Community Center.

Hal Hovey, representative of the neighboring condominiums -- He is inspired by a courtyard at Western Washington University, which replicates the San Juan Islands and his interest in using creative hardscapes in the park.

Franji Christian, representative of the neighboring condominiums -- She is inspired by integrating hardscape and soft scape, and rose gardens.

Kristi Freig, Representative of the Oak Harbor School District -- She is inspired by facilities for family barbecues, field trips, and playgrounds.

Background

The Windjammer Park Integration Plan (WPIP) will be a long-term plan for the 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.

The purpose of the January 20, 2016, first CAG meeting, was three-fold:

- Introduce and formalize the CAG
- Clarify program elements for Windjammer Park
- Prioritize program elements

A summary of the meeting follows.

Meeting Proceedings

Participants

Community Advisory Group Members

Franji Christian
John Fowkes
Karla Freund
Greg Goebel
David Goodchild
Hal Hovey
Ferd Johns
Kristi Krieg
Cheryl Lueder
Erik Mann
Skip Pohtilla
Jonathan Phillips
Melissa Riker
Norvin Stanley
Kara Vallejo
Jes Walker-Wyse
Michael Wright

Absent Community Advisory Group

Members

Mike Horrobin

Project staff:

Steve Powers, City of Oak Harbor
Development Services Director
Gill Williams, GreenWorks
Jennifer D'Avanzo, GreenWorks
Jeff McGraw, MWA Architects

Audience

Brett Arvidson, Project Engineer, Clean
Water Facility
Hank Nydam, Operations Manager, Oak
Harbor Parks and Recreation
Joe Stowell, City Engineer, Clean Water
Facility

Norvin Stanley, Representative of the Whidbey Island Kite Flyers -- He is interested in maintaining open space to take advantage of the south winds.

John Fowkes, local business owner/arts -- He is inspired by parks that have opportunities for theatrical / performance purposes (more substantial than a gazebo).

Karla Freund, Representative of the Oak Harbor Music Festival --She is inspired by greenery, art, and items that promote fitness and interactivity in the park.

Erik Mann, Representative of Windermere Real Estate -- He is inspired by elements that in turn stir activity at all hours, for example a splash park with LED lights and creative and aesthetically pleasing hardscapes. He is also interested in natural amphitheater and small kiosks for vending.

David Goodchild – He is inspired by active and passive park elements, with events that draw people to the area. Also interested in making sure funds are available to implement the Plan.

Cheryl Lueder, Representative of N Whidbey Little League, – She expressed that baseball fields are important. She is inspired by places that are for families all year round, not just big summer holidays.

Ferd Johns, Community member at large / Professor emeritus of architecture Montana State University - He is inspired by parks that are interactive with downtown.

Skip Pohilla, Representative of the Oak Harbor Art Commission -- He is inspired by using the Clean Water Facility to spur park thinking, including more water elements and making the park available for events throughout the year.

Review and adopt CAG charter

Erin Taylor discussed the purpose of the CAG and reminded the group that the Clean Water Facility will be integrated into Windjammer Park. The Clean Water Facility design process and WPIP are working in parallel, ensuring consistency and coordination. Steve explained that in siting the Clean Water Facility in Windjammer Park, and using portions of the park for construction, there are inherent impacts to the Park must be mitigated. Solutions for that mitigation may be developed by the CAG through this process, but the entire park will be envisioned as a whole. The WPIP will also contain a phasing schedule with expected funding; areas directly impacted by the Clean Water Facility could be eligible for funding through the sewer fund, while other recommendations for the park could be funded in other ways (to be determined). Gill clarified that as the plan comes together, park phasing will identify different avenues to fund specific park elements.

The group is being asked to:

- Be prepared for all meetings.
- Review information to understand elements that have been included in previous park plans.

- Provide feedback to Oak Harbor’s project team and advice on the definitions and locations of programmatic elements for Windjammer Park.
- Advise the city on interests of the community for the future Park, acting as a sounding board for the project team.
- Serve as a liaison to the public and/or their organizations in a timely manner.

Erin Taylor walked through the CAG’s purpose and charter, further explaining the group’s role as sounding board for the design team, and schedule to reach a final WPIP. Steve Powers explained the WPIP schedule is designed to be fast-paced, purposeful, and focused. Parts of the WPIP may be eligible for inclusion in Clean Water Facility construction, therefore need to be coordinated with the facility final design and construction schedule. Time will be taken, if needed, to ensure that a quality plan is achieved.

Erin Taylor discussed the CAG’s roles and her role as facilitator, and the group’s role as participants. She asked the group if the charter could be adopted, including roles, responsibilities and ground rules. The CAG members unanimously adopted the charter.

Plan background and schedule

Steve Powers introduced the WPIP, explained its purpose, and described existing park elements. The design team presented examples of parks comparable in acreage, location, and city size to Windjammer Park. Programming elements would serve as inspiration for Windjammer Park. Parks included:

- Riverfront Park - Corvallis, OR
- McEuen Park – Coeur d’Alene, ID
- Waterfront Park – Hood River, OR
- Riverfront Park - Milwaukie, OR

Review of Past Planning Efforts

Gill Williams provided an overview of existing park plans and previous planning efforts, emphasizing that the WPIP would be based on this existing work. The following plans offer basis for the WPIP:

- 1987 Park Plan
- 2005 Waterfront Enhancement Program
- 2007 Master Plan
- 2009 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan

Gill Williams explained the challenge is three fold: 1) integrating the Clean Water Facility into the park, 2) connecting the park to the growing downtown, and 3) connecting the park and facility to points east and west. Space activation and programming is vital to the park’s success. Gill provided an overview of the context map and explained that the park’s location within a larger park system. He discussed the existing conditions, explaining how the existing park could have improved program definition and “flow” or adjacency between park elements. The WPIP will help determine what a future park looks like, and recognizing the tone of the park and its relationship to surrounding activities and downtown core.

Park Programming Elements

Gill Williams led CAG members through a discussion of park element categories with sample images intended to be example inspiration. Gill explained that the park must serve many functions, including how parts can have year-round use. Creating multi-purpose spaces can maximize that park usage and relevancy, offering different reasons for people to visit. The following summary highlights the CAG's discussion only.

Question: Is there a formula or rule of thumb for programming 28.5 acres?

Response: No. Different variables have to be addressed in each park, depending on if it is rural or urban, major park function (soccer vs. garden), etc.

Access

Access was discussed in terms of either a grand entrance or smaller entrance at Beeksma Drive or City Beach. Access also includes access to the beach. The existing entry at Beeksma Drive and HWY 20 does not clearly provide direction to the park.

- The roundabout at the intersection of HWY 20 and Pioneer Way would be a good location for an entrance to downtown and Windjammer Park. Placing the entrance near the existing RV Park would be in an area not seen by the public.
- The existing Oak Harbor City logo should be incorporated into the design of the park or used to brand Windjammer Park.
- Beach access would be preferable, but programming should have a return on investment, which might be limited due to driftwood.
- To maintain beach access, accumulating driftwood would need to be controlled.
- The future of the RV Park should be considered in concert with a grand entryway?

Recreation

Lagoon

- A grand promenade could help activate the lagoon.
- The lagoon could be considered to be frozen for winter ice-skating.

Multiuse hard court

- Location of existing courts are oddly adjacent Oak Harbor Bay and affected by wind, but are still used regularly.

Splash Park

Splash parks vary in terms of art and aesthetic and tend to be active with kids and families. Splash parks can be programmed for nighttime use.

- The Experience Music Project in Seattle was discussed as a play space that was utilized during day and night.

Question: Does Windjammer Park close at night?

Response: It currently closes at 10 p.m.

Ballfields

The ballfields require increased acreage and can possibly be relocated and replaced with a multi-use space.

Playground

Playgrounds have evolved from traditional platform play to inclusive / barrier-free. A lot of creative thinking can happen for a new playground.

Open Space / Fields

Open space and fields can be composed of a variety of materials with various tradeoffs and benefits including combining turf and grass.

Question: Has there been any leading study about the safety of turf vs. grass?

Response: Crumb rubber and cork surfaces have been tested and the findings have assured safety for both impact and materials.

Gardens and Native Vegetative Spaces

Existing Wetlands

Wetlands can be an amenity to the park and can be enhanced by boardwalks. Wetlands can be integrated in a useful and graceful way with the rest of the park.

Question: What is the plan for the wetland? Is it categorized as a wetland?

Response: The wetland is categorized as a wetland and must be mitigated in some way: either mitigated off site, enhanced, or expanded.

Question: Can the wetland function to clean the storm water?

Response: Since it is categorized as a wetland, it becomes regulated by certain standards. Enhancements could be a way to mitigate some storm water.

Question: Is part of the CAG process going to determine the interface between the park and the northern commercial properties?

Response: Yes, these properties can become attractive places for commercial realty and / or green streets.

Landscape and Gardens

Passive garden spaces could include educational components.

Structures

Existing structures such as restrooms, kitchens, gazebos and windmill could be maintained depending on operations and maintenance of these facilities. The character of the structure could be unique but also cohesive.

- It was noted that if the existing buildings are determined to stay, the façades could be updated.

Site Furnishing

Furnishings create continuity in a broader park system and current options can provide character, a sense of place, and identity. The furnishings can reflect the character and personality of Oak Harbor.

Plantings

Plantings can function aesthetically to create spaces, delineate spaces, and can be functional and may include community gardens.

Event Space*Stage / Amphitheater*

A stage or amphitheater may resemble a traditional or formal amphitheater or be created by natural mounds that could serve as an event space. These types of facilities can serve multiple purposes and include a mix of hard and soft surfaces.

Overnight Use*RV Park*

The Staysail RV Park currently generates income for the City but its location disrupts the park's open space and the challenge is to integrate the RV Park or move it to another location.

Question: How many spaces are in the RV Park?

Response: Currently there are 56 hook up sites with 23 dry sites for tents.

Kayak Campsite

The kayak campsite at Windjammer Park is included on the existing Cascadia Marine Trail.

Automobile Infrastructure

Automobile infrastructure can be integrated into the park but will displace green space.

Question: Is there a way to incorporate a pedestrian bridge over Beeksma Drive to access the trailhead, especially for running races?

Response: The design team noted the need for a safe connection.

Question: Did the transportation plan adopt this current wetland area for a future Bayshore Drive?

Response: The transportation plan and the WPIP are dovetailing as the update processes are occurring simultaneously. If the street is not needed, it can be removed from the WPIP.

Non-motorized Boat Launch

The non-motorized boat launch may have maintenance concerns due to driftwood and tides and this space could be formalized.

Trail

The existing waterfront trail can be widened and soft surface paths can provide circulation in the park, potentially being a signature element of the future park.

Adjacent Uses/ North Park Commercial Redevelopment

The interface between the North Park Commercial area and the park could improve.

Question: Can a raised parking facility be constructed over the wetland to connect the northern commercial area with the park since there is some parking lost from the construction of the Clean Water Facility?

Response: There are ways to integrate these areas.

Prioritization Activity

Erin Taylor asked the CAG to participate in an activity to prioritize program elements they would like to see included in the WPIP. CAG members were provided five green stickers to place on elements they deemed priorities and one red stickler for elements that may not be considered a priority for inclusion. Erin asked the CAG members if there were any additional elements that should be included in the prioritization exercise. The following elements were added:

- Safe connection between bike trail and park
- Town / Municipal Dock
- Educational elements
- Fitness trail
- Improved linkages to downtown

(It should be noted that this prioritization exercise was similar to the prioritization exercise completed by City Councilmembers in December. For the CAG, additional specificity for descriptions were added to further clarify certain park elements.)

Erin Taylor summarized the dot exercise as follows:

Elements that were considered highest priority (received green dots) included:

- Waterfront park trails
- Splash park
- Amphitheater
- Ball field relocation
- Gardens
- RV Park (include in redesign)
- RV Park (relocate)

Elements that were not considered priorities (red dot) included:

- City / Municipal dock
- Bayshore Drive

The following elements received no dots. Erin Taylor asked the CAG to explain why these elements did not receive dots.

- North Park Commercial Redevelopment – The CAG felt that this element was difficult to understand; it is unclear what will happen with these properties in the future. They noted that the WPIP should show attainable actions.
- Parking – The CAG explained that parking will be available, is being addressed in concert with the Clean Water Facility, and would be included in the park regardless of priority by the group.
- Kayak Campground – The CAG explained that the kayak campground currently exists and if nothing was done, it would most likely stay.
- Site Furnishings – The CAG explained that site furnishings seem like a standard element in parks; they clarified that contemporary or Oak Harbor materials for these furnishings would be preferred over traditional aesthetic.
- Wetland – The CAG explained that it was unclear what the options would be for the wetland, and permitting may be part of a driver for its treatment.

Erin Taylor asked each CAG member if they were surprised by the results of the dot exercise. Most CAG members were not surprised by the results but the following elements and their prioritization or lack of prioritization, did cause some CAG members surprise:

- RV Park, including split between remain/renovate and relocate
- Ballfield (relocation)
- City Dock
- Bayshore Drive
- Bayshore Drive (relocation)

Erin Taylor provided the group an overview of the City Council’s priorities and clarified that the next step for the team would be to combine the two lists into a recommended, cohesive prioritization.

Next Steps

Erin Taylor clarified that the next meeting (Feb. 4, 2016) would have opportunity to see the draft list of priorities, and would be a chance for broad public review of the priorities. A more specific agenda would be provided prior to the next meeting. Erin adjourned the meeting.

Appendix A



**Windjammer Park Integration Plan
Community Advisory Group Meeting 1**
Wednesday, January 20, 2016
5:30 – 7:40 p.m.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

- *Introduce and formalize CAG*
- *Clarify program for Windjammer Park*
- *Prioritize park elements/program*

DETAILED AGENDA

Note: Facilitator will check in for potential break after 60 minutes

<i>Time</i>	<i>Agenda topic</i>	<i>Speaker</i>
5:30 – 6:00	Introductions and “homework review”	Steve Powers Erin Taylor
6:00 – 6:25	Review and adopt CAG charter	Erin T.
6:25 – 6:45	Plan background and schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define WPIP schedule • Clarify program for Windjammer Park, using previous plans as starting documents • Provide examples of waterfront parks and park elements for consideration 	Steve P. Gill Williams
6:45 – 7:15	Park program elements <i>Discuss and define starting point for Park program</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access • Recreation • Native / Vegetated space • Structures • Event spaces • Transportation and circulation • Adjacent uses • Additional elements 	Gill W. Jeff McGraw Erin T.

7:15 – 7:25	Prioritize park elements Dot exercise, discussion / themes	Erin T. Gill W. Jeff M. CAG Members
If time allows	Last words / Round-robin	All
7:25 – 7:30	Next steps	Erin T.
	Adjourn	

Appendix B: Prioritization Exercise





Graphic created by Ecem Afacan from Noun Project.

**CAG MEETING #2 SUMMARY NOTES
AND AGENDAS**





Windjammer Park Integration Plan Community Advisory Group Meeting 2 Summary

Thursday, February 4, 2016
5:30 – 6:30 p.m.
Elks Lodge

Additional staff (continued):

Joe Stowell, City Engineer, Clean Water Facility
Bryan Shirley, Hoffman Construction, Clean Water Facility

Facilitator:

Erin Taylor, EnviroIssues

Note taker:

Zack Ambrose, EnviroIssues

Background

The Windjammer Park Integration Plan (WPIP) will be a long-term plan for the 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 Feb. 4, 2016 second CAG meeting:

- Introduce WPIP and CAG to public
- Present draft priority park elements
- Discuss space constraints and launch points for park concept development
- Gather public feedback on park elements at an open house following the meeting

A summary of the CAG meeting follows. Comments received during the open house are also included for reference.

Meeting Proceedings

Participants

Community Advisory Group Members:

Franji Christian
John Fowkes
Karla Freund
David Goodchild
Mike Horrobin
Hal Hovey
Ferd Johns
Kristi Krieg
Cheryl Lueder
Erik Mann
Skip Pohtilla
Jonathan Phillips
Melissa Riker
Kara Vallejo
Jes Walker-Wyse
Michael Wright

Absent Community Advisory Group

Members:

Greg Goebel
Norvin Stanley

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

Welcome and Introductions

Erin Taylor, Facilitator, EnviroIssues, called the meeting to order and explained the CAG's operating ground rules. Erin acknowledged City Councilmember Joel Servatius and City Administrator Dr. Doug Merriman. 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.

Steve Powers thanked the group for attending. He recognized the sudden passing of CAG member Bob McNeil, acknowledging his volunteer spirit.

Erin recapped the first CAG meeting and introduced Gill Williams to discuss park elements.

Windjammer Park Integration Plan: Draft park element priority list

Gill Williams provided an overview of the list of prioritized park elements. This list was generated through both CAG and Council feedback. Gill clarified that space constraints will dictate how many of these elements will fit in the park. The design team will continue to consult the CAG to identify how priority elements that should move forward in the design process. Those elements were outlined as follows:

"Standard":

- Automobile infrastructure (City Beach and Beeksma bookend the park, and if Bayshore Dr. is to be relocated in or out of park)
- Canopy
- Existing wetlands
- Kayak campsite
- Kitchens
- Parking
- Restrooms
- Site furnishings - contemporary design or designed from materials found in Oak Harbor
- Windmill

High priority:

- Event plaza
- Lagoon (renovate)

- Splash park
- Stage / amphitheater
- Waterfront trail / park trails

Medium priority:

- Beach access
- Educational elements
- Gateway entrance (grand)
- Landscape and gardens
- Linkage to downtown
- Multi-purpose lawn
- North park commercial redevelopment
- Playground
- RV Park (relocate in or out of park)
- Safe connection bike trail to park (relocate in or out of park)

Low priority:

- Baseball fields (relocate in or out of park)
- Boat launch
- Fitness trail / equipment
- Gazebo
- Multi-use hard court / basketball court

Identified for removal:

- City dock
- Site furnishings – traditional
- Wading pools

Question: Why was automobile infrastructure (Bayshore Drive) categorized as “standard” in the prioritization list? I recall that most CAG members did not identify it as a priority.

Response: Bayshore Drive will be addressed through the Transportation Plan update process. City Beach Street and Beeksma Drive, that bound the park, will have to be integrated in Windjammer Park regardless of the outcome of Bayshore Drive. In addition, the Transportation Plan is likely to identify that Bayshore will not be extended, or that there is not enough benefit to the transportation network to extend it.

How big is that?

Erin explained that as Windjammer Park is modernized, some elements will be given more contemporary treatment, which may take more space. To demonstrate size of modern park elements, Gill discussed the size of the current RV Park and baseball fields, and various options to configure these larger elements out in a future Windjammer Park. The goal of this activity

was to show size and scale within the park and demonstrate tradeoffs, and how a landscape architect begins to explore these park “sketches.”

Steve clarified that “sketches” were not intended to show a City-endorsed proposal for use of space in Windjammer Park, or to endorse removal of Staysail RV Park or baseball fields. The team encouraged CAG members to consider the size of these elements and imagine what other park elements might be included in their place.

Gill showed several illustrations for using the space currently occupied by the Staysail RV Park and baseball fields.

Exchanging existing baseball fields for several multi-purpose fields



Illustration: configuration of multi-use fields in current baseball fields

Configuring multi-use fields elsewhere in park

Multi-purpose fields could also fit elsewhere in the park. For illustration, the existing ballfields remain. This also might constrain space on the existing Staysail RV Park, but still accommodate up to 17-20 updated spaces.



Illustration: space available for multi-use fields in Windjammer Park

Upgrading RV Park to current standards

Gill explained that the current Staysail RV park is not comparable to other, modern RV parks, and expectations of those RV campers. Newer parks have larger bays, pull-through spaces, increased privacy, and utility connections. There are currently three bookends for the RV Park:

1. Keep updated stalls within the existing footprint of Staysail RV Park, 17-20 updated spaces could be accommodated.
2. Update equal number of stalls to those today, using an expanded park footprint to accommodate those 57 spaces.
3. Remove the RV Park



Illustration: required space for 57 RV spaces at modern configuration

Question: How big are the small soccer fields shown in the second sketch?

Response: The soccer field is for U-12 (Under-12 players), approximately 50 yards x 80 yards.

Question: Would removable fencing be included in the multi-purpose fields?

Response: Multi-purpose fields would generally imply having availability of removable fencing and set up for a variety of sports.

Question: Could the fields be lit?

Response: Lighting can be considered based on possible impacts to the surrounding properties.

Question: Does a modern RV Park need to include green space between each stall?

Response: An updated RV Park could be designed to meet the needs of Oak Harbor.

Question: Should the RV Park be located outside park boundaries?

Response: The RV Park could be located elsewhere if it is determined that it is a future priority.

Question: Has the City explored other real estate options for an RV park?

Response: No. The City has the opportunity to decide if (as a public agency) it wants to continue to operate an RV Park, or if it is a service better operated by a third party/private enterprise.

Question: Does the park need to include all of these programming elements?

Response: No. These sketches are for illustration purposes. The CAG now has the opportunity to make recommendations for what should be included in the final plan presented in the WPIP.

Developing park concepts

Erin Taylor explained that the next step is to develop concepts with combinations of elements: standard, priority, and a combination of other park elements. Gill explained that depending on availability of space and size of park elements, each configuration may have more or less additional elements. It is likely that three park concepts will be developed, with and without the RV park and ballfields.

Erin asked the CAG to take a step back and think about available park space, those elements that have been established as standard and priority elements, and those that had not been further prioritized. She walked the CAG through a prioritization activity. Erin directed CAG members to focus on five elements in the park and rank them between 1 (most important) to 5 (least important).

The chart below summarizes the CAG’s responses.

		Priority				
		1	2	3	4	5
Elements within park	Grand gateway	1	0	0	1	4
	Beach access	0	2	3	5	0
	Playground	6	1	2	1	1
	Educational elements	0	1	1	0	1
	Landscape and gardens	4	2	4	3	1
	Wetland	0	0	0	1	0
	Multi-purpose lawn	1	8	0	2	2
	Multi-use hard court	0	1	1	0	2
	Fitness trail	0	0	2	0	2
	Contemporary site furnishings	0	0	1	0	0
	Material site furnishings	0	0	0	0	0
	Wind shelters	1	0	0	1	0
	Boat launch	0	0	0	0	0
	Gazebo	0	0	0	0	1
Elements outside park	North Park Redevelopment					
	Linkage to Downtown	1				1
	Safe connection / bike trail				1	

**Note: most CAG members did not focus on space outside the park; these elements should not be considered fully prioritized.*

Erin asked for general questions and comments about medium priority park elements.

Comment: Should the Staysail RV Park be included in the WPIP? Some consideration should be given to this type of space especially during festivals and events or the fear is that RV users will park elsewhere (without permission).

Comment: The RV Park attracts people to downtown but should not be upsized to meet today’s standards as it is out of scale with the rest of the park. The RV Park could be located in other areas close to the park on nearby properties.

Comment: The Staysail RV Park should stay due to its unique location on the water.

Comment: Coupeville has a pier to get out to a floating dock.

Comment: A more secluded area may be more appropriate for the Staysail RV Park. Upgrading the existing footprint is preferred over expansion.

Comment: RVs will park whether there are spaces or not. There will be RVs along the streets, which could affect events held at Windjammer Park.

Comment: Windjammer Park should be planned for the people of Oak Harbor first.

Question: Should the Staysail RV Park’s income determine the potential for a future upgrade?
Response: The RV Park generates approximately \$80,000 net profit per year but costs have not remained consistent.

Question: Can a fourth concept that would include ball fields and an upgraded RV park be developed?
Response: The Staysail RV Park can be upgraded and the revenue may be reduced. The 57 spaces could be improved or the current RV Park’s footprint could be maintained and spaces could be upgraded.

Question: How would improvements to the RV Park be funded? If funds are from the Clean Water Facility, would the RV Park’s revenue be used to pay off the Clean Water Facility?
Response: Question was tabled for a future discussion.

Question: If a city / municipal pier were a reality in the future, would it be included in Windjammer Park?
Response: The pier would go to Flintstone Park based on WPIP’s boundaries.

Question: What would the gazebo be?
Response: The gazebo would be a larger structure that could be rented for public use.

Question: The previous park plan included the adjacent marshland, could this land be used for the Staysail RV Park?
Response: Yes, this is a possibility depending on real estate acquisition, etc.

Erin asked the project team if there was enough feedback provided to begin developing concepts. Gill confirmed that this was the case and asked the CAG if he was correct in assuming that the CAG does not want the Staysail RV Park to look as it does today. CAG members

confirmed. Jeff McGraw suggested that one of the concepts will include the Staysail RV Park as it exists today.

Erin asked Gill to provide a preview of what would be coming next. At the next meeting, the CAG and design team will begin mixing layouts and developing drawings and vignettes. This activity will be used by the design team to further develop park concepts.

Public Questions and Answers

Erin asked the public for clarifying questions for the design team:

Question: Will there be a road (Bayshore Extension) that cuts through the park?

Response: The Transportation Planning process currently dictating that the road is not necessary and City Council was informed of this analysis on February 3.

Question: Will improvements to the lagoon be considered?

Response: Functional improvements to the lagoon will be included in park concepts.

Question: Regarding the Staysail RV Park, one option might be to reduce the size, include modern facilities, and charge more. Why would revenue decrease?

Response: If the size of the existing Staysail RV Park were reduced by a third, raising the rates would be one way to recoup the lost revenue. A study would need to be developed.

Question: How much will tourism be impacted if the Staysail RV Park is lost in any form?

Response: Currently, the city has been unable to draw a conclusive connection between the Staysail RV Park and downtown business revenues.

Question: What prevents someone with an RV from taking up three parking spaces on the street otherwise?

Response: This question was tabled for a future conversation.

Erin recapped the purpose of the CAG meeting for members of the public who arrived late and clarified that the purpose of the WPIP is to examine the park holistically, and understand how the new Clean Water Facility could be integrated into the park. Erin described the open house, asking members of the public take a look at inspiration/precedent images of park elements, provide their feedback, and offer input toward placement of those elements in the park.

Erin adjourned the CAG meeting and transitioned to the Open House.

Appendix A: “Adjacency Matrix”

CAG members completed the adjacency matrix above and could place an ‘X’ indicating that there is a critical connection between two elements or a ‘C’ indicating that a connection was apparent but it was not critical. The table above includes the combined weighted results. A color scale has been applied to highlight which items received the majority of points. The following table shows which elements received more than 5 points. Elements receiving less than 5 points are not included.

Element	Automobile infrastructure	Baseball fields	Beach Access	Boat launch	Canopy	Event plaza	Existing wetlands	Fitness trail/equipment	Gateway entrance	Gazebo	Kayak campsite	Kitchens	Lagoon	Landscape and gardens	Linkage to downtown	Multi-purpose lawn	Multi-use hard court/basketball court	Parking	Playground	Restrooms	RV Park	Site furnishings	Splash park	Stage/amphitheater	Waterfront trail/park trails	Windmill
Automobile infrastructure																										
Baseball fields	8																									
Beach Access	2	0																								
Boat launch	9	0	8																							
Canopy	2	0	0	0																						
Event plaza	7	1	0	2	1																					
Existing wetlands	2	0	2	0	0	0																				
Fitness trail/equipment	0	4	1	0	0	0	0																			
Gateway entrance	11	0	0	1	0	2	0	0																		
Gazebo	2	0	0	0	7	3	2	0	0																	
Kayak campsite	0	0	8	1	2	0	0	1	0	0																
Kitchens	3	1	0	0	14	5	0	0	1	6	2															
Lagoon	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0														
Landscape and gardens	0	2	4	2	6	8	8	0	7	6	2	2	3													
Linkage to downtown	11	0	5	0	1	4	2	5	7	0	4	0	0	5												
Multi-purpose lawn	0	1	3	0	5	9	0	1	2	6	0	5	8	3	2											
Multi-use hard court/basketball court	2	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1										
Parking	14	4	2	7	1	10	0	0	7	4	2	3	1	4	7	5	4									
Playground	3	3	0	0	3	1	0	0	3	4	0	8	7	4	2	5	4	4								
Restrooms	2	9	0	4	7	6	0	0	3	6	6	16	6	3	1	7	7	5	12							
RV Park	7	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	1	3	4	2	0	3	2	5						
Site furnishings	0	5	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	2	0	11	0	4	2	2	2	1	5	2	0					
Splash park	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	4	11	10	1	2				
Stage/amphitheater	5	0	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	2	2	10	1	3	2	2	0	4	0	6	0	4	0			
Waterfront trail/park trails	2	0	10	0	2	1	4	2	2	2	8	2	3	6	3	6	1	3	0	2	3	5	1	0		
Windmill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	

WEIGHTED: X's (x2), C's (x1)



Automobile infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseball fields Boat launch Event plaza Gateway entrance Linkage to downtown Parking RV Park
Baseball fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrooms
Beach access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boat launch Kayak campsite Waterfront trail / park trails
Boat Launch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking
Canopy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gazebo Kitchens Restrooms
Event plaza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape and gardens Multi-purpose lawn Parking Restrooms
Existing wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape and gardens
Gateway entrance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape and gardens Linkage to downtown Parking
Gazebo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kitchens Landscape and gardens Multi-purpose lawn Restrooms
Kayak campsite	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrooms Waterfront trail / park trails
Kitchens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playground Restrooms Site furnishings

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage / amphitheater
Lagoon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-purpose lawn • Playground • Restrooms
Landscape and gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterfront trails / park trails
Linkage to downtown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking
Multi-purpose lawn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrooms • Waterfront trail /park trails
Multi-use hard court / basketball court	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrooms • Waterfront trail / park trails
Playground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrooms • Splash park
Restrooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Splash park • Stage / amphitheater

**Appendix B
Public Comments**

The following comments were received during the open house. Participants provided comments via comment cards and flip charts. Comments are transcribed verbatim and scanned versions are included in this summary.

Comment Card 1

Bird watching, don't remove baseball field, restort windmill and gen. power, cleen lagoon from jelly fish and seaweed, make playground smaller

Comment Card 2

Make walkways wide enough for police cars to drive on so they can easily patrol the park at night.

Comment Card 3

- *Move RV park and ballfields out of park*
- *Park should allot space to activities that a majority of people use*
- *Cost would be helpful in evaluating different use options*

Comment Card 4

Please consider preserving the mid-century modern architecture of the kitchen and restroom buildings. This could be cost effective and unique – Oak Harbor has much interesting modern design that other small cities in the area don't have.

Comment Card 5

Don't put high noise programs near condos. High noise = basketball, splash park.

Comment Card 6

Thought: Next time provide Post-Its so that feedback can be provided more anonymously and more than one person can contribute to a poster at a time (they are compostable). Thanks for the interesting meeting.

Letter from Dwight Galbraith

To: City Beach Advisory Committee

From: Dwight Galbraith, Retired School Teacher, Local business owner for 35 years

Date: February 1, 2016

1. The parking at City Beach on a nice day during the summer is scarce as it is. When we create the plan for redevelopment of the park we will need more parking.
2. We need to look at repurposing the area that the outdated lagoon occupies. In other words, "Fill it in."
3. Creating a splash park for the young kids would be a much safer option. It would have a much higher utilization by all, and much more easily supervised. You **must** visit the Kiwanis Splash Park near Hillcrest Park in Mt Vernon. It is a great exciting place for the kids.
4. The skateboard park should be moved from its remote location behind Oak Harbor Elementary to City Beach. This would allow much better supervision and visibility. This could also allow the park to become an integral part of the community, instead of hidden away and adversely impacting the local neighborhood. Many parents will not let their kids visit the skateboard park because of stories about what goes on there. It is almost impossible to supervise. Set it up so local police could drive by it without getting out of their patrol cars. Make it a positive part of the community. Perhaps contests and events focused on skating.
5. Remove the baseball fields. They are used very few days/hours during the year. Times have changed; we need to concentrate on utilization. We used to have tennis courts, slides, swings, wading pools and barbecue shelters. They are gone. Now the lagoon and baseball fields need to go.
6. A well protected outdoor amphitheater would also be great for summer music events. It would serve all ages with music, movies and events. The city beach gazebo is not adequate.
7. Create spaces for vendors to rent & store kayaks, bicycles, etc. Reserved spaces for food trucks would be a plus, also.
8. **City Beach Park is the Jewel of Oak Harbor.** We need to keep in mind the park is for the residents of Oak Harbor first, and then for tourists. If we create a great place for our own residents, the tourists will come.

Comments from flip charts

- Signage – pick up after dog, within park – currently only on either end.
- Play grounds a must
- Sea wall (small) along walkway
- Love to see an amphitheater!!
 - Amphitheater – music fest
 - Need a stage, music / drama
 - Concerts?
- All park structures have green roofs
- Windmill – bring it back to life, show actual workings and power meter
- Trail to beach to bird viewing blind
- Relocate RVs and ballpark
- Waterfront – heart of the city park
- Build yurts instead of RV park
- Relocate RV Park and ballfields
- LED – a must, change colors with events.

Appendix C



City of Oak Harbor
Windjammer Park Integration Plan CAG Meeting and Open House
 February 4, 2016
 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.


MEETING OBJECTIVES

- *Introduce Windjammer Park Integration Plan and Community Advisory Group to public*
- *Present draft priority park elements*
- *Discuss space constraints and launch points for park concept development*
- *Gather public feedback on park elements*

AGENDA

5:30 – 5:40	Introductions and ground rules <i>*CAG “homework” collected</i>
<hr/>	
5:40 – 5:45	Windjammer Park Integration Plan: draft park element priority list <i>Presentation of priorities, as defined by City Council and CAG</i>
<hr/>	
5:45 – 6:00	“How big is that?” <i>Presentation to understand scale of modern park elements</i>
<hr/>	
6:00 – 6:30	Developing park concepts <i>Discussion: Begin considering space trade-offs</i>
<hr/>	
6:35 – 6:40	Public Q&A
<hr/>	
6:50 -7:30	Adjourn to Public Open House <i>Gather public feedback on park element priority list and initial thoughts on placement of specific park elements</i>

**CAG MEETING #3 SUMMARY NOTES
AND AGENDAS**





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





Graphic created by Ecem Afacan from Noun Project.

**CAG MEETING #4 SUMMARY NOTES
AND AGENDAS**





Windjammer Park Integration Plan Community Advisory Group Meeting 4 Summary

Tuesday, March 29, 2016

5:30 – 6:30 p.m.

Elks Lodge

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. 18, 2016 fourth CAG meeting:

- Recap park concept to date
- Present draft plan/draft preferred concept
- Gather public feedback on draft plan

A summary of the CAG meeting follows.

Meeting Proceedings

Participants

Community Advisory Group Members:

Franji Christian

John Fowkes

Karla Freund

David Goodchild

Hal Hovey

Ferd Johns

Kristi Krieg

Cheryl Leuder

Erik Mann

Jon Phillips

Skip Pohtilla

Melissa Riker

Kara Vallejo

Jes Walker-Wyse

Michael Wright

Absent Community Advisory Group

Members:

Greg Goebel

Mike Horrobin

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

Joe Stowell, City Engineer, Clean Water

Facility

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 third CAG meeting and discussed the evening's agenda.

Recap of general design options

Gill Williams provided an overview of the CAG's activities to date, including: prioritization of park elements, completion of an adjacency matrix, and development of three draft concepts. Gill explained the themes of the three concepts, including recreational, naturalistic, and civic. Gill discussed the various concepts including the inclusion or exclusion of the baseball fields and RV Park as they exist currently. *(For more information about the three draft concepts, please see Meeting 3 Summary).*

Windjammer Park Integration Plan preferred design concept

Gill reminded the CAG that throughout the process, the plan will continue to be refined and evolve based on feedback from the CAG, community and City Council.

Erin asked the CAG to take notes during the presentation and consider how well the preferred concept / draft plan incorporates feedback they have provided.


Gill walked the CAG members through the various elements of the preferred concept / draft plan. The following elements are included in the preferred concept / draft plan:

- Infrastructure to address storm water storage issues
- Crescent parking lot
- Reconfigured rentable picnic spaces
- Reconfigured Waterfront trail – undulate between dunes at various heights to create a slight buffer along the waterfront
- Reconfigured lagoon – dune like landscape with overlooks; current lagoon inlet will be maintained
- Smaller stage and larger stage area for various size events
- Water feature extended from Clean Water Facility, stretches from north to south along a new promenade with a terminus at the harbor
- Playground and splash park in close proximity to each other
- Sloped lawn spaces for viewing the harbor / fireworks, etc.
- Multi-use sport fields




Preferred concept / draft plan


Gill also discussed five enlarged views of the preferred concept / draft plan. (Please refer to the presentation for larger images of the slides.)



Enlargement 1




Enlargement 2



Enlargement 3



Enlargement 4



Enlargement 5

CAG questions & answers

Erin asked the CAG if they had any clarification questions for the design team. No questions were asked.

Erin asked each CAG member to indicate how well the plan incorporates the feedback provided on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 – not at all, 5 – agree). Comments are quoted as verbatim and are as follows.

Name	On a scale from 1-5, how well has the draft plan incorporated your feedback?	Why do you feel this way?
Karla Freund	5	“The design team incorporated everything that was discussed and I approve of the windmill placement. The park has a good flow.”
John Fowkes	4.5	“This park looks like a neat place to hang out for the weekend but there feels like something is missing. Overall the feedback has been incorporated.”
Franji Christen	4	“Pleased at how the design team has listened and incorporated feedback including the relocation of the windmill, lagoon, and open spaces. Can City Beach Street turn right and not have the street on the west side of the park?”
Mike Wright	4	“Concerned about parking on the east side and may create problems with condos and increased park traffic. Concerned about kitchens, bathroom placements, and wetlands.”
Jes Walker-Wyse	4	“Approve of the windmill placement. Still absorbing the overall plan.”
Kara Vallejo	5	“Overall, a positive transformation has taken place and could have never imagined.”
Melissa Riker	3 (ranked by Melissa’s son)	“Concerned about landscape areas near crescent parking area and maintenance costs to maintain gardens. Who will fund these?”

Skip Pohtilla	4-4.5	"Concerned about access and parking but approve of the idea of moving the windmill so it is visible from HWY 20 to draw people to park. Concerned about landscape maintenance and issues, may replace with some art or shade trees that may not need as much maintenance. For beach access, dunes could be replaced with a manmade beach above high tide, similar to what was done in Vancouver."
Jon Phillips	5	"Like the increase of trails, natural design, the dunes as natural windbreaks, and understand that by pulling picnic spaces away from beach, maintenance can be reduced. Approve of parking throughout park, promenade with splash park and defined terminus will be the defining point for the park."
Erik Mann	4-4.5	"Not fond of the dune concept and reduction of open space in the park as this area will require more maintenance and take away views of the park. Windmill relocation is a plus and approve of the event space."
Cheryl Leuder	4	"I understand that the ballfields and RV Park aren't included. I approve of the windmill relocation but dislike the road nearest the condos due to light pollution and traffic impacts."
Kristi Krieg	4	"I understand that change is hard and ballfield removal is difficult to imagine. I understand it won't meet everyone's needs but seems to meet the needs discussed."
Ferd Johns	5	"Great plan, turns the corner on downtown and moving away from vehicular to pedestrian. Takes advantage of the waterfront and park visitors will have a variety of activities and a lot of different experiences."
Hal Hovey	4	"Like the potential windmill relocation. Don't like the west side of the lagoon, the dunes, the east-end parking and street. This does not seem like an easy concept to build incrementally."
Dave Goodchild	4	"How often is the kayak campsite being used by the general public? The dune landscape is interesting. In terms of park architecture, what is the park's character or theme? Will it be Dutch or reference Deception Pass? Concerned with rentable space management at City level and appearance of gardens during off-season."

Erin explained that she would send the CAG homework to provide more specific feedback following the meeting. Additionally, an online open house would be available for comment for

two weeks for the public to provide feedback on the preferred concept / draft plan discussed during this meeting.

Public questions and answers.

Erin asked the public if there were clarification questions for the design team.

Question: What happens to the Dutch Boy?

Response: Public art and memorials will remain in the park and can be salvaged as much as possible for future placement.

Comment / Question: Need to make sure this park plan is useable and enacted. Concerned that the ballfields and RV Park should remain as a draw for families, kids, and tourists into downtown.

Erin rephrased this as a question: If the RV Park was replaced what is the space allocated for it?

Response: The RV Park with modernized spaces, would have one-third the space it does today. Nothing would happen until the RV Park and ballfields could be relocated elsewhere.

Question: Have the Fourth of July been considered?

Response: Yes, the fireworks can still be seen from the park and the harbor is visually accessible.

Question: Have construction costs been associated with design elements? How will the plan be phased and implemented?

Response: The design team is collecting planning-level cost estimates and phasing options that will be shared with the CAG at the next meeting. An undetermined amount of work will take place during the construction of the Clean Water Facility.

Question: Has there been any consideration of the properties north of the park?

Response: The City is not currently considering purchasing additional land for parks.



City of Oak Harbor
Windjammer Park Integration Plan CAG and Open House

March 29, 2016
 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- *Recap park concept to date*
- *Present draft plan/draft preferred concept*
- *Gather public feedback on draft plan*

AGENDA

5:30 – 5:40	Introductions	Erin Taylor
5:40 – 5:50	Recap general design options	Gill Williams
5:50 – 6:25	Windjammer Park Integration Plan preferred design concept <i>Presentation to describe preferred design concept [20 min]</i> <i>CAG Q&A and discussion [20 min]</i>	Gill, Jeff McGraw
6:25 – 6:30	Public Q&A	All
6:40 – 7:30	Adjourn to Public Open House <i>Gather public feedback on draft park plan/draft preferred concept</i>	All

**CAG MEETING #5 SUMMARY NOTES
AND AGENDA**





Windjammer Park Integration Plan Community Advisory Group Meeting 5 Summary

Thursday, May 5, 2016

5:30 – 7:30 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) provides a forum for community members to inform the future vision of Windjammer Park.

Objectives for the May 5, 2016, fifth CAG meeting:

- Recap park concept to date
- Present draft plan/draft preferred concept
- Gather public feedback on draft plan

A summary of the CAG meeting follows.

Meeting Proceedings

Participants

Community Advisory Group Members:

Franji Christian
John Fowkes
Karla Freund
David Goodchild
Hal Hovey
Kristi Krieg
Cheryl Leuder
Erik Mann
Jon Phillips
Skip Pohtilla
Melissa Riker
Kara Vallejo
Jes Walker-Wyse
Michael Wright

Absent Community Advisory Group

Members:

Ferd Johns
Greg Goebel
Mike Horrobin

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
Karl Hadler, Corrollo Engineers
Beth Munn, City Councilor
Chad Sanderson, MWA Architects
Joe Stowell, City Engineer, Clean Water
Facility

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 reminded the group that this was anticipated to be the last meeting for the Windjammer Park Integration Plan. Erin provided a general recap of the CAG's purpose and charter established at the beginning of the process and recapped the community involvement process to date. She let the group know that at the end of the meeting, they would consider next steps for the group.

Present feedback received on draft plan / preferred concept

Erin provided a recap of feedback received during the previous in-person and online open houses. Key Plan feedback included:

- Family-friendly elements and activities should be prioritized, especially supporting splash park.
- Observations that there are a lot of different elements in the park plan.
- Concern about effect on Waterside Condos (due to new activities or driveway/ parking).
- Varied opinions on the inclusion of dunes as part of walking path, potentially needing additional information/clarity of design.
- CAG generally agrees with removing/relocating RV Park and ball fields, if other locations can be found. Public opinion varies.
- Consensus that the waterfront is a resource and asset.

Gill Williams presented the updated preferred plan and addressed specific updates. Gill walked through the following feedback and how it had been addressed in the updated preferred plan. Erin reiterated that the plan is a master plan and that a more specific level of detail will be provided later.

Family-Friendly Activities

Gill explained that family friendly activities, such as the splash park, play areas, and programmable open space, have been clustered near each other to promote this synergy. These elements have been located in close proximity to both parking and restrooms.

Question: What size are the buildings?

Response: Building size will be determined as each design phase comes to fruition. Conceptually, we should assume that the plan shows a placeholder for a building of general types.

Question: Will the water from the water feature and splash park recirculate through the Clean Water Facility?

Response: More details regarding implementation and construction would be developed, as construction plans for each element and phase are determined. That specific element requires some water engineering design.

Shoreline Enhancement and Trail

Gill explained that the CAG and community expressed that the “dune concept” was a concern. Gill explained that the updated interpretation includes a fairly flat landscape that provides a shoreline buffer between the water and the park. This area would include subtle, integrated overlook areas with natural plantings.

Wetlands

Gill explained that the wetlands have a functional purpose, and integration with the Clean Water Facility will assist with flood control. In addition, they serve as a natural amenity for the park.

Trees and Plantings

Gill explained that the CAG had previously expressed concern with tree canopy height, density of plants, and general maintenance concerns. These concerns have been addressed through creation of open space and reduction of trees and plantings. As the design process moves forward, attention will be paid in coordination with parks staff to make judgment calls for total density and height of vegetation.

Impacts to Waterside Condos

Concern about the effect on the Waterside Condos with the proposed road along the east side of the park has been addressed: the road has been removed, as well as the park-and-view and east side parking areas. Gill noted that an existing pathway between the condos and baseball fields is an existing utility corridor and therefore will be and must be maintained.

Gill proceeded to walk through enlargements of the various park areas with precedent imagery. Gill discussed a suggested “modern windmill” artistic wind turbine, placed at the north-south promenade terminus. This wind sculpture could harvest wind power, and could be a combined effort with the Arts Commission.

Question: Is there space on the grass for classic automobiles?

Response: Yes.

Question: Will there be standing water in the splash park all summer long?

Response: No, the water shown is for illustrative purposes. A splash park does not include standing water.

Erin asked the group for clarifying questions regarding the updated preferred plan.

Question: Have the RV Park and ball fields disappeared, or have they been relocated when this plan is complete?

Response: Steve noted that the CAG had previously provided feedback indicating that the RV Park was not essential for the future design of the park, but that the ball fields should not be

removed until a new location was found. Information about the CAG decision-making process will be included in the master plan document.

Question: In this plan, are there less, or more, parking spaces than exist today at Windjammer Park?

Response: Additional parking spaces will be added mostly to the west side of the park. The plan includes approximately 200 spaces.

Question: Given the proximity of the splash park to Oak Harbor Bay, is there concern for salt water, sand, and debris to damage filtering system?

Response: This can be addressed through system design and engineering.

Question: What is the lagoon’s purpose? Will it be used for swimming?

Response: The existing lagoon can be improved upon; in this plan, the footprint has been reduced and better integrated into the promenade. An aerator could be installed to improve the water quality. Due to archaeological resources in this area, the plan is to limit deep digging. How it is used for swimming/activities can be further defined in future design.

Question: Will access to the lagoon be limited?

Response: The lagoon would only be accessible from the eastern side.

Question: Concerning the plantings, will trees be planted?

Response: Yes, trees will be planted.

Question: Is there still access to the beach? How will access be protected from driftwood?

Response: The plan includes four beach access locations. Protection will have to be addressed during design and construction and can vary depending on location. Any construction on the beach is heavily regulated.

Question: Where is the windmill located currently vs. in this plan?

Response: Today the windmill is located northeast of the lagoon, and the plan proposes its relocation to Beeksma Street as part of the grand entrance.

Question: Does the park have a net loss or gain of green space?

Response: The plan will temporarily reduce green space until the ball fields are relocated. Once relocated, the park will gain green space.

Erin asked each CAG member to provide their initial, general perspectives of the preferred plan so far. Responses included:

- Appreciated the design team listening to feedback and incorporating it into the design.
- Still concerned with the amount of waterfront parking as people will sit in their cars on stormy days and watch the water.

Response: Parking can be easily expanded and a playground be relocated. Parking and park space must be balanced to accommodate a reasonable amount of activity.

- Too much parking in the park and asked if the City could conduct a study of current parking utilization (two comments).

Response: Yes, the City could complete this study during the design phase; there is a list of items that will need further refinement as the master plan is put in motion, and parking can be addressed then.

- Desire to have the splash park developed in a way that is bright, colorful and light. The current plan looks more natural.
- Worry about longevity of some activities that may be popular today (e.g., bocce), but not in the long-term. Concern with the waterfront enhancements and trail noting that it would be underutilized and advocating for a boardwalk.
Response: Like all specific elements in the plan, the splash park will continue to be refined and designed. Programmed spaces are generally widely uses, it is a balance between various park uses to have flexible and programmed spaces.
- Wonder if it is realistic to spend money to build the baseball fields elsewhere and where funding would come from.
- 450 kids currently use the baseball fields and noted that a small percentage of people will use the new park space for activities such as bocce.
Response: Reminder that the plan was an opportunity to look at the park as a whole, all audiences who use it, and the plan is a concept for what could be.
- People currently use various park spaces and thought that they would enjoy the new programmed space. The park will appeal to everyone.
- Excitement about possible parks enhancements.

Phasing, Cost, and Funding

Gill walked the group through a discussion of general costs, phasing, and possible funding to implement the preferred plan. Gill explained that initially, the plan would be implemented by through restoration work following Clean Water Facility construction. Gill walked through the various comparable parks and costs per acre, noting that each park had elements that may be included in the future Windjammer Park.

Gill discussed the comparable parks and associated costs noting that the average cost was \$640,000 / acre. Parks varied in cost depending on complexity and elements. Various funding sources were also included for each park. The proposed cost for Windjammer Park is approximately \$630,000 / acre.

Gill reiterated that the group should think big about how the park can be used in the future, beyond how it is used today. Steve Powers reminded the group that the cost estimate is a planning-level estimate with contingencies built in, not a true cost estimate of what would be built. Costs would continue to be refined.

Jeff McGraw explained that there are high and low cost areas of any park.

Question: What park had the largest acreage? Were the costs final, as built?

Response: 8.5 acres, costs were final.

Comment: Westmoreland Park in Portland is similar to Windjammer Park and is very popular with children.

Phasing

Gill discussed the various phasing options for the park and noted that there would be six phases.

- *Phase 1* – Phase 1 focuses around the Clean Water Facility with excavated soil used for Phase 1B which includes grading and seeding.
- *Phase 2* – Phase 2 includes the western edge of the park, streetscape enhancements, relocation of the windmill, parking crescent and roundabout.
- *Phase 3* – Phase 3 includes restoration of the great lawn, removal of some structures, regarding, and the stage area.
- *Phase 4* – Phase 4 includes the lagoon restoration and shoreline enhancement.
- *Phase 5* – Phase 5 will occur once the existing ball fields have been relocated.

Question: If the existing RV Park is not restored as part of the Clean Water Facility, could the savings be applied to Windjammer Park?

Response: The City has imposed a series of conditions that provide flexibility concerning the RV Park. This includes rebuilding in the same location, rebuilding elsewhere, or do not rebuild and use the funds for *Phase 1*.

Steve Powers walked the group through the potential funding mechanisms available, including and beyond the City's sewer fund and general fund. Steve noted that the sewer fund is allocated to restoring areas impacted by the construction of the Clean Water Facility. Steve explained that the City has access to funding sources, loan and grant opportunities, which could be used to develop the park, and noted that the plan is to match funding sources with applicable projects. He reiterated that there will be a plan to fund specific park elements and the City can leverage revenue with other groups or matching funds to fill out a feasible funding implementation plan.

Erin reminded the group to focus on the phasing of the park plan, as shown in their charter, and opened the floor to questions.

Question: What is the total duration of the plan and what is the City's capability to implement the plan?

Response: The plan does not have a timeframe. The City and community will be responsible for plan implementation. The community and City Council must work together to communicate, especially during the budgeting process. Phases 1 and 1B have a short timeline since they will be completed during the construction of the Clean Water Facility.

Question: How viable is it to remove the RV Park? Will City Council approve this approach?

Response: City Council will have to answer this question and consider whether the RV Park is a long-term revenue stream.

Question: Can funding sources be applied to multiple park elements?

Response: Yes but certain funding sources, especially Federal funds, are constrained. City funds are more flexible but scarce.

Question: Is there a process for keeping the plan's momentum going?

Response: The CAG process and community interest can keep the process moving with City Council to keep the plan on track.

Question: With the completion of the Clean Water Facility in 2018, how can the community be assured that Phases 1 and 1B will be implemented?

Response: The City has no interest in leaving an empty construction site. By allocating funds through the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), the plan can be implemented in phases.

Question: Would the City consider a permanent grant writer?

Response: Currently, City departments collaborate in writing grants. There has been past conversation about hiring a grant writer, but the position was not a good use of resources.

Question: Will the soil removed for the Clean Water Facility construction be used on site?

Response: Yes, most of the soil will be used to raise the Clean Water Facility, and the remainder can be applied to Phase 1B of the park plan shown.

Question: Will the community be involved during the phasing process?

Response: The community could be involved and if there is an interest. This idea will be passed along to City Council. Continued involvement builds ownership and stewardship for the future park.

CAG Wrap-up

Erin reminded the CAG of their charter and role. At the previous meeting, Erin asked the CAG to rank from 1 to 5 how well their input was received and incorporated and encouraged the CAG members to reflect on this moment, given on average they had ranked around 4.5. Erin then asked the CAG to provide one of three responses:

Thumbs up – Feedback has been well received and incorporated and the CAG is achieving what was set forth in the charter.

Thumbs down – Nothing has been achieved, or input incorporated.

Thumbs middle – A thumbs up but there are one or two concerns.

10 CAG members gave a thumbs up, 0 members gave a thumbs down, and four members gave a thumbs middle.

Of the CAG members that gave "middle", Erin asked what are the major concerns and whether they would need to be addressed in the written plan or design. Erin also asked if the plan could be sent to City Council. CAG members responded in the following manner.

John Fowkes – John realized that everyone won't be happy, but this accommodates a lot of feedback and perspectives; his hope is that the final design continues to be defined and that there is parking for larger rigs.

Hal Hovey – Hal expressed his approval of the plan overall, but noted that his concerns are with phasing and that the plan could lose momentum for implementation, similar to the Clean Water Facility's community room.

Kristi Krieg – Kristi expressed her approval of the plan, but is concerned with the total budget. She has hesitation to change, but realizes that the park can be a community amenity.

Franji Christen – Franji expressed her approval of the plan, but is concerned that there are too many restrictions that will alter the final plan or funding won't be available. Franji reiterated the need to have the community involved throughout the implementation process.

Skip Pohtilla – Skip noted that there should be a public relations/engagement effort for the plan to describe the process and what the plan could mean for the City. Franji noted that she would be interested in helping this effort.

Erin summarized the group's feedback noting that most members approved of the plan and that it should be refined and sent to City Council. She noted that they had expressed an additional recommendation that there should be a strong emphasis on maintaining momentum through the CIP and phasing processes. The CAG was generally in favor of this plan. As such, the CAG's two recommendations to Council were as follows:

1. The group supports the recommended plan, because the process has been inclusive, the design team listened to their input, and the plan incorporates that feedback.
2. The community engagement process has built momentum for the plan, and should be continued as phases or specific park elements are contemplated for implementation. Community engagement and transparent reporting on park progress has a strong potential to support turning the vision into reality.

Gill explained that other parks have been funded by building portions, continuing momentum, and fundraising based on success.

Erin concluded the CAG process and noted that the CAG summaries will be included in the plan as an appendix. Erin thanked the CAG for offering their time, full participation, and thoughtful feedback at all meetings, taking the community as a whole into consideration.

Steve offered his thanks for the CAG’s participation on behalf of the City of Oak Harbor, noting how well the group worked together.

Question: Can the CAG members see the plan before it goes to City Council?

Response: The draft plan can be shared before the City Council meeting and CAG members were encouraged to attend the City Council meeting.

Adjourn.



**City of Oak Harbor
Windjammer Park Integration Plan CAG Meeting 5**

May 5, 2016
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.


MEETING OBJECTIVES

- *Present feedback received on draft plan / preferred concept*
- *Present and discussed preferred plan*
- *Gather feedback on preferred plan*

AGENDA

5:30 – 5:40	Introductions	Erin Taylor
5:40 – 6:00	Present feedback received on draft plan / preferred concept <i>Discuss how feedback has been incorporated into</i>	Erin Gill Williams
6:00 – 6:40	Windjammer Park Integration Plan updated preferred plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Presentation to describe preferred plan and park experience [20 min]</i> • <i>CAG Q&A and discussion [20 min]</i> • <i>Gather feedback on preferred plan</i> 	Erin, Gill, Jeff McGraw
6:40 – 7:00	Phasing, cost, funding	All
7:00 – 7:30	WPIP CAG Wrap – up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next steps • Final thoughts • Final recommendation to City Council [TBD] 	All

PUBLIC COMMENT AND FEEDBACK





Windjammer Park Integration Plan Feedback Summary

Apr. 18, 2016

Overview

Siting the Clean Water Facility in Windjammer Park presents a unique opportunity to develop a long-term plan for the park. To help guide the future vision of this special community space, the City of Oak Harbor is developing a Windjammer Park Integration Plan with input from the public and a community advisory group. In March and April 2016, the City hosted both in-person and online open houses to gather input from the community at large. The public had the opportunity to learn about project progress, view ideas from community advisory group meetings, and give feedback on the draft plan both in-person and online.

Purpose and Next Steps

This document is intended to serve as a record of the meeting and public input received; it has been provided to project designers for further consideration for design direction and evolution. All feedback received from the community will be provided to the community advisory group and City Council. The project team will take feedback from the community, the community advisory group, and City Council into consideration as they finalize the park plan. The community advisory group will meet on May 5 to contribute additional feedback on the draft recommended concept. The City is planning to present the final recommended concept to City Council on May 25. At its discretion, the with City Council can take action on the final Windjammer Park Intergration Plan, as soon as June, 7, 2016.

Executive Summary

The in-person open house, held on March 29, was the second the City hosted to gather community feedback on the future design of Windjammer Park. To expand opportunities for public input, the City paired the second in-person open house with an online open house lasting 10 days, from March 30 to April 8. A total of 53 people gave feedback through these two open houses. Many of the participants who indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with the draft plan or elements of the draft plan did not leave comments. In addition to the feedback received from the public through the in-person and online open houses, members of the community advisory group gave feedback on the draft plan (more information about the community advisory group is included below).

Based on all comments received, the following themes have emerged:

- There is a difference in opinions between respondents who have been involved in the past three months of deliberations as part of the community advisory group and those who are recently involved in the Windjammer Park Integration Plan. Overall, community advisory group members reflect a **high level of satisfaction in the draft plan, and recognition that there are variety of values and programs to be balanced** in a future plan. They recognize trade-offs and the future vision for the park.
- Consensus that Windjammer Park is a popular destination for families in Oak Harbor, and **family-friendly elements and activities** should be prioritized.

- **Reflection that there is a lot of different elements in the park plan**, requiring reassurance that the number of elements can be accommodated to reduce the feeling that the plan is crowded or there is too much included in the park.
- **Satisfaction from advisory group members concerning the community advisory group process and the feeling that they were able to meaningfully contribute to the draft plan process.** Community advisory group members represent community interests, values and desires in the process. When specifically asked if the plan is inclusive of feedback to date on a scale of 1-5, they average a 4.3.

Regarding specific elements and program reflected in the plan, respondents generally reflect the following:

- Support and appreciation for including the **splash park and other family-friendly elements** in the park
- Concern about the **effect on Waterside Condos** from the new road and east side parking
- Varying opinions on **whether the dunes are a good fit** for Windjammer Park
- Support for keeping **open grassy spaces**
- Varying opinions on whether the **RV park and ballfields should be moved** out of the park, with the Community Advisory Group agreeing that removal should be a long-term plan, assuming there is a place for these facilities in the community either by public or private ownership
- Consensus that **the waterfront is a resource and asset** to Oak Harbor
- Looking to the events plaza and the activities it could house in the long-term, varying opinion on **whether the farmers market should be moved** to Windjammer Park

Participation

- In-person open house attendance: 28
- Online open house visitors: 356 unique users
- In-person comment forms and surveys completed: 6
- Online Open House feedback received: 49 surveys total

Notifications

The project team advertised both in-person and online open houses between March 18 and April 8, 2016. Notifications included:

- Whidbey News-Times ad (print)
- Slides on Channel 10
- Postcard sent to all residents within Oak Harbor city limits
- Facebook post on the City page (note: The Friends of Windjammer Park Facebook account also published a post linking to the online open house)

The following table includes notification type and estimated circulation.

Type	Publication	Circulation (estimated)
Print	Whidbey News-Times (March 16)	4,900
Television	Channel 10 ad	N/A
Direct mail	Postcard	10,600
Social media	Facebook	201

Appendices

1. Open-ended question results from community advisory group
2. Open-ended question results from public
3. Notifications
4. Chuck Krieg feedback

Community Advisory Group Feedback on Draft Plan

The community advisory group has offered significant feedback over the course of the last three months at four different meetings, including two public open houses and various homework assignments. At the in-person open house on March 29, 2016, community advisory group members asked questions and provided verbal feedback on the draft plan. The community advisory group was given the opportunity to provide feedback using the same questions as the public (below). Group members took a separate online survey. The following summarizes feedback received from the online survey. Full, verbatim answers are included in Appendix 1.

Feedback received on overall plan

1. The project team has worked with a community advisory group, the community and City Council to prioritize park elements, which are reflected in the draft plan shown. Looking at the plan in its entirety, to what level are you satisfied with the plan in a draft stage?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Very satisfied	1	10%	70%
Satisfied	6	60%	
Neutral	2	20%	
Dissatisfied	0	0%	10%
Very dissatisfied	1	10%	
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>10</i>		

2. Windjammer Park hosts a range of community activities: events at 4th of July, boat races, daily walkers, lunch time storm watchers, young families, at playgrounds, Little League tournaments, pick-up basketball, lagoon swimmers and many more. Please indicate how well you think the draft plan represents the Oak Harbor community and the activities that could be enjoyed at Windjammer Park.

Answer	Count	Percent	
5 – very much	3	30%	70%
4	4	40%	
3	3	30%	
2	0	0%	0%
1 – not at all	0	0%	
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>10</i>		

3. There are several "given elements" in the park, including the park's wetlands, kitchens, parking, restrooms, the windmill and site furnishings. These items have been prioritized to be a part of any future Windjammer Park. On the whole, how satisfied are you with the treatment and quantity of the given elements in the park?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Very satisfied	2	20%	70%
Satisfied	5	50%	
Neutral	2	20%	
Dissatisfied	1	10%	10%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%	
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>10</i>		

4. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the treatment and quantity of the given elements in the park?

10 participants responded to this question. Their comments included:

- Feeling that the draft plan reflects the needs of the Oak Harbor community (2)
- Support for the splash park (2)
- Appreciation for the plan overall (5)
- Dissatisfaction with the planning process (1)

Feedback received on park quadrants

5. There are several distinct areas of the draft plan for Windjammer Park. The project team has looked to connect all areas of the park. By creating physical connections between areas, the intent is to enhance the park's use in all seasons and for many different events. Do any of the quadrants seem disconnected from the other quadrants (see map)? If so, click the appropriate circle below. If not, select the last option.

Answer	Count	Percent
Quadrant 1	0	0%
Quadrant 2	0	0%
Quadrant 3	1	10%
Quadrant 4	3	30%
None seem out of place	6	60%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>10</i>	

6. Quadrant 1 of the draft plan includes rentable spaces, kayak campsite and non-motorized boat dock, hardcourts and playgrounds, and park-and-view parking. Park users can easily access these features from the parking lot and take advantage of the various spaces for recreation, play or picnicking. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Answer	Count	Percent
Very satisfied	2	20%
Satisfied	1	10%
Neutral	5	50%
Dissatisfied	2	20%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>10</i>	

7. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 1?

10 participants responded to this question. Their comments included:

- Feeling that Quadrant 1 is disconnected from the rest of the park / doesn't fit in (3)
- Appreciation for the close proximity of activities to parking (2)
- Feeling that the draft plan meets the community's needs (1)
- Advocacy for refining the bathrooms further (1)
- Dislike that there isn't more parking near the waterfront for 'park and view' activities (1)
- Dislike for kayak camping (1)
- Advocacy for moving boat access to the marina and Flintstone Park (1)
- Desire for more open space (1)

8. Quadrant 2 of the draft plan includes a grand entrance with the windmill, crescent parking, multi-use fields, lagoon and stage. The grand entrance with the iconic windmill will identify the park at Beeksma and draw users into the park. This entrance takes advantage of the clear views and access leading into the park via the parking lot through the multi-use fields to the harbor, lagoon

and stage. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Answer	Count	Percent
Very satisfied	4	40%
Satisfied	5	50%
Neutral	0	0%
Dissatisfied	0	0%
Very dissatisfied	1	10%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>10</i>	

9. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 2?

10 participants responded to this question. Their comments included:

- Appreciation for open space on the waterfront (3)
- Appreciation of the entrance (2)
- Dislike for the gardens (2)
- Feeling that the flow between spaces is good (1)
- Belief that waterfront trail is no longer a waterfront trail (1)
- Appreciation of the parking lot (1)

10. Quadrant 3 of the draft plan includes a large events space/plaza, splash park and overlook with beach access, taking advantage of the north-south promenade. The promenade leads from SW Pioneer Way and traverses through the plaza to the overlook. The large plaza connects the east side of the park with west side and provides spaces for events like farmers markets and car shows. From the plaza, users can access the Clean Water Facility visitors' center, stage, lagoon and splash park. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Answer	Count	Percent
Very satisfied	4	40%
Satisfied	5	50%
Neutral	0	0%
Dissatisfied	0	0%
Very dissatisfied	1	10%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>10</i>	

11. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 3?

Eight participants responded to this question. Their comments included:

- Positive feedback on the multi-use area being used for farmer's markets (2)
- Appreciation of the splash park (2)
- Concern for the location of the splash park (2)
- Feeling that the quadrant meets community needs (2)
- Appreciation of the gateway (1)
- Feeling that more parking is needed near splash park, playground and plaza (1)

12. Quadrant 4 of the plan includes a multi-use field, large playground, vehicle access and a park-and-view parking lot. These elements take advantage of the physical proximity of and connection to the historic downtown. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Answer	Count	Percent
Very satisfied	0	0%
Satisfied	2	20%
Neutral	3	30%

Dissatisfied	4	40%	50%
Very dissatisfied	1	10%	
Total responses	10		

13. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 4?

10 participants responded to this question. Their comments included:

- Dislike for the road (3) and parking (2) near the condos
- Feeling that the quadrant should include parking near condos (1)
- Feeling that the ballparks separate Windjammer from downtown (1)
- Feeling that the quadrant isn't connected to the rest of the park (1)

14. The draft plan includes a waterfront trail which traverses the southern edge of the park, taking advantage of the harbor views. The trail is raised and moved into the park in areas to provide a diverse walking experience. There are nature walks and wind shelters that spur off of the trail so users can enjoy the dunes and picnic closer to the harbor. The waterfront trail connects users, downtown businesses and residents on the east side and the Freund Marsh on the west side. To what degree are you satisfied with the waterfront trail?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Very satisfied	4	40%	70%
Satisfied	3	30%	
Neutral	1	10%	
Dissatisfied	1	10%	20%
Very dissatisfied	1	10%	
Total responses	10		

15. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the waterfront trail?

Nine participant's responded this question. Their comments include:

- Appreciation for the trail's different elements and undulating path (4)
- Appreciation that the topography does not block the view (1)
- Feeling that the waterfront trail should be on the waterfront (1)
- Feeling that the trail won't connect to downtown (1)
- Dislike for the wind shelters (1)
- Preference for a boardwalk style promenade (1)

Feedback received on specific elements

16. There are several park elements that could become "signature elements" for Windjammer Park, helping define the park's character and place in the Oak Harbor community. With that in mind, as they exist in the draft plan, which of the following park elements is your favorite in the draft plan?

Answer	Count	Percent
Beach access	0	0%
Events plaza	3	30%
Gateway entrance	2	22%
Lagoon	0	0%
Landscape & gardens	1	11%
Multi-use lawn	0	0%
Playgrounds	0	0%
Splash park	3	30%
Stage/amphitheater	0	0%

Waterfront trail	0	0%
Windmill	0	0%
Total	9	

17. Based on community priorities, the existing baseball fields have been identified as a park element that could potentially be removed, only if a separate location can be found to accommodate formal baseball games and tournaments. Instead, the design team has placed multi-use fields in the park. What choice for formal ballfield activities best matches your opinion for inclusion in a future Windjammer Park?

Answer	Count	Percent
Include baseball fields as they are today, only for specific baseball use	1	10%
Include a limited number of multi-use fields, which could be striped for baseball or other sports	2	20%
Remove and relocate elsewhere in the city; formal ballfields are not necessary at Windjammer Park	6	60%
Unsure	1	10%
Total	10	

18. An RV park is not shown in the draft plan for Windjammer Park. Staysail RV Park currently has 57 stalls and is primarily used in summer months. When designers considered rebuilding an RV park in the same footprint/area for an RV park at Windjammer Park, approximately 17-20 RV stalls that could accommodate current RV lengths could be included in the facility. This greatly reduces the number of patrons who could use the facility. In addition, community advisory group members have prioritized other activities for inclusion in Windjammer Park over an RV park. There is potential that the RV Park could be relocated to another property in Oak Harbor and be run by a private enterprise rather than the City, which is common for RV Parks.

With this in mind, to what degree do you agree an RV park should be removed from Windjammer Park?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Somewhat agree (with removal of RV park, as shown)	2	20%	70%
Strongly agree (with removal of RV park, as shown)	5	50%	
Neutral/unsure	1	10%	
Somewhat disagree (keep a City-run RV park at Windjammer)	1	10%	20%
Strongly disagree (keep a City-run RV park at Windjammer)	1	10%	
Total	10		

19. The Windjammer Park Integration Plan will be built over a series of years as funding is available. Phasing will begin with areas adjacent to the Clean Water Facility once construction is complete. If you could choose, which two elements do you believe should be prioritized to be built first?

Answer	Count	Percent
Beach access	0	0%
Events plaza	7	37%

Gateway entrance	2	11%
Lagoon	0	0%
Landscape & gardens	1	5.3%
Multi-use lawn	1	5.3%
Playgrounds	1	5.3%
RV park	0	0%
Splash park	5	26%
Stage/amphitheater	1	5.3%
Waterfront trail	1	5.3%
Windmill	0	0%
<i>Total</i>	<i>19</i>	

20. What additional comments do you have about the draft plan?
See verbatim responses in appendix.

Feedback Received from the Public

Participants at both the in-person open house and online open house were encouraged to provide feedback via paper or electronic survey. Both surveys included identical questions and focused on both the individual's overall satisfaction with the draft plan / preferred alternative and specific treatments of park elements through a series of multiple choice questions. Respondents were also encouraged to provide qualitative feedback via open-ended questions. The following summarizes feedback received from both in-person and online surveys. Full, verbatim answers are included in Appendix 2.

Feedback received on overall plan

1. The project team has worked with a community advisory group, the community and City Council to prioritize park elements, which are reflected in the draft plan shown. Looking at the plan in its entirety, to what level are you satisfied with the plan in a draft stage?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Very satisfied	7	13%	30%
Satisfied	9	17%	
Neutral	7	13%	
Dissatisfied	16	30%	58%
Very dissatisfied	15	28%	
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>54</i>		

2. Windjammer Park hosts a range of community activities: events at 4th of July, boat races, daily walkers, lunch time storm watchers, young families, at playgrounds, Little League tournaments, pick-up basketball, lagoon swimmers and many more. Please indicate how well you think the draft plan represents the Oak Harbor community and the activities that could be enjoyed at Windjammer Park.

Answer	Count	Percent	
5 – very much	8	15%	40%
4	14	25%	
3	10	18%	
2	17	31%	42%
1 – not at all	6	11%	
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>55</i>		

3. There are several "given elements" in the park, including the park's wetlands, kitchens, parking, restrooms, the windmill and site furnishings. These items have been prioritized to be a part of any future Windjammer Park. On the whole, how satisfied are you with the treatment and quantity of the given elements in the park?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Very satisfied	6	11%	44%
Satisfied	18	33%	
Neutral	13	24%	
Dissatisfied	11	20%	31%
Very dissatisfied	6	11%	
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>54</i>		

4. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the treatment and quantity of the given elements in the park?

24 participants (44 percent) were satisfied or very satisfied with the given elements in the draft plan. Their varied comments included:

- Appreciation for a thoughtful plan (5)
- Support for the inclusion of a splash park (4)
- Support for keeping the RV park (3)
- Support for large, grassy areas (2)

13 (24 percent) participants had a neutral opinion of the given elements in the draft plan. Their varied comments included:

- Support for keeping the ballfields (3) and RV park (2)
- Concern for the new road and parking area (2)

17 (31 percent) participants were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the given elements in the draft plan. Their comments included:

- Support for keeping the ballfields (8)
- Concern for the new road (8) and its impact to the condos (6)

Feedback received on park quadrants

1. There are several distinct areas of the draft plan for Windjammer Park. The project team has looked to connect all areas of the park. By creating physical connections between areas, the intent is to enhance the park's use in all seasons and for many different events. Do any of the quadrants seem disconnected from the other quadrants (see map)? If so, click the appropriate circle below. If not, select the last option.

Answer	Count	Percent
Quadrant 1	3	8%
Quadrant 2	1	3%
Quadrant 3	2	5%
Quadrant 4	12	32%
None seem out of place	20	53%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>38</i>	

2. Quadrant 1 of the draft plan includes rentable spaces, kayak campsite and non-motorized boat dock, hardcourts and playgrounds, and park-and-view parking. Park users can easily access these features from the parking lot and take advantage of the various spaces for recreation, play or picnicking. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Answer	Count	Percent
Very satisfied	6	13%
Satisfied	18	39%
Neutral	8	17%
Dissatisfied	7	15%
Very dissatisfied	7	15%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>46</i>	

3. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 1?

24 participants (52 percent) were satisfied or very satisfied with Quadrant 1. 14 of these participants did not submit comments. The comments that were submitted included:

- Support for the kayak campsite (3)

- General appreciation of the quadrant, especially the family friendly elements (3)
- Support for the parking as shown in the draft plan (2)

8 participants (17 percent) had a neutral opinion of Quadrant 1. Their comments were varied and indicated that more information was needed before these participants could make a decision on Quadrant 1.

14 participants (30 percent) were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with Quadrant 1. Their comments included:

- Dislike for the lack of parking in the quadrant (7)
- Feeling that the quadrant is too crowded and there is not enough open space (3)
- Support for keeping the RV park (4)

4. Quadrant 2 of the draft plan includes a grand entrance with the windmill, crescent parking, multi-use fields, lagoon and stage. The grand entrance with the iconic windmill will identify the park at Beeksma and draw users into the park. This entrance takes advantage of the clear views and access leading into the park via the parking lot through the multi-use fields to the harbor, lagoon and stage. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Answer	Count	Percent
Very satisfied	6	13%
Satisfied	12	26%
Neutral	15	33%
Dissatisfied	7	15%
Very dissatisfied	6	13%
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>46</i>	

5. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 2?

18 participants (39 percent) were satisfied or very satisfied with Quadrant 2. Their comments included:

- Appreciation for open space (2)
- Support for the parking as shown in the draft plan (2)
- Appreciation for community focus (2)

15 participants (33 percent) had a neutral opinion of Quadrant 2. Their comments included:

- Dislike for the lack of parking in the quadrant (7)
- Feeling that the quadrant is too crowded and there is not enough open space (3)
- Support for keeping the RV park (4)

13 participants (28 percent) were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with Quadrant 2. Their comments included:

- Support for keeping the RV park (4)
- Dislike for the relocation of the windmill (3)
- Advocating against including a community center (2)

6. Quadrant 3 of the draft plan includes a large events space/plaza, splash park and overlook with beach access, taking advantage of the north-south promenade. The promenade leads from SW Pioneer Way and traverses through the plaza to the overlook. The large plaza connects the east side of the park with west side and provides spaces for events like farmers markets and car shows. From the plaza, users can access the Clean Water Facility visitors' center, stage, lagoon and splash park. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Very satisfied	11	24%	48%
Satisfied	11	24%	
Neutral	12	26%	
Dissatisfied	6	13%	26%
Very dissatisfied	6	13%	
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>46</i>		

7. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 3?

22 participants (48 percent) were satisfied or very satisfied with Quadrant 3. Their comments included:

- Appreciation for splash park (6)
- General appreciation for this quadrant (3)
- Need for more bathrooms (3) and parking (3) in Quadrant 3

12 participants (26 percent) had a neutral opinion of Quadrant 3. 5 of these participants did not submit comments. Submitted comments included:

- Feeling that they did not have enough information to respond (2)
- Concern that the plaza is too small for car shows (2)
- Concern that the clean water facility is located in the park (2)

12 participants (26 percent) were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with Quadrant 3. Their comments included:

- Concern that the splash park will not be maintained in the winter (3)
- Concern that the elements in Quadrant 3 will be damaged in winter storms (3)
- Support for holding all events outside of the park (2)

8. Quadrant 4 of the plan includes a multi-use field, large playground, vehicle access and a park-and-view parking lot. These elements take advantage of the physical proximity of and connection to the historic downtown. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Very satisfied	4	8%	25%
Satisfied	8	17%	
Neutral	7	15%	
Dissatisfied	9	19%	61%
Very dissatisfied	20	42%	
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>48</i>		

9. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 4?

12 participants (25 percent) were satisfied or very satisfied with Quadrant 4. 8 of these participants did not submit comments. The comments that were submitted included:

- The parking may be too small (1)
- Appreciation for the softer feel of Quadrant 4 (1)

7 participants (15 percent) had a neutral opinion of Quadrant 4. 2 of these participants did not submit comments. Submitted comments included:

- Support for keeping the baseball fields in the park (2)

29 participants (61 percent) were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with Quadrant 4. Their comments included:

- Concern regarding the location of the parking lot and road (15), including the effect on the condos (12)
- Support for keeping the baseball fields as they are today (7)
- Concern for children's safety when crossing the streets and parking lots in Quadrant 4 (4)

10. The draft plan includes a waterfront trail which traverses the southern edge of the park, taking advantage of the harbor views. The trail is raised and moved into the park in areas to provide a diverse walking experience. There are nature walks and wind shelters that spur off of the trail so users can enjoy the dunes and picnic closer to the harbor. The waterfront trail connects users, downtown businesses and residents on the east side and the Freund Marsh on the west side. To what degree are you satisfied with the waterfront trail?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Very satisfied	10	22%	52%
Satisfied	14	30%	
Neutral	7	15%	
Dissatisfied	11	23%	33%
Very dissatisfied	5	10%	
<i>Total responses</i>	<i>47</i>		

11. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the waterfront trail?

24 participants (52 percent) were satisfied or very satisfied with the waterfront trail. 14 of these participants did not submit comments. The comments that were submitted included:

- Appreciation for the waterfront trail as shown (6)
- Appreciation for the waterfront trail as it is today (2)

7 participants (15 percent) had a neutral opinion of Quadrant 4. 3 of these participants did not submit comments. Submitted comments included:

- Feeling that they did not have enough information to respond (2)
- Support for the trail as it is shown in the draft plan (1)
- Advocacy for preserving the walk on the east side (1)

16 participants (33 percent) were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the waterfront trail. Their comments included:

- Support for keeping the trail on the waterfront and avoiding the middle of the park (4)
- Support for keeping the current trail as it is today (5)
- Acknowledgement that the trail needs a seawall to block the wind and water (2)

Feedback received on specific elements

1. There are several park elements that could become "signature elements" for Windjammer Park, helping define the park's character and place in the Oak Harbor community. With that in mind, as they exist in the draft plan, which of the following park elements is your favorite in the draft plan?

Answer	Count	Percent
Beach access	10	22%
Events plaza	1	2%
Gateway entrance	4	9%
Lagoon	1	2%

Landscape & gardens	2	4%
Multi-use lawn	1	2%
Playgrounds	2	4%
Splash park	11	24%
Stage/amphitheater	4	9%
Waterfront trail	8	18%
Windmill	1	2%
<i>Total</i>	<i>45</i>	

2. Based on community priorities, the existing baseball fields have been identified as a park element that could potentially be removed, only if a separate location can be found to accommodate formal baseball games and tournaments. Instead, the design team has placed multi-use fields in the park. What choice for formal ballfield activities best matches your opinion for inclusion in a future Windjammer Park?

Answer	Count	Percent
Include baseball fields as they are today, only for specific baseball use	20	44%
Include a limited number of multi-use fields, which could be striped for baseball or other sports	7	16%
Remove and relocate elsewhere in the city; formal ballfields are not necessary at Windjammer Park	13	29%
Unsure	5	11%
<i>Total</i>	<i>45</i>	

3. An RV park is not shown in the draft plan for Windjammer Park. Staysail RV Park currently has 57 stalls and is primarily used in summer months. When designers considered rebuilding an RV park in the same footprint/area for an RV park at Windjammer Park, approximately 17-20 RV stalls that could accommodate current RV lengths could be included in the facility. This greatly reduces the number of patrons who could use the facility. In addition, community advisory group members have prioritized other activities for inclusion in Windjammer Park over an RV park. There is potential that the RV Park could be relocated to another property in Oak Harbor and be run by a private enterprise rather than the City, which is common for RV Parks.

With this in mind, to what degree do you agree an RV park should be removed from Windjammer Park?

Answer	Count	Percent	
Somewhat agree (with removal of RV park, as shown)	11	23%	48%
Strongly agree (with removal of RV park, as shown)	12	25%	
Neutral/unsure	7	15%	
Somewhat disagree (keep a City-run RV park at Windjammer)	3	6%	37%
Strongly disagree (keep a City-run RV park at Windjammer)	15	31%	
<i>Total</i>	<i>48</i>		

4. The Windjammer Park Integration Plan will be built over a series of years as funding is available. Phasing will begin with areas adjacent to the Clean Water Facility once construction is complete.

If you could choose, which two elements do you believe should be prioritized to be built first?

Answer	Count	Percent
Beach access	9	21%
Events plaza	3	7%
Gateway entrance	4	9%
Lagoon	4	9%
Landscape & gardens	8	19%
Multi-use lawn	1	2%
Playgrounds	11	26%
RV park	4	9%
Splash park	19	44%
Stage/amphitheater	5	12%
Waterfront trail	11	26%
Windmill	2	5%
<i>Total</i>	<i>43</i>	

5. What additional comments do you have about the draft plan?

38 (79 percent) participants submitted additional comments about the draft plan. Selected quotes are listed below and the complete list of comments is included in Appendix 1.

"The splash pad must come first. I would also like to see the RV park moved to the empty lot on Bayshore where the carnival is held."

"I think any elements that encourage individuals (walking trail) and families (playgrounds, splash pad) to get outside should be prioritized."

"Forget the dunes. Keep all parking areas out of the park and away from the Waterside Condos."

"Keep existing waterfront walkway as natural and wild as possible. Keep concessions, rentals stages, and farmers markets as far from the shoreline as physically possible. Don't move trees. Don't cut trees."

"If a lesson is to be learned by what you did to Old Town (one way street) and keeping the sewage treatment plant where it is, you aren't going to listen to many of us who think the park & ball fields are better the way it is."

"I believe if we don't do something, then we will have a fabulous new modern building, but it will be surrounded by outdated and run down looking areas around it."

"Leave the park as is. Please do not wastes the money. Built a YMCA at a different location. Have you seen the one in Mount Vernon? It is will use. The young people need a good activity place."

Appendix 1: Open-Ended Question Results from Community Advisory Group

Note: comments are verbatim as written.

Feedback survey 1: Overall feedback

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the treatment and quantity of the given elements in the park?

Note: 1 of 10 answers were blank.

It was a tall order, and the design team did a great job of setting priorities that appropriately addressed the role of a city-wide waterfront plan

the play area and splash park seem to be a big want for the community, it is my understanding that their are two play areas and a splash park. You have met someones needs! I want more greenery and you have provided that.

Overall Good elements but need more refining.

I think the approach was wrong from the beginning. To disregard the reality of the funding/cost meant that time was wasted considering hugely expensive and therefore unrealistic ideas such as moving the windmill out to the edge of the water, at the expense of more modest ideas that are more in keeping with the casual and unstructured park that we currently have. I would like to see more left alone, and less fixes. Add a splash park and maybe a events plaza with a small platform that could be used as a stage, but otherwise, clean up/refurbish the current elements and then leave the park alone as much as possible.

I still believe the RV park should not be fully eliminated nor the baseball fields.

There are too many park elements in the existing park and in the proposed plan that are currently not being used. Only two items were removed from the park (RV Park and baseball fields). Based on the size and location of the park, it should be designed to not exceed current maintenance budget while removing elements that are not used by the majority and expanding elements that are.

I love the dunes Idea over any Idea of sand(do not add sand, this beach and park do not need that) I like the multiple venues for performing arts. I like the areas laid out for "market days" events. I Love the Idea of the SPLASH park and an water feature that leads to it. I like how the water front trail veers a way from the water and back to it, making easy access for picnicking patrons they can be on both sides of the natural walkway. I am not a fan of the "Gardens Area" there are other under utilize parks like this, "hollad Gardens" for example. It is beautiful at the right time of year but under utilized. There is also another Garden across from the Ball fields if someone really wants this manicured garden element and it also seems under utilized by The citizens. And across from the RV park there is another that is more of a nature walk (I see people there a lot). The garden area could be more open space, and or a few small pavillions lining the open space (not in the center of the open space) that way groups have accesss to dry space in case of rain. We have to have Parking, though I prefer Minimalist overnight stay spaces, for RVs. If they want the extra space and accomodations they can find an RV park. Most of the time these RV spaces are used so that your young child and older family patrons have a respite space away from the overstimulation of events. Less issues like that create a more enjoyable time for everyone. (this was in Quadrant 4 it would be a way to attract more vacationers to the down town area.)

I think a little more time needs to be considered with the bathrooms and kitchen areas. Also, maybe a little less tree canopy coverage and a little more open space.

I feel that the given elements encompass the entire community, add necessary components to the park, and add to the overall success of everyone's visits to the park.

Feedback survey 2: Quadrants feedback

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 1?

It puts the play courts, picnic areas and watercraft area near parking for unloading as mentioned. A no-brainer. The kayak campsite is in a tough place, but it is already there

It seems to feel the needs of the community in a thought out way. Nicely done!

Bathrooms need some more refinement.

Like the layout and crescent parking. Dislike that there isn't more waterfront parking - currently a dozen or more cars will sit watching the water - this plan allows for less than half of that.

I don't believe it connects well with the other areas of the park, and I believe the driveway/entrance right by the condos will be a major issue.

Do not believe there is a large demand for kayak camping; boat access should be at the marina and Flintstone Park.

I would like to see a walk through on this to get a feeling for it. I feel it does not represent this park as I see it. This park is about building community and these spaces seem to segregate part of that community out. I think having them all open to the larger field and having less foliage blocking would build community better as well as keep more eyes on the structures.

I think less shrubbery. Make it more open.

I'm afraid it may be too broken up, with lots of areas conducive to increasing our already bad vagrant/drug problems. I like the idea of having seperate areas for people to gather, I am just concerned about it being too "private" making it hard to patrol and deter the wrong uses.

I love what it has to offer, the set up, and how much you are able to pack into one space without it feeling overwhelming.

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 2?

Another no-brainer, except for the master stroke of moving the windmill. It preseves the feeling and actuality of open space on the waterfront

The flow is very nice here. I like the open area surrounded by greenery.

Maintains the max open space.

I like the parking, am okay with the relocation of the windmill. I hate that the waterfront trail is no longer a waterfront trail. Some of the coolest cities in the world that I have visited (Paris, London, Istanbul, Washington D.C.) have grand waterfront promenades or path systems directly adjacent to the water. I don't think we need to replicate the beach trails, we already have beach trails all over the island, including directly across the harbor at Maylor's Point.

I like the entrance, dislike the gardens.

Overall good layout, don't know about the dunes and keeping the sand off the fields and walkways.

Neutral-to-satisfied You missed mentioning the Gardens in the question. The more I think about the gardens the more I think that they do not belong in this park. Other parks in the area that are Gardens are under utilized and there are gardens right across from where the baseball fields are. There is also a nature trail across from the present RV park if someone wants to get back to nature. The garden area could be more open space, and or a few small pavillions lining the open space (not in the center of the open space) that way groups have accesss to dry space in case of rain. We have 4 or 5 state parks on the Island, we try not to cut down trees anywhere, lets leave trees everywhere else and have this as an open space, one of the few that could be great or kite flying. Open space is a good thing. I really like the muliple performing arts areas this will be the only park with an actual performing art space let's make sure they look the part. I do not understand the SW (upper right hand) corner of this Quadrant, another water hole/Feature it seems we are expanding the wetlands and it looks like we are keeping the ditch too. It seems that this space could be utilized better. I hate seeing the lagoon smaller, BUT it is a very underutilized area in the park. Yes people do swim in a very small part of it, and I like that we are keeping that part. I believe a smaller lagoon is a smart choice. I think we need

to utilize the whole lagoon in its smaller size for people use, if someone wants to get back to nature there are multiple parks with natural waterfeatures to enjoy, this is not one of those; this is people space. This is a People space for building community within Oak Harbor.

Love the grand entrance.

I like the open space, parking, stage, windmill, etc. I am not a fan of the meandering pathway along the beach. I prefer the boardwalk style beachfront and would prefer to see the meandering pathway through the north area of the park around the wetland area.

LOVE the parking lot, it gives great access into the park. Personally, I'm tired of the windmill (but that's just me :)) I like the open space and the idea of having music/performances on the stage.

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 3?

Don't understand a splash park in this climate, but moms know best, I guess. Promenade is great. Plaza is great. I would put the splash park (if there has to be one) in Quadrant 1.

Again, nicely done. I think you meet everyone's needs but looks well put together. I for one have no problem with changing stuff up!

Like the gateway but the overlook will need work.

There needs to be more parking directly adjacent to the splash park, playground and plaza, or people won't use them as much.

Great multi functional area for farmers market. Concerned with the location of the splash park near the water (sand and driftwood).

I believe I am most satisfied with this part of the Park. Quadrant 3 seems to reflect the historic use of the park for use by people and building community. I really like the idea of an interactive water feature that leads to a splash park. I love the Idea of a tall Iconic presence at the beach. I can Imagine people talking about those visits for years and remembering them for decades. The dune in the NW corner so fits for the walking path, but the area may be utilized better (as level ground) as over flow for events activities as these events get larger. I still wonder if there is enough parking at this end, but what is the difference right now people walk from as far away as walmart for the larger 4th of July events as it is. The splash park is the best element of the entire park and the sound of water during events will be an added ambiance that I hope is appreciated. Quadrant 3 is my favorite space.

I love the big event plaza and addition of splash park. I am dissatisfied in the look of the splash park, I have advocates for a modern led lit artistic style splash park since before this process started. I don't like the idea of a driftwood natural feel to the splash park. I want to see it full of artistic type sculptures with shades/colors that inspire. There also should be some additional parking incorporates into quadrant 3 especially if it is the first phase of development.

I love the hardscapes and opportunities it offers. The splash park, of course, is my favorite. I am excited to take my kids there someday. Exciting!

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 4?

I liked it even better when there was parking alongside the condos. I know condo residents and little league supporters don't. But this is a waterfront City-wide Park, not private property. Highest & best use.

There seems to be some concern about the road next to the condos. I don't have a problem with it. Basically people are so lazy they are going to need that parking lot to get their kids to the play ground! The concern about noise and too much greenery seem silly. The lights stay on all night done there on the walkway and perverts can hide out in RV's as well as greenery.

The front parking lot will need to be reworked, maybe the a large round about.

I am very dissatisfied with the access road to the parking area that runs along the front of the condos. This is a huge mistake. The access should be via an extension of City Beach Street. One of the key

promises in the design of the Sewer Plant was that the site line from Pioneer Way down City Beach Street to the water would not be disturbed. I do not think this design honors that promise.

I think it is wasted space near the road, there is plenty of open lawn in the quad drank to use. Dislike the driveway/entrance. Think this needs to be moved to where it is now

Parking should be off Bayshore road, move park/ greenscape south against the water.

the ball park seems to cause a separation from the downtown, without adding a real upside. If this was a minimalist, all RVs welcome, space for RVs to park over night it would have up sides to all. RV Parking close to the Park for events, Quiet for the Neighbors in the condos, a close place to downtown where tourists can park shop and eat thus supporting downtown, and the Ball fields would need to be moved to a warmer location perhaps by one of the schools where they could be utilized during school hours, and after school. A very minor thing, the NW corner there is a path through the play ground and it ends at the parking lot drive way, it could continue on the other side of the drive and merge with water front walk.

I think this area needs a little more work to feel more connected and useful.

This is my least favorite area of the plan. I like the idea of adding access to the east side if the ballfields are eventually relocated, but don't see that happening for many years, and think we need to focus on the rest of the park.

I don't love or hate quadrant 4. I don't spend much time over there, so I don't feel any attachment to it. I like the parking on that side. Every other place has so much specific purpose, and from the map view, I don't know the specific purpose, which may be a good thing so there is some open area that can be used for anything. (Was that confusing?)

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the waterfront trail?

I like the idea of injecting a little "topo" into the edge, as long as it doesn't block too much waterview. I like diverse experiences throughout the whole park.

The trail is interesting with the different elements, don't give in to the naysayers!

Like the winding trail but hope we can keep the View.

I hate this. Put the waterfront trail on the waterfront. I hate this.

I don't agree that this walkway will every really be connected to downtown since it is two blocks away Remove the wind shelters.

I really like that it veers away from the beach on occasion, this will help with walking traffic during the crazy busy events like the 4th of July as groups will not set up right on the path. This leaves an easy exit from the site if for some reason a person leaves early they can comfortably walk with out infringing on another's "space" (although those occasions are good for the community too once in a while. Helps everyone realize the great people we live with here.) Not sure how much we need "nature walks" in this park, as there is a really great place like that just east of this space. I think this park is about the People and building community, and this park will never compete with the nature trails of our Island state parks. A long this trail there could be art, statues and memorial plaques/benches perhaps with some history of why they are to be remembered and why the art was created. I see this a People Park, there is a lot of nature around us, it is beautiful but not so much here. I have always loved the bridge over the water at the lagoon; I always want to cross it. I really like how the picnic areas are not on the main walk, but have a trail of their own. I would like to know proximity to the restrooms though (I forget which buildings are which.) The overlooks on the Beach side at each parking lot I do like very much. I see them as an attraction to go look and as a place for walkers when the rain starts suddenly. Please do not add sand to the park (except places it is already... the Beaches) I just do not think that fits this park. I like that the walk can continuously go from Scenic Height to Flintstone park (or even the Marina if you count sidewalks). I like how that flows.

I enjoy the diverse scene of the trail. Not just a straight away.

I prefer a boardwalk style promenade along the water with the meandering paths located throughout the rest of the park, especially near the wetlands, parking and picnic areas, etc.

I love the trail! I am a fan of a trail that isn't a straight shot across the beach. Very excited about this!

Feedback survey 3: Specific element feedback

What additional comments do you have about the draft plan?

Note: 2 out of 10 responses were blank.

17. Irrelevant question. That is why we have designers. The draft plan just needs a bit of refinement, easing of transitions between events and design development. Strong concept.

I believe the plan is fantastic. However, I do not see the need for so many playgrounds or the size of the lagoon. I don't think the lagoon fulfills the need it did in the past. I have found while being in this group that most people do not want any changes with existing features but yet want a splash park and a stage. How can you keep things the same but make improvements? As it stands, Windjammer Park is a big trailer park with a lot of lawn and a windmill. Welcome to Oak Harbor! Please keep up the good work and stay in this century!

I would like to see a few elements added like a splash park, and a cleaned up lagoon, but otherwise I think the whole design is too much given the unwillingness of our city/citizens to raise the taxes necessary to make the proposal a reality. Scale it back, keep it recognizable. Orient it more towards locals, and less towards

none

I really think we need to have a minimalist RV park in the park. If someone is looking for an RV Park that has all the amenities this isn't it (water, sewer and electricity, if you want space go someplace). . The Island has them north and south (I do not know if they are all inclusive or if they only allow newer RVs.) I think that Wind Jammer park and the City of Oak Harbor both benefit from having the Minimalist RV park and I believe it would be better located where the Baseball Fields are presently closer to downtown. The large events are pretty tough on the very young (their parent) and the older members of our town. They want to participate but there is need for a respite space when they get over whelmed and having an RV close by to take that break is the difference between joining the community and staying home. I want this park to be for all of the community. Entertaining events like carshows, carnivals, craft fairs, renaissance fairs, dog shows, Shakespeare festivals... etc. bring in people from out of town and one of the draws the entertainers to this park is a place to park their RV as a respite because of the long hours in the park. When my wife and I were traveling with our face painting booth to fairs and festivals we had multiple Towns festivals we could set up on the same day.... Convenience makes the difference. "Why worry about these out of towners?" I have heard similar things tossed out, we like entertainment as much as the next town lets have a park that brings them here: the entertainment and the citizens of the next town. In closing I think that the Ball Fields need relocation, perhaps to a school where they will be utilized during school hours and after school hours and in a warmer location. The "gardens" by the parking lot in quadrant 2 do not fully fit this park and there are similar ideas in other parks close by that are under utilized. If someone wants a nature trail, there is one right across the street and at least 5 state parks on the Island, Windjammer does not need to compete. Windjammer Park is about people and building community through fun and educational events that include all residents and their out of town friends and family. Windjammer park is a one of a kind People Place, with open spaces for kite flying, and helicopter rescue demonstrations. It is the home to the Islands biggest 4th Of July celebration that draws so many that people have to park at Rite Aid and walk, on a good weather year. Windjammer Park is a wide open people place in the midst of numerous natural treed parks, lets try to keep it different.

I would like to see the beach plan designed by Scott Fraser implemented into the park plan. I think this would be the most beneficial use of the beach area and the best way to get locals and tourists to enjoy the beach front. I would also like to revisit the baseball fields. I enjoy having them there and feel that they are beneficial to the park.

I am still unsure about the western end of the lagoon. It seems like a wasted space and doesn't seem to fit in.

I am so excited about this draft plan! As it was brought up in the last public meeting, I do wonder about the maintenance of the landscape and gardens. Other than that, love it.

Appendix 2: Open-Ended Question Results from Public

Note: comments are verbatim as written.

Feedback survey 1: Overall feedback

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the treatment and quantity of the given elements in the park?

Note: 11 of 57 answers were blank.

[in person open house] Too much --- We don't need farmers market. Keep the Little League fields. Don't need soccer.

[in person open house] I believe considerable thought has gone into the conceptual plans. Not everything is going to please all of the citizens

I need to see more to be able to make a remark.

The park is beautiful because it is natural! Fix the picnic shelters! Improve the bathrooms. Do not add a road or parking inside the park! Keep the playground and the ballfields! You are wasting money and destroying the feeling of the park with this outrageous plan!

The park's beauty is in its naturalness! Adding so much takes away from that. Parking and roads should be outside the park.

There are a lot of elements put into the big blank canvas of grass etc. that we have now. I hope it doesn't get too chopped up with all that is planned. It looks like it may be OK; it's just hard to visualize now.

Picnic shelters are falling down. More tables and grills are needed. There is no way to the beach for elderly or blind people.

No parking lot by Waterside Condos!!!

It is a waterfront park. There should be water access with dock and boat ramp. There should be NO road access or parking adjacent to Waterside

I rarely use the kitchens, restroom, no use for windmill and think that we can better utilize the area without these items personally. I would rather see a splash park, amphitheatre, etc. in the place of these items. I personally like the covered areas at Ft. Nugent in lieu of the existing kitchens. They look way better and I am sure they are less maintenance.

This is the only one that appears to have adequate parking incorporated into the design. =(There is no RV park. =(Love the idea of a splash park. I think the lagoon served its purpose for years but is no longer needed. If we must save it, then a smaller version would be adequate.

Do not the additional parking added to park on east side near the condos. Do not the expense of adding road and parking there. Please change this back to grass and trees. If you remove this parking lot, the rest of the park should handle the needs and elements you said were addressed,

Something for everyone.

Looks like a great plan to bring Windjammer park up to date, and really make it a pleasant and functional space for the community to enjoy.

Creating a new road running just outside property owners back doors to an unnecessary and unsightly parking lot shows blatant disrespect for those condo owners property values. You are wasting money on a road and parking lot when both already exist on the other side of the ballpark. Keep and/or widen (if necessary) the existing road to the existing parking lot behind the current sewage plant. You can expand that parking lot if you need to as it appears from the map there is room. It'll be cheaper and won't ruin anybody's property values. Don't use up valuable and beautiful waterfront for another freakin' parking lot!! Be prudent and improve what is already in existence. Additionally, the storm watchers parking lot on the other end of the park should not be reduced in size. It's already almost too small. Adjust the placement of the new playground equipment so you're not eliminating parking in that lot and then you won't need a new lot on the other end!

I live in the condos overlooking the baseball field. Please DO NOT replace the walking path with a road. I'm sure the junkies who hang out in the old "element" parking lot would love the open field

proposed to replace the baseball field. Please keep the baseball park as it is. An improvement would be to lock up the fence & prevent access to the dug outs. I see junkies sleeping there regular basis.

1. Changing the road into the park, is not acceptable to the many residents of Waterside Condos. It would affect the ball parks which are very important to the community. Eliminated the play field for a parking lot which is not acceptable. If there is not going to be a RV park, why not make the parking lot over there where the street is already in. The windmill needs to stay away from the flood area. Why not work around what we have and make it better, without relocating our elements.

I can't tell what the rankings are based Ina.

There is too much. The things mentioned in #2 above are important (Don't forget the Car Show). The design seems to limit rather than enhance these activities.

I do not want to have a street built on the park side of Waterside Condos. I love the bike/pedestrian path that is currently there. The ball park and family parks are also great. But a street, for vehicles coming & going is not a tranquil addition. We already have a street where cars speed by despite a slower speed limit. Thank you for your efforts.

Leave the park along. Why waste money on the park it is pretty as it is now.

I really hope a community recreation center is part of the final design. Non military kids in this town need a place to go similar to the centers on base that provide activities year round. It is something that is really lacking in this town.

RV park brings in business and visitors year around. It will be a source of funds. Removal of ballparks (to where) does not show much consideration or concern for youth programs. The city population is not just old people.

Lack of beach access (needs multiple points of access). worried that beach path will be separated by a large body of water at the lagoons water intake. To many treelines separating parts off the park. we have a wet land just west of the park, so why do we need a wet land enhancement? Will each playground be for different age groups? Will the clean water facility smell like the current one?

I'm excited that the splash park will see a renovation that families and persons of all ages can utilize. These plans look to finally create a great community gathering place.

There needs to be more emphasis on the beachfront. The main waterfront walking path needs to stay as close to the beach as possible. It is this long beach that makes Windjammer Park unique, and we should celebrate that and embrace it as the key element that everything else focuses on. Anything that takes the path away from the beach is a loss of focus. The lagoon is another unique element that should be enhanced with opportunities to rent paddleboards or paddleboats (like they used to many years ago).

Traffic should be routed around and away from the park. The design of the park should be simplified and left with as much open space as possible. Try to imagine how you would bring in and stage a 250 car and trucks for a show. High visibility parking lots should be streetside. Rape and assault prevention should be part of the design.

This is an unrealistic plan. How can you even make a plan without a budget ??? The ball fields will not be moved so include them in a plan. The consultants are taking the city for a ride.

It is and always will be known as "City Beach Park" drop Windjammer Park, a distinct few even know what windjammer is.

Where's the \$\$ coming from? You are removing the RV park in favor of parking and a kayak campground? Most folks like to park close to the water now will have to walk further and the new walkway doesn't front the water all the way. The 'nature path' shown will get blocked by the ever present logs. And by the way, the reality of the logs is not shown at all on the map. The plan also shows a new road at the east edge of where the ballparks next to the Waterside condos. At least where the parking is now (at west end and on City Beach St) there is no residential interface. The days where there might be a demand for more parking than you have now can be counted on 1 hand - not enough to justify the replacement and addition of the parking shown on the map Why don't you spend much less money on just fixing and sprucing up what you do have. i walk the park frequently and the only thing that has received much attention in the last 3 years is some new bark dust and borders around one of the play areas. Shore line shelters are in tatters, several of the building look like they

long ago needed new roofs, the windmill needs some new shingles and a full paint job. Some of the walkways have inexplicable divots in the pavement, the pond dock needs minor repair and good paint. I find that for just having one community input meeting there is now a completed map showing the park as, who, the City, would like it? Bill Ferry

The cost of all this is what concerns me..OH is a NAVY town whether you want to admit it or not... Everything that is planned should have that in mind, not some plush areas for primarily outsiders to enjoy but HOME FOLKS should be number ONE consideration..My first impression of all this is that all the emphasis of these plans which are gradoise, lean towards promoting OH as a destination for business, development, vacations..etc..as primary..vice us residents

The design is just amazing! With there being so many new families introduced to the community this really creates an open space for people to come together, share, bond, or just get out of the house! I love that there is an emphasis on activities for youth, as our community will be in dyer need of this in the years to come. Love the innovation and the openness to community involvement here. Good job Oak Harbor! I would suggest possibly considering keeping "F" a baseball triangle. Those have always been utilized the most at Windjammer.

Beach access is listed as medium priority, it should be listed as high.

The baseball field is gone. The access road on the east side with access to parking on the waterside of the park is not worth the cost. It disrupts the existing walking paths and cuts too close to the existing condos creating traffic noise, and an area not easily patrolled by the police of park attendants. The idea of moving the windmill with all the logistics and probability of damage is not worth the cost.

I like that they have chosen to locate the grand entrance away from the clean water facility and made the windmill a focus of that entrance. The first thing visitors to the park see should not be a treatment facility and the windmill evokes much of Oak Harbor's history and tradition.

Keep the baseball fields!

No. Too much focus in removing existing infrastructure.

Very happy to see a spray park near the top of the priority list and feel that everything else falls in place appropriately.

I like the the grass covered dunes (there is plenty of sand on the beach we do not need it on the grassy areas. I dislike H there are other parks in town that are gardens and they are often under utilized. We have nature trails all over this Island.... let's keep the Gardens away from this park and leave more open room for events like fourth of july and the Car show. The more I think about losing the RV park the more I dislike it. Private RV Parks often only cater to those with newer RVs which may leave older RVs parking where ever they find space. We do not need the RV portion to be big and fancy... In fact it should be built to where only the die hards would stay there. We are not in the business of taking a future RV parks business, so when that business opens and makes the beaches RV idea no make any money... then we can re purpose the space. The RV park should be moved over to the area near the condos, that can insure that the evenings the condos will not have a lot of traffic nearby. It also puts the travelers closer to the down town. This park needs to be about open space, we have parks that are Gardens, we have parks that are forests, we have nature trails that can be walked extremely close to this park. We need to have places to fly Kites and watch fire works. I love the Idea of the Splash Park! Regardless of whether a RV park is in the Park. Showers should be in Bathrooms so that swimmers can rinse off. The Hard work of making every one happy, will not make everyone happy, but If we have something like like it in town, like H "gardens" maybe we should keep this park for more of what it has been used for an Open area for main events, and add amenities that we do not have in town like the Splash Park, and multiple venues for different styles of performing arts.

The plan clearly mentions Little League tournaments (games),and there is no baseball field complex in town besides the one located at the park currently. Is the city expecting Oak Harbor youth to head into Coupeville or Anacortes to play baseball in the future? If so, forget families looking at oak Harbor favorably when moving here. Also, no RV sites seem planned, however there is kayak camping? If our area rented kayaks this might be of interest, but when looking at tourism, RV spaces close to locations where events are held will entice people to come into town to spend money at the events. As soon as

the only RV options are the state parks or the base, more revenue will go toward those communities (once again Coupeville and Anacortes). When the city talks about making our town more visitor friendly, but takes away the limited in town lodging option that is affordable for many (since there really are very few lodging options within town anyway) and tries to cater to kayaker and families who only want to go to a playground, they won't come.

Not happy with the over-all plans. Yes, it looks pretty but these are my comments and I have never like the name change so I will continue to call it City Beach because that is what it is- The City's Public Beach! 1. The windmill looks stupid plopped down in the middle of the round-a-bout. It needs a nice grass garden around it. Similar to how it is now. 2. Don't hold land for a "future community center" on this Open Space land. City should purchase additional site off Pioneer, Bay Shore to build this facility. Use the money from the logging site to purchase a new site down near City Beach. 3. Add a Ball Field back into the plan. You mention Little League as a current use but I did not see a ball field in the plan. Only soccer fields that could be use for other activities but how will the Carnival fit? 4. Keep a RV park down at City Beach not a Kayak Campground. The RV park brings visitors and \$\$ to Oak Harbor that otherwise would be staying near Anacortes or Coupeville. It also provides temporary housing for military family and their visitors. The kayak Campground doesn't generate \$ and how many kayak campers have we had in the Oak Harbor Bay? The RV park ALWAYS has someone camping there 12 months out of the year. 5. No Boat Launch near a parking lot? It looks like the only boat entry point is through the kayak Campground. 6. What are the 2 long and skinny structures that are not labeled on the site maps. West end of site between shelter and beach trail. Near Playground. 7. East Playground- move it closer to the beach so kids can play at the beach and in the playground without running through a parking lot. Similar to how it is now. Kids of various ages do a lot of "free creative play" on the beach. Swings? I see a lot of climbing structures but no swings, slides. West Playground- I guess it is OK but it still seems like we have less playground area then what is currently at City Beach. 8. Glad to see the lagoon- but cement steps? Keep it natural (sand or sand mix) plus the seagulls and geese will only poop on the cement. Cement Steps make it look sterile and not a natural. 9. I like the idea of the splash park and it is a great asset to City Beach. 10. Parking spots along the waterfront- Happy to see the public will still be able to take their lunch break in their cars but it appears the total number of spots down at City Beach is less than we have now. (west side, east side, plus along current RV Park). 11. I didn't notice the "new road" that was mentioned but is this really necessary? It just takes up open space when Pioneer Road is one building away. Less pavement (roads) is better for natural drainage anyway. At one meeting it was discussed that it would be for shops located on Pioneer. Why can't they enter from Pioneer instead of the Beach Side? It would make Pioneer Blvd. more attractive then looking at Backs of Buildings while driving through town (across from Habitat Furniture). Goal is to Beautify downtown Oak Harbor not make it uglier! 12. Basketball courts- No Tennis courts? I am happy to see you kept the courts but I don't know how much they will get used tucked off in the corner -plus it looks like a security issue because they are surrounded by trees. I like how the teens play pick-up down on the beach and I don't know if they will do that in the new location. I thought the long range goal of the city was to create one regulation size tennis court in Oak Harbor that are not located at OHHS. 13. Do we really need that many trees planted down on this small piece of property. Are they OAK Trees? They will take 50- 100 years to be of any size. Large fast growing trees around the sewage facility to "soften" the look but what are the other trees. Native to the NW I hope! I really don't think Oak Harbor has to do much with the City Beach area except to soften the look of the new treatment facility and update the playground equipment and the current kitchens/windshelters near the RV park and the 2 other areas. This project looks like it will cost millions and not bring in any \$\$ revenue since you are taking out the RV park. The City does not have to spend millions the public is using it as it is now. Focus on bringing business back into Downtown and along Midway. The money spent on this project could be used to add sidewalks in the East Side of Town, update the neighborhood parks and replace the playground equipment at Neil Park and other parks around town to encourage new families to purchase homes in Oak Harbor, revamp the farmers market area are just a few suggestions for the City "entice" families to purchase home in Oak Harbor.

Looks like a very thought out plan

Not sure what is driving the park renovation. The Park is a center piece of what Oak Harbor has hidden. When we have something good, capitalize on its good points rather than "beginning from scratch. Its use and activities are always governed by access (proximate parking) and weather. Football & Baseball & Basketball & Tennis courts do not need prime beach park locations. They just need land - as Ft. Nugent multi-field park affirms. A beachfront park draws waterfront viewers, walkers & strollers, picnicking and RV'ers (to come and stay at Oak Harbor). Convenient parking proximate to those activities increases usage. Why is RV Park NOT under "Given Elements" since it: * Has been part of the existing park for so long? * Is the only significant, repeating and regular revenue-generating feature of the park? * Was so recently renovated and upgraded and funded? * Is truly a tourist attraction to come and spend time in Oak Harbor and its utilization record proves to be a source of measurement - where other park uses are sporadic? And why would - for reasons above - the RV Park be listed under "Medium Priority"? Michael Thelen 1401 SE Dock St. # 101 OH 98277. thelemike.assoc@gmail.com

in THE area of the ball fields it floods during the winter. you would need to spend a lot of money to keep the parking and activities area drained. best to keep it grass and trees so the flooding will not matter. birds like the flooding and float then in the winter.

There does not seem to be as much parking as is currently provided. While the current parking may not always be full, when events such as Driftwood Days are held, parking gets full quickly. Reduced parking will severely impact that kind of event. The number of kitchen shelters should not be reduced. What is a Kayak campground? What happened to the RV park. RV owners will spend much more in the city than tent campers.

I like having the baseball fields but if there is a better place for the little league to play I'm good with too.

[in person open house] We are try to jam to many elements into a limited space. Parking is a hard problem to solve. Current draft plan is not "user" friendly...especially on group 4 – eastern side.

Feedback survey 2: Quadrants feedback



Draft concept and quadrants as shown in the in-person and online open houses.

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 1?

Note: 18 of 46 answers were blank.

[in person open house] [noted "too much" to question 1] We need to keep open area grass. Family picnic areas --> Beach access

[in person open house] It appears to be functional with little effort

I can't really tell from the map, but it seems almost the same as it is now?

I hope the residents next to where the kayak campsite is to be wouldn't mind having it next door. Screening is possible but they built their cool little house to take advantage of the small view; no point in making those people antagonists.

I think it is a good idea to have this park amenity, we personally use the current park and view and my kids love playgrounds.

Seems to have the right elements.

keeps the much used parking and also the kayak area is saved.

The boat dock and kayak campsite are out of the way and not used by most of the community.

This should be modified or eliminated. It takes away family space and beach access.

Not enough space.

RV Sites missing, No Ballparks Not family orientated

The kayak parking area is very secluded.

Dislike - Not enough beachfront parking. Like - I like that the basketball courts have been moved away from the waterfront. It would be nice if they had a canopy over them for wintertime use and to keep the seagulls from dropping shells on them (they are heavily used all year around).

Show me the demand for a kayak campground over an RV park

OK

I really like the Kayak Campground and the integration of courts, playgrounds, kitchen and bathrooms all in the same location. It's a major upgrade from before. It'll be nice to see how these multi-functioning areas turn out. Great place to entertain and host events!

No Rv park?

Not clear what is meant by rentable spaces.

Not clear what is meant by rentable spaces.

There should be more parking spaces to sit in a car and look at the water. The area in this map looks way too structures. I think it should be more informal like it is now.

Huge increase in parking. And a complete removal of existing parking in same quadrant only to reconfigure it? Put your buildings and rentals near the commerce and away from the waterfront (a cost saving). Keep the shoreline as wild as you can, otherwise a great storm will reconfigure all these man made affectations. Wasteful.

I may be more satisfied with it if I saw that the buildings were set up in such a way that they did not block the fire works. Yes that many people attend, and some people park at Walmart, haggins and ace to go see the fire works.

The area seems nice, however the kayak camping area seems odd and trendy - will potentially attract more homeless than actual kayakers.

You took out the RV park and put in a worthless Kayak campground. How many Kayakers have asked to camp at City Beach? The RV Park always has people staying at it that would other wise be staying near Coupevelle or Anacortes. They stay there because it is close to services, family and Wal-mart, grocery stores and it is relatively quite (no planes flying over). If I was kayaking camping I would not be doing it in the Oak Harbor Harbor. Kayak Camping is more toward San Jauns, Deception Pass, Hood Canal areas- There are 2 long structures not labeled in this section. NE of playground. NW of Path- What are they?

Football & Baseball & Basketball & Tennis courts do not need prime beach park locations. They just need land - as Ft. Nugent multi-field park affirms. A beachfront park draws waterfront viewers,

walkers & strollers, picnicking and RV'ers (to come and stay at Oak Harbor). Convenient parking proximate to those activities increases usage. City Beach Street gives already-paved access to the existing parking area and could easily accommodate the proposed "east beachfront" parking -thus eliminating a proposed 2-lane access road and its construction noises, disruptions and extra lighting requirements - all bordering Waterside Condominiums (Haven't they some say in the already harsh, on-going vibrations and noise associated with the Sewer Treatment Facility?).

parking is more than enough in quadrant 1 . You will need plenty of garbage cans near parking as lunch groups and others leave paper and bottles in parking areas now.

The image provided in this section of the survey does not include the explanation of the enhancements as the previous section does. The survey taker has to rely on memory as to what is placed where. I have to rely on your optimistic description of unicorns and rainbows without a visual layout. I cannot adequately address the question so give it the lowest possible score. Shame on you for creating such a bad survey. It seems your intent to mislead the taxpayer.

Water-front parking lot reduced too much. Move new playground equipment back and restore existing parking. This will eliminate need for a new water-front lot on other end of park by condos.

[in person open house] Except for viewing the water – we made no effort to improve access to the beach. I am talking about getting down to the beach.

Feedback survey 2: Quadrants feedback

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 2?

Note: 14 of 46 answers were blank.

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 2?

[in person open house] Current access is fine. Keep RV Park.

[in person open house] Maintaining a parking with view of the sound is critical

Hopefully the lagoon will be reworked

The open space and parking seem adequate to be used for the car show etc. that are historically used. I think the idea of space for a community center is taken out. That's good. The city needs to procure the large property at the corner of Pioneer Way and Bayshore/Midway to be used for a combination performing arts/convention/community center with open space for event parking, vendor stalls, etc. Except for the performing arts section (tucked into the west end), all the rest should be kept at one story height. This would be an enhancement part of the Downtown renewal effort.

Just.

The grass area is too small. The park is no longer configured to accommodate the large events that have been there: especially the large Car Show and the very large gathering that takes place at 4th of July. Keep the lagoon as large as it is now. Grand entrance idea is good but as shown may constrict the actual entrance of any large carnival use. Is that a little bridge I see for the entrance?

The grass area is too small. The park is no longer configured to accommodate the large events that have been there: especially the large Car Show and the very large gathering that takes place at 4th of July. Keep the lagoon as large as it is now. Grand entrance idea is good but as shown may constrict the actual entrance of any large carnival use. Is that a little bridge I see for the entrance?

The grass area is too small. The park is no longer configured to accommodate the large events that have been there: especially the large Car Show and the very large gathering that takes place at 4th of July. Keep the lagoon as large as it is now. Grand entrance idea is good but as shown may constrict the actual entrance of any large carnival use. Is that a little bridge I see for the entrance?

The grass area is too small. The park is no longer configured to accommodate the large events that have been there: especially the large Car Show and the very large gathering that takes place at 4th of July. Keep the lagoon as large as it is now. Grand entrance idea is good but as shown may constrict the actual entrance of any large carnival use. Is that a little bridge I see for the entrance?

I love the stage location and the extra parking, but I think the lagoon should not be so prominent. I would also like to see the RV park in there somewhere.

;like the entrance, but question the cost of moving windmill to that location. Perhaps a less costly sign or rock could be used.

I like that the windmill will be moved there and the parking looks great.

This is not a very clear map. It's difficult to comprehend the changes.

Leave the Windmill alone and bring back the RV Park. This is an asset to our downtown community and moving it will take business away from our already struggling businesses. We don't need multi-use fields here they can be relocated to another site. Improve the lagoon and build a stage, but leave the rest alone. You are not drawing users to the park. You are discouraging them.

To many areas that the police can not keep up with break in of cars. Did you read this week police blotter? All the cars that got spray painted.

There is definately not enough parking available in this plan. All the events you want held in this area and the water facility is built where most of the cars used to park. Where will those cars park now that all of that space has been removed? How excited will people be to attend events when they have to walk 1/2 a mile or more to get to the park?

Waste of money, currently the city has a nice welcome sign that could be added to.

I don't like the shape or style of the lagoon - it doesn't seem well oriented to use of the water by paddleboarders, swimmers, etc. I hate the way the waterfront trail winds away from the beachfront into the park. If I wanted to walk on a trail through the park I have many others to choose from, i want the beachfront trail to be ON the waterfront. The parking layout is good though, and I kind of like the windmill as a grand entrance to the park, although I would prefer to see it inside the park itself.

I'll point you back to what I wrote before: where's the money coming from and don't spend on new infrastructure, spend on fixing what you have.

Excited to see how those stages come into play during the sunny season. I know in Langley they have concerts on the lawn every Wednesday. That would be a great thing to integrate into this area with time. Again, the plans are showing optimistic outcomes for community gatherings and activities.

The lagoon looks good and there is still lots of open grass

If the intent is to move the windmill, it is not cost effective. It would be better just to create an appropriate sign

Way too structures. I dont like all the garden spaces at the crew ent shaped parking area. The city won't maintain it, so it will look messy and become a hangout for rats and/or homeless people.

Moving the windmill to make it a "beacon" sounds good from a pr perspective but costly in the real world. You need to enlarge a natural wetlands in this quadrant (a cost saving). Less expensive and yet attractive to wildlife, attracting birders, photographers and nature enthusiasts.

Would like to see some of quadrant 2 serve as an arboretum.

Get rid of the Gardens Gardens "H", add to the Multi use fields or put in picnic areas that that can be reserved for picnics. There are Gardens like "Holland Gardens" that locals can visit about a mile from this location and another garden across from sector 4 where people can walk. We need the open spaces for the larger events like 4th of July (yes I keep mentioning it... it is that big here we are a military town)

Not sure what the clear views refer to... Of the water? Does that mean the hills and trees will be removed? Not a fan of that, but the space is nice. If carnivals come to the area, will they fit in this space? Could they get in-out? Does the park need 2 stages? Will the music festival plan on using this space instead of the street- pulling business away from downtown?

VERY VERY Dissatisfied. Should not be holding land for a "future Community center". The City should purchase additional site for this facility. Put back in the RV Park instead of planning to use this area for a Community center. The city should purchase property off Pioneer that borders Quadrant 2. This would add to downtown Oak Harbor instead of take away from City Beach. Hate the idea of moving the windmill to a Round-a-bout. It needs to be in a garden. Maybe west of the Lagoon area instead? Cement steps in the Lagoon- keep it natural material. Birds will just poop on it anyway. Is that a ROAD or a walking path that borders Quadrant 2? It should be a bike path and not a road. At one of

the public meetings that I went to it was discussed that this would be a road. I am against this because it would take away from the business on Pioneer. When driving through downtown from Hwy 20 it would be ugly- we would be looking at the back of buildings (northside) instead of fronts if they parked on the south side facing the beach.

Community Centers and Amphitheater replace with concrete and structures the park lawns and natural qualities. Additionally, weather, rain, and 52 degree breezes and wind from Puget Sound neutralize Plaza and Amphitheater usage. The proposed far-away parking and closure of City Beach Street deter usage as well.

Do not move the wind mill. too much cost. Build a smaller one at grand entrance.

The image provided in this section of the survey does not include the explanation of the enhancements as the previous section does. The survey taker has to rely on memory as to what is placed where. I have to rely on your optimistic description of unicorns and rainbows without a visual layout. I cannot adequately address the question so give it the lowest possible score. Shame on you for creating such a bad survey. It seems your intent to mislead the taxpayer.

Removal of a popular RV campground for a questionable number of day visitors is short-sighted. RV campers bring more steady business to downtown than day visitors.

[in person open house] I do not like the round about in a rotary. Money could be better used elsewhere. RV park is a money maker for city and businesses...why eliminate it. One vice two basketball courts.

Feedback survey 2: Quadrants feedback

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 3?

Note: 11 of 46 answers were blank.

[in person open house] Drop it - Car show on current grass space is preferred.

[in person open house] Would like to see all of the above accomplished

need to know more

The events plaza is too small for a farmers market or car show but could be used for smaller events. Are the events to pay for rental use? Need to think about that kind of thing.

We already have a Farmer's Market location that is perfect. Car shows create noise. They need to be near noise, not near quiet!

Splash park water area is a great idea. Keep playground close by also. Major area for young families, parking, bathrooms and picnic tables need be here.

Splash park water area is a great idea. Keep playground close by also. Major area for young families, parking, bathrooms and picnic tables need be here.

Splash park water area is a great idea. Keep playground close by also. Major area for young families, parking, bathrooms and picnic tables need be here.

Splash park water area is a great idea. Keep playground close by also. Major area for young families, parking, bathrooms and picnic tables need be here.

We will be the only City without a splash park in our near vicinity by 2017, even Sedro Wooley has been given the green light on their new splash park and Anacortes will have one in 2017. Burlington and Mt. Vernon both have one. We should be able to do the same. I also like moving the Farmers Market down there.

It has great elements, except that there doesn't seem to be enough parking on this side.

Hope this is where bathrooms are located. You will need more bathrooms near parking entrance.

Very family organized. Short walk to all the quadrants and downtown.

Who would maintain the splash park? Other than the summer, it would not be used.

Slash Park is the best new idea. Improve the playground and leave the rest alone. Again visitors center, farmers market and Plaza can be at other sites. The space remaining for the Car Show is much

too small, It has to accommodate 250-300 cars plus vendors and displays. This design would kill the car show as we know it.. Our visitors like the setting and the fact they can show their cars on grass. That makes our show special.

Seems like you are trying to do too many things in one park

Waiting for a car accident. How foolish to think that this would cause so many accidents!!!!!!

Same concern for parking here as well. The push is to get people to the waterfront, to enjoy all the elements of this park but so much parking has been removed that it may become a hassle to get to any of the elements in the summer months, let alone any special events. It will be much harder to add parking in the future than to create it initially.

It seems that walking is the only item of concern. We currently have two pools for kids that were closed due to lake of funds, The splash pool will be damaged by the first winter storm. Who is interested in viewing a Clean Water Facility.

Lack of perimeter trail for urban hikers

There needs to be a nice playground facility immediately adjacent to the splash park, as well as bathroom facilities close by. There also needs to be parking close by, because parents won't use the splash park if they have to haul a bunch of kids and all their gear halfway across the park just to get there.

Now the farmers market is going to be moved to the park??!! Oh, and lots of people are coming to town to visit the Clean Water Visitors Center? You had a splash park there before and it was filled in. Why now another? Now the staffing needed is just for mowing, trash and light maintenance - all these added components are going to require much more oversight and maintenance from the City

The splash park is something this community WILL DEFINITELY USE! That could not be a more firm investment. Moving farmers market down to Windjammer will be awesome! Can't wait to see how this really opens up the multitude of options for local venues!

Like the plaza and the splash park

It is unfortunate that the city decided to put a clean water plant at this location. It give the appearance that the city is not interested in preserving the waterfront.

I mostly like this, but there needs to be more parking nearby. People aren't going to walk from the other end of the park to visit a Farmer's Market. And the plaza is kind of hidden from the main roads, so tourists won't even know it is there.

The overlook will get hammered in storms. The City currently has to excavate the lagoon outflow area. The promenade and plaza separate the green spaces with the hard space of the plaza. Make the plaza a fun zone with playground and splash park. Reduce the existing parking at the south edge of the CWF rather than eliminate it all together (a cost saving)

Extremely satisfied with the approximate location of the splash pad and couldn't be happier with the promenade as I really feel this will be the parks grand entrance.

Best Part of the Park design, this is a brilliant plan and I think it will add to the 4th of July event and well as be utilized from spring through fall! This is the part I like best!

Not thrilled about a splash park near a water treatment facility. Will not be utilized most of the year. After being at car shows, thus area does not seem adequate to park all of the cars. It looks like there are going to a lot of changes for our city events if this plan is adopted. And at a very high dollar cost to taxpayers.

I don't see that the area (between the facility and the beach) will be used as much as the current daily area is being used. current use: Playground, parking, lunch eating, basketball courts, walker parking, kitchens for rentals.

Community Centers and Amphitheater replace with concrete and structures the park lawns and natural qualities. Additionally, weather, rain, and 52 degree breezes and wind from Puget Sound

neutralize Plaza and Amphitheater usage. The proposed far-away parking and closure of City Beach Street deter usage as well.

Put coffee stand in bottom of Windmill and leave it where it is. Make sure that up keep of splash park year round happens and is funded. otherwise just a catch place fro trash and leaves.

The image provided in this section of the survey does not include the explanation of the enhancements as the previous section does. The survey taker has to rely on memory as to what is placed where. I have to rely on your optimistic description of unicorns and rainbows without a visual layout. I cannot adequately address the question so give it the lowest possible score. Shame on you for creating such a bad survey. It seems your intent to mislead the taxpayer.

Why on earth does a sewage plant need a visitor's center? You can give it all the fancy names you want but it's still a sewage plant and not a draw for visitors. Why put the farmer's market in such a hidden location? Instead of continually trying to draw people to the park, how about drawing them downtown to the businesses that could use some foot traffic. Do what they do overseas and turn Pioneer Way into a farmer's market one day a week.

[in person open house] Is there going to be room to park on this street? Both sides of the street? You obviously have not seen the number of cars at our current farmers market. Not enough parking close to the event. Look at the age of the people attending – they do not want to walk long distances.

Feedback survey 2: Quadrants feedback

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 4?

Note: 12 of 46 answers were blank.

[in person open house] I would prefer no other street or parking near the condos.

I live in the Waterside Condo's. Do I want a busy road with lots of traffic and people right outside my apt.? No! Are you trying to force us out so that you can take our land, too? Is that in your 5 - 10 year plan? We need to keep the baseball fields! They are in use from March into October by teams, and by families after that when the weather is nice. Please keep the field by us at least. Widen your road to the park on the west side and have the parking there. Come visit with any of us that about the field, where your new road would go, and see if you can see our view point. I don't want to have to move; if I would even be able to sell my apt. that is. Please rethink your plan.

Available parking might be small.

Parking lots and roads need to be outside the park. People who live at Waterside Condos will be hurt by a road and parking lot. It will create noise and pollution, as well as litter. It will interfere with safety, especially regarding children.

NO ROAD BESIDE CONDOS. Make use of the existing City Beach Street. Larger grass area, please.

NO ROAD BESIDE CONDOS. Make use of the existing City Beach Street. Larger grass area, please.

NO ROAD BESIDE CONDOS. Make use of the existing City Beach Street. Larger grass area, please.

NO ROAD BESIDE CONDOS. Make use of the existing City Beach Street. Larger grass area, please.

Honestly, who cares about historic downtown. The shops are never open when we are off work and the store owners are grouchy. I would rather pay and drive to go to Pt. Townsend where there is a true downtown.

I like the playground and parking lot, but I'd rather see a baseball field than another lawn.

Do not like the location of parking and road to parking being added. Cost is too much for such a small need here. better to have more grass and trees, than to have this parking. I do not like paying for this parking and road !!!

Should be another way into the parking spaces.

Please keep the baseball fields as they are. An open field would become the new hang out for the local drug addicts and homeless. Please keep the parking lot out of Q4 and respect the tranquility that is already there. I do not want to hear loud music or smell cigarettes & marijuana from the parked cars.

There should not be a road or parking placed adjacent to existing homes at Waterside condominium. Additionally, new trees should not be planted, as they would block existing views from these homes.

Leave the Little League fields alone. If you want people to take advantage of downtown leave the RV Park in place. People coming to use the park want a place to picnic and enjoy family activities. Put in covered picnic areas like we used to have and don't try to rent out covered picnic areas. Make it family friendly and improve beach access. No dunes!

I do not want a street put in on the Waterside Condo side. We already have Bayshore traffic and many events impeding a our area. Another street boxing us in is unacceptable. Thank you

People will be fighting over parking. As this town gets more and more people.

Putting an access road in front of the condos to access parking is a HUGE mistake. It will create conflicts with the homeowners there, and end up making the city close the access outside of normal hours like 8-6, which means that in summer we can't drive to the waterfront to watch the sunrise or sunset. Instead, parking should be accessed from the current City Beach location. I also don't think diagonal parking along Bayshore is a good idea, traffic comes around that corner very fast, and there will be accidents from cars trying to back out.

You already have most of that in the are to either side of City Beach st.

I want to ensure that the Little League Ballfields remain where they are..not moved

It's a nice, soft break to the rest of the park. Nice for over lookers!

Baseball fields are gone. Expensive road leading to a waterfront parking lot too close to the nearby condos.

How will all of this be maintained and made secure and safe?

How will all of this be maintained and made secure and safe?

It seems a bit cut off from the remainder of the park. The elements here are heavily geared towards use by youth (baseball fields, playground, etc.). Placing it adjacent to a sewage treatment plant does not seem in the best health interests of the children of our community.

Very bad idea to have a road to the parking area drive in front of the condos. You are going to have a bunch of old people who live in those condos in their walkers and wheelchairs chaining themselves to block construction of road there. You already screwed then by putting the sewer plant in their front yard, don't screw then further by putting a road 15 feet outside their bedroom windows.

Put the playground near the splash park. You have the quadrant bisected with four walkways, a playground a parking lot and a new road. There is just not that much space there. You have the open (quiet) area out by the intersection and the road and the playground over where people live. Don't waste the waterfront. Utilize what you have and respect your neighbors.

I think the RV park should end up over here. Not a new updated nice thing.... Just spaces with the ability to have water, electric and sewer for the night. This puts travelers close to downtown, gives 4th of july vendors and families from out of town a place to stay for a night insted of the Walmart Parking lot(especially if they only have an old RV that may not be able to get into rv parks) This could be more like RV overflow and parking. People bring their RVs to the park for many reasons. Older persons may not be able to keep up for a full day and need to take breaks, New moms and babies often need these time outs too. one more reason for keeping the RV park. It is utilized year round.

The ball fields are gone, more places for cars. Disappointing.

No Baseball field Playground not near beach- kids will have to cross the parking lot to get to the beach. Not sure the basketball courts will be used in that current location No Updated Tennis Courts

Convenient parking proximate to those activities increases usage. City Beach Street gives already-paved access to the existing parking area and could easily accommodate the proposed "east beachfront" parking -thus eliminating a proposed 2-lane access road and its construction noises, disruptions and extra lighting requirements - all bordering Waterside Condominiums (Haven't they some say in the already harsh, on-going vibrations and noise associated with the Sewer Treatment Facility?). At present, the current contractor parking area lends itself to the RV Park utilizing the north side and center for two rows (which appears to be capturing 75-80% of previous RV sites). The south edge of the contractor parking could be vehicle parking accessing the park. The existing tree line on

this south edge could be the "north edge" dedicated to a single line of tent campers (since this grassy area here-to-for has rarely seen use. Some "H" areas could border these. Why is RV Park NOT under "Given Elements" since it: * Has been part of the existing park for so long? * Is the only significant, repeating and regular revenue-generating feature of the park? * Was so recently renovated and upgraded and funded? * Is truly a tourist attraction to come and spend time in Oak Harbor and its utilization record proves to be a source of measurement - where other park uses are sporadic? And why would - for reasons above - the RV Park be listed under "Medium Priority"? Community Centers and Amphitheater replace with concrete and structures the park lawns and natural qualities. Additionally, weather, rain, and 52 degree breezes and wind from Puget Sound neutralize Plaza and Amphitheater usage. The proposed far-away parking and closure of City Beach Street deter usage as well. The cleaned-water stream and the fountain are both nice additions, however their placement knocks out the City Beach Street access to proposed new parking. These features could be re-routed and relocated, respectfully. I would hope to have these observations carefully reviewed and would appreciate hearing back from you. Michael Thelen 1401 SE Dock St. # 101 OH 98277. thelenmike.assoc@gmail.com

Part of this area floods in winter and would be bad for paly area. Would need big draining project that would cost too much. better leave as trees and grass. Enough parking at quadrants 1 and 2 for daily use. Special times should not have parking there anyway. Need more grass area for 4th of July event. Also need walk way for better foot access.

The image provided in this section of the survey does not include the explanation of the enhancements as the previous section does. The survey taker has to rely on memory as to what is placed where. I have to rely on your optimistic description of unicorns and rainbows without a visual layout. I cannot adequately address the question so give it the lowest possible score. Shame on you for creating such a bad survey. It seems your intent to mislead the taxpayer.

Using more waterfront property for another parking lot is horrendous and will scar the park and the property values of the condo owners next door. Do we seriously need a new road running right outside their back doors to get to a parking lot we don't need. What are you thinking? Instead, increase the size of the existing parking lot behind the old sewer plant and improve the existing road that goes there. When you have options, why choose the one that will ruin property values.

[in person open house] Proposed road by condo's unsat. Eliminating ball fields for a lawn makes no sense. Work on parking in the area – getting closer to simming-splash area.

[in person open house] the planned road from Bayshore to the parking lot is too close to the Condos – where I live, it destroys the walking path in that area; A parking lot so close to the water take up space that could be used for rest & relaxation, rather than pavement; the entry/exit from Bayshore contributes to traffic congestion due to the 7 other entrys between City Beach St & Dock St; and such a road would invite unsavory activities in the park all night long. Please don't build this road.

Feedback survey 2: Quadrants feedback

Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the waterfront trail?

Note: 17 of 46 answers were blank.

As it is now, its great. Except where the high winds took out the wind breakers by the picnic tables.

Basically OK, except that I'm not sure what the nature walk is supposed to be. I and other people who use the current trail a lot like to see what is going on shore-wise the entire trail would probably opt to take whatever would get me, and my dog, as close to shoreline as possible. I think most people would make the same decision. That nature walk would get a lot of use, probably as much as the inshore idea. Also, people will want to get onto the beach wherever they can, not just at some designated access point. Make them more frequent.

Dunes? Completely unnecessary! Un natural to this area. There needs to access to and from the beach.

If it is a Waterfront Trail, it needs to be on the edge of the beach like it is now. Please don't add DUNES. We are a wind swept beach.

If it is a Waterfront Trail, it needs to be on the edge of the beach like it is now. Please don't add DUNES. We are a wind swept beach.

If it is a Waterfront Trail, it needs to be on the edge of the beach like it is now. Please don't add DUNES. We are a wind swept beach.

If it is a Waterfront Trail, it needs to be on the edge of the beach like it is now. Please don't add DUNES. We are a wind swept beach.

I think it is great having a waterfront trail, but I would never walk through the marsh alone due to safety. I like the waterfront trail through the park out to the Marina and think that should remain. It is a great walk.

Love it.

Would like the trail to still be used of bike events and to have trail instead of road on east side of park. Hhope you have sea wall in mind along bay as beach can be lost otherwise. (see storm this last winter and spring).

Love to walk the beach trail.

Difficult to see your vision from the map.

Waterfront trail we have is goo and should be expanded to increase length. I enjoy the walk from City Beach to the Marina and back and believe it should basically be left as is.

To easy for the people who use drugs to hide. Have you been to the park and see how big the drug problem is and the homeless. people???

Lack of beach access

It needs to run directly along the waterfront, not divert into the park decreasing the connection between trail users and the waterfront. There are plenty of other trails if people want to venture to the interior of the park.

We have a nice path now. Your are going to rip it all up and do it again? You already have access to Old Town via the Boardwalk. The irony of the wind shelters is that, due to the prevailing winds, every shoreline shelter you have now or will have also block the view.

Really great way to tie it all in together!

Love the trail -- we need more trails!

Need to preserve the walk on the east side of the park.

Having varying elevations on a trail would reduce accessibility by the disabled members of our community. The current trail is very ideal in that it is level and easily accessible. I would hate to see that change.

It should be a big waterfront promenade like it is now. Many waterfront cities have nice boardwalks or waterfront promenades. It is stupid to take the waterfront trail away from the waterfront.

Why dilute the purpose of a waterfront trail by moving it into the park? The waterfront is the gem. Put the walkway there. Better yet, make your plan around the existing walkway (a cost saving) and the existing kitchens and City Beach street. There are more walkways in this plan than in the existing park. That just cuts large space into small spaces.

I like it weaving in and out as that will give the 4th of July event (yes the event is that big) room to have people their chairs tents and BBQs on each side and make the mass exodus from the park a little smoother after the Fireworks. Please keep the SAND on the beach. The Idea of sand in the park is not good and is unlikely to be utilized. Lets keep the dunes, and open spaces that can be utilized for many things.

Seems like nice trail system

Very happy to have a Trail available down along the waterfront. As long as it is a smooth, flat service for the elderly. I am not elderly but I notice that a lot of the walkers downtown are and that is because it is flat making it easy to walk their dog.

But keep parking accessible, using existing streets, not constructing new ones.

Need to keep access on east side the way it is from Bayshore Dr. Foot traffic only. Also need SEa Wall along water to protect walkers, bikers, and children from high water and storms when people like to see the bay up close. The path will wash away again if no sea wall.

The image provided in this section of the survey does not include the explanation of the enhancements as the previous section does. The survey taker has to rely on memory as to what is placed where. I have to rely on your optimistic description of unicorns and rainbows without a visual layout. I cannot adequately address the question so give it the lowest possible score. Shame on you for creating such a bad survey. It seems your intent to mislead the taxpayer.

[in person open house] Park your car area 1 or 4. Where are the distinct paved paths to these areas? None that I could see. In future drafts – see how a stroller and two young children would get to swim area.

[in person open house] I and others have problems walk on non-level paths. I like the current levelness of the park.

Feedback survey 3: Specific element feedback

What additional comments do you have about the draft plan?

Note: 10 of 46 answers were blank.

locate parking centrally, remove plans for road on east side of park, keep sufficient open space, keep city beach street open, placing parking along that road for access to east and central park. Implement crescent parking lot on west side. keep windmill in side the park, not on the waterfront.

[in person open house] City Beach is the gem of Oak Harbor. It should emphasize family activities (i.e. picnics). Covered picnic areas like we used to have.

wider paths?

Regarding the RV park, it's a money source (year around) that could help run Windjammer. As an RVer, I hate to see it given up; it's a great location that RVers appreciate. However, it does take up space and am willing to see it gone if the space has more utility for residents. Actually, the Freund field opposite the RV area would be a great spot; easy access to a new park, walking trails, shopping close by etc. Landscaping would add to the Nature Trail and new park. I imagine there are wetland codes etc. involved but maybe it could all be done well. Otherwise, hopefully an RV location close could be found. Just keeping a few RV spaces in the park would make no sense.

Forget the dunes. Keep all parking areas out of the park and away from the Waterside Condos.

Forget the dunes. Keep all parking areas out of the park and away from the Waterside Condos.

I like the basic of Third design: it is ok if the ball park is relocated (frequently, now, participants families will picnic on the sidewalk making obsticals for walkers etc) BUT, the design allows too much parking on the residential side of the park. And Trees would not be a good use of green space as they would block the sun for the folks in the blue condos. Plus eventually also hide shady characters.. trying not to be paranoid! Adding another street, surrounding the blue condos is not cool, where AS IT IS NOW, there are many events down Bayshore, where that street is blocked off for extended periods of time and residents need to either stay in, or leave their home before the street is closed off to vehicles.. I like the kid park. it is good you are asking thoughts from the community. Thank you

NO ROAD BESIDE CONDOS Use City Beach to access SewerPlant and Parking. Keep grass areas large. Have two kitchen facilities one at each end of park. NO DUNES.

NO ROAD BESIDE CONDOS Use City Beach to access SewerPlant and Parking. Keep grass areas large. Have two kitchen facilities one at each end of park. NO DUNES.

I believe if we don't do something, then we will have a fabulous new modern building, but it will be surrounded by outdated and run down looking areas around it. We definitely need the entire plan and we definitely need to make it happen all at once or it will never happen. The City is good at implementing parts of plans, but not the entire thing. Something always comes up and/or personnel always changes and so does the direction.

If another location is identified for a local RV park, then you've convinced me that it would be appropriate and desirable to remove that element from the park design. Since the construction would be completed in phases, I'm assuming that we would still be able to access the waterfront trail, beach,

and some lawns while construction is taking place in other areas of the park. That's why I marked that the splash park and stage would be my two top elements to complete.

Remove the road and parking on east side of park. Replace with grass and plantings and trees. It is important to keep a park green and walking and running friendly. the addition of parking a=on east side does neither and cost is not justified.

Build the new ball fields some where in town first. Use the base of the windmill as a walk-up coffee and soft drink concession. Have a push-cart type of concession during the summer.

I think any elements that encourage individuals (walking trail) and families (playgrounds, splash pad) to get outside should be priotiritized.

Keep the baseball field and section 4 as it is. Focus on improving the rest if the park. Get rid of the Windjammer name. Everyone I know stills calls it "City Beach".

There should not be a road or parking placed adjacent to existing homes at Waterside condominium. Additionally, new trees should not be planted, as they would block existing views from these homes.

Please, Do not add another street on the Waterside Condo side

Too much ... Think family activities. Forget the gardens. Change the park name back to "City Beach". That is what all of us who have lived here call it anyway.

Leave the park as is. Please do not wastes the money. Built a YMCA at a different location. Have you seen the one in Mount Vernon?It is will use. The young people need a good activity place.

If it were included in the plan I would say that a rec center would be a big priority and I would have selected that as one of the first things to be built.

Play Grounds need some definition as to what items are included. Climbing and swings seem to bring problems with insurance requirements.

I would like the park to be left as much like it currently exists as possible. The problem with the park currently is that the City has not prioritized its maintenance, and many park elements have deteriorated. The concept plan looks beautiful, but does not seem sustainable given the lack of prioritization by the City on park maintenance. The concept seems very expensive to bring to realization, and hugely expensive to maintain. I do not see that is being a reality given our City's history of taking the cheapest approach to everything it does.

Sorry, but I still think that fixing what you already have is the more prudent tack. If a lesson is to be learned by what you did to Old Town (one way street) and keeping the sewage treatment plant where it is, you aren't going to listen to many of us who think the park & ball fields are better the way it is.

My comments in the first box on the overall draft plan are repeated here..This is primarily a NAVY town ..It seems that the overall plan presented herein is pointed toward visitors to OH and businesses, not the populace that makes up 3/4 of the town (Active and Retired Navy)... Don't forget who pays the majority of the taxes here.

I don't fully understand the need for Kayak campsites -- if the RV park is run by a private company, would the campsites also be independently run?

Parking areas should all be in one spot and close to existing roads. The best spot would be on the west side. It makes no sense to have a small parking area on the east side with a new road all the way to the beach. Once that lot is full, traffic will continue to flow in and out looking for open spots when there are none. This can be eliminated if all the parking is together.

Keep the park family friendly. Right now we have families with small children who have to drive to Mt Vernon to use their splash park. Keep it easy to see, and get to, the waterfront. The RV Park should be owned by a private company, and put on private land. The city shouldn't be in that business any more than they should be running restaurants or drug stores.

Keep existing waterfront walkway as natural and wild as possible. Keep concessions, rentals stages, and farmers markets as far from the shoreline as physically possible. Don't move trees. Don't cut trees.

The splash pad must come first. I would also like to see the RV park moved to the empty lot on bayshore where the carnival is held.

Put a minimalist rv park (more like what we have) in sector 4 where the baseballfields are. No need for updating it, cram them in in the busy season, and on slow days the can have space in between. This

also puts town visitors closer to down town. Not all RV park allow all RVs. This one does and that is one reason we need it.

After seeing that ball fields could be relocated, I'd like to know where? Also where would a private investor find land in town to be able to be zoned for RV parking? Lots of big questions. While it's not necessary to have either at the park, true ball fields are necessary to offer little league programs and competitive programs. Also locating ball fields and RV PARKS within a park is pretty standard in communities. It allows families to get out and enjoy the areas together while at tournaments etc. if they were to be relocated, other park areas in the city would need to be constructed at yet more cost.

You mis-led the public by saying the RV Park is primarily used in the summer months in this survey. It seems there is always someone staying there from March to November besides the Camp Host. Maybe not this year since you promoted that the RV Park was closing in 2015 and this year it has a big pile of dirt next to the park. PLUS there would be room for an RV park downtown if you didn't hold land for a future Community Center. This building should be relocated elsewhere not the RV Park. A playground near the splash park? Is it on a hard surface only? No play structures. Plus the East playground needs to be relocated so kids don't have to run through a parking lot to get to the beach. The Beach allows "free and creative Play" that they can only get at City Beach. That should be the city focus plus it doesn't cost any money. Driftwood is FREE.

This summarizes the overview of this - and, by the way, I appreciate the on-line opportunity. I was surprised that the 3 plans shown were not included in giving us the public an opportunity on line to give input to each. There were qualities they each had that together could have maximized the potential improvements, but they were treated as exclusive to a particular Concept (ie 1, 2 or 3): Not sure what is driving the park renovation. The Park is a center piece of what Oak Harbor has hidden. When we have something good, capitalize on its good points rather than "beginning from scratch. Its use and activities are always governed by access (proximate parking) and weather. Football & Baseball & Basketball & Tennis courts do not need prime beach park locations. They just need land - as Ft. Nugent multi-field park affirms. A beachfront park draws waterfront viewers, walkers & strollers, picnicking and RV'ers (to come and stay at Oak Harbor). Convenient parking proximate to those activities increases usage. City Beach Street gives already-paved access to the existing parking area and could easily accommodate the proposed "east beachfront" parking -thus eliminating a proposed 2-lane access road and its construction noises, disruptions and extra lighting requirements - all bordering Waterside Condominiums (Haven't they some say in the already harsh, on-going vibrations and noise associated with the Sewer Treatment Facility?). At present, the current contractor parking area lends itself to the RV Park utilizing the north side and center for two rows (which appears to be capturing 75-80% of previous RV sites). The south edge of the contractor parking could be vehicle parking accessing the park. The existing tree line on this south edge could be the "north edge" dedicated to a single line of tent campers (since this grassy area here-to-for has rarely seen use. Some "H" areas could border these. Why is RV Park NOT under "Given Elements" since it: * Has been part of the existing park for so long? * Is the only significant, repeating and regular revenue-generating feature of the park? * Was so recently renovated and upgraded and funded? * Is truly a tourist attraction to come and spend time in Oak Harbor and its utilization record proves to be a source of measurement - where other park uses are sporadic? And why would - for reasons above - the RV Park be listed under "Medium Priority"? Community Centers and Amphitheater replace with concrete and structures the park lawns and natural qualities. Additionally, weather, rain, and 52 degree breezes and wind from Puget Sound neutralize Plaza and Amphitheater usage The proposed far-away parking and closure of City Beach Street deter usage as well. The cleaned-water stream and the fountain are both nice additions, however their placement knocks out the City Beach Street access to proposed new parking. These features could be re-routed and relocated, respectfully. I would hope to have these observations carefully reviewed and would appreciate hearing back from you. Michael Thelen 1401 SE Dock St. # 101 OH 98277. thelenmike.assoc@gmail.com

leave beach Street as is and if you need parking, keep current parking off beach street.. Do not move windmill, it is too big to move, Put coffee stand in it. Build smaller windmill at big entrance Roundabout. More trees, plantings and grass. Less money on big hard scape. Sea Wall is needed most important.

I cannot see in the image where the windmill is located. The windmill is an iconic Oak Harbor landmark. If you are going to move it, it should be place in a place of significance - at the main entrance or in the center of the "open" multi-use areas that are suggested by the poorly provided images.

The city should restore lifeguards to the lagoon with paddle-boat rentals as before. That was such a nice feature and a draw for parents to bring their kids. Now, without lifeguards, it's dangerous and not the draw it used for family summer-time activities. If you want people to come to the park, you have to give them something to do, safely. The sewer plant is not going to bring them in no matter how pretty you make it. You can put lipstick on a pig, but it's still a pig.

[in person open house] Start over. Leave baseball fields where they are – also keep the RV Park. Solve the parking problem and make access to beach and lagoon area user friendly. May have to give up some of the grass area for parking. Use area of current sewage plant for parking. Look at the events held at the park and see how you can best accommodate them. Watch your budget. Very expensive to do your current plan. Erin Taylor did a fine job of running the meeting. Use large print so we can see what is on the slides.

[in person open house] I do hope the east side road next to the Condos will be re-thought. ON the Easterly Quadrant arrange all parking to be accessed from City Beach St. Please less pavement in the park and more green plants instead. I feel the Team and the CAG have worked really hard on this project and appreciate their efforts. Thank them

Appendix 3: Notifications

Display ad in Whidbey News-Times

City of Oak Harbor
Windjammer Park Integration Plan

You're Invited! Share your thoughts on the future design of Windjammer Park

In Person
Tuesday, March 29
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Elks Lodge
155 NE Ernst St.

- Observe advisory group proceedings
- View the draft plan and share your thoughts

Online
March 30 – April 8
oakharborWPIPpublicmeeting.info

- Learn more about the draft plan
- View the draft plan and share your thoughts



The City of Oak Harbor has formed a community advisory group to help plan the future of Windjammer Park. Join us to learn more and provide feedback on the draft plan. Additional community feedback will help finalize the park plan this spring.

www.oakharborcleanwater.org/Park



Postcard sent to Oak Harbor residents

City of Oak Harbor
Clean Water Facility Project
Windjammer Park Integration Plan

You're Invited!

Share your thoughts on the future design of Windjammer Park

The City of Oak Harbor has formed a community advisory group to help plan the future of Windjammer Park. Join us to learn more and provide feedback on a draft plan. Community feedback will help finalize a park plan this spring.

In Person
Tuesday, March 29
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Elks Lodge
155 NE Ernst St.

- Observe advisory group proceedings
- View the draft plan and share your thoughts

Online
March 30 – April 8
oakharborWPIPpublicmeeting.info

- Learn more about the draft plan
- View the draft plan and share your thoughts



Siting the Clean Water Facility in Windjammer Park presents a unique opportunity to develop a long-term plan for the park.

Have questions about the Windjammer Park Integration Plan?
Contact Steve Powers: 360-279-4511 | spowers@oakharbor.org
Visit: www.oakharborcleanwater.org/Park



Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan – Open House Summary

Updated: Apr. 18, 2016

Slide for Channel 10 news (both open houses, left; online open house, right)


City of Oak Harbor
Clean Water Facility Project
Windjammer Park Integration Plan

You're Invited!

Share your thoughts on the future design of Windjammer Park

In Person
Tuesday, March 29
5:30 - 7:30 p.m.
Elks Lodge
155 NE Ernst St.

Online
March 30 - April 8
oakharborWPIPpublicmeeting.info




City of Oak Harbor
Clean Water Facility Project
Windjammer Park Integration Plan

Share your thoughts!

March 30 - April 8
oakharborWPIPpublicmeeting.info

- View draft design plan
- Give feedback on future of Windjammer Park



Yard signs in Windjammer Park

City of Oak Harbor
Clean Water Facility Project
Windjammer Park Integration Plan

How will Windjammer Park change in the future?

Find out more

In Person
Tuesday, March 29
5:30 - 7:30 p.m.
Elks Lodge
155 NE Ernst St.


Online
March 30 - April 8
oakharborWPIPpublicmeeting.info



Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan – Open House Summary

Updated: Apr. 18, 2016

Facebook posts (x2)



Appendix 4: Chuck Krieg Feedback

From: Chuck Krieg
To: Steve Powers
Subject: Windjammer Park plans
Date: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 4:44:53 PM

Mr. Powers,

Having been out of state all of February and most of March I was unaware how much had been done to develop new plans for the Windjammer Park area. Your email link is provided in the page that the city linked to for the park so I'd like to share a few of my personal thoughts. Without going into all the different options that your advisory group is discussing, I want to go on record with two concerns.

The main one is the area of the little league fields. I am completely opposed to removing these fields in their entirety. Having spent countless hours over my lifetime playing there, coaching there, volunteering on work parties to improve the fields, and donating financially through our businesses, I think removing baseball from park would be a terrible idea. The little league fields draw lots of kids & families to the park and it gives a "family friendly" feel to the city, especially the downtown region. And not only do I feel that the "vibe" of the city is made better with baseball there, the thought that all the efforts by those who contributed both financially and with their time being completely removed from the park will cause some very hard feelings about donating to projects like this in the future. And if building replacement fields is included somewhere in the advisory groups discussion, I don't think that building ballfields on top of the old city dump will ever replace what we have at city beach.

My second concern is not having an RV park in the plans. What I found online labeled as the "preferred alternative" includes no RV park. It seems that the RV park has always been a frequently used facility. And when notice of the closure was given there was such an uproar over both the lack of notice and the duration, that if the city now comes out with a plan that has nothing for RV's the city will create even more animosity than when they announced the "temporary closure".

Thanks for taking the time to read this and please forward to whoever in the city organization as would be appropriate for submission of community input.

Sincerely,
 Chuck Krieg

Appendix 5: Online Open House Form

City of Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan



- Welcome
- Background
- Design Basis
- Draft Plan/Preferred Concept
- Feedback 1
- Feedback 2
- Feedback 3
- Thank You

Welcome

Next

Welcome to the Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan online open house! The City of Oak Harbor hosted an in-person open house on March 29, 2016 to gather community feedback on a draft long-term design plan for Windjammer Park, including its activities and layout.

The online open house is intended to:

- Provide the latest information about the draft plan.
- Introduce the draft plan and get your feedback.

This open house will be available until April 8, 2016. All feedback from the online and in-person open houses will be provided to the project team. The final proposed plan will be shared with City Council on April 19, 2016.

How to use the online open house

Each tab above represents a station of this online open house. Navigate the stations by either clicking the "Next" button or the station names above. As you learn more about the draft plan, you may take notes in the section below. You will have the opportunity to submit the notes at the end of the online open house. You will also have the opportunity to share your thoughts and provide feedback through our survey in the "Feedback" stations.


[Next page](#)

Take notes as you go

You can use these notes later to provide your input on the Feedback 1, 2, and 3 pages.

sdgfsdfgdfg

Copyright ©2016 EnviroIssues



City of Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan



- Welcome
- Background
- Design Basis
- Draft Plan/Preferred Concept
- Feedback 1
- Feedback 2
- Feedback 3
- Thank You

Background

Next

What is the Windjammer Park Integration Plan?

Siting the Clean Water Facility in Windjammer Park presents a unique opportunity to develop a long-term plan for the park. To help guide the future vision of this special community space, the City of Oak Harbor is developing a Windjammer Park Integration Plan. The Plan will build upon past park planning efforts.

The Plan will:

- Integrate existing and new park elements (such as the windmill and the Clean Water Facility)
- Prioritize and define park elements
- Detail the location and layout of included park elements
- Identify potential funding sources
- Propose a phased implementation schedule (including potential funding sources)*

**Park elements defined in the Windjammer Park Integration Plan may be included in the park restoration associated with the Clean Water Facility Project.*



Timeline and process



Once Oak Harbor City Council adopts a final Windjammer Park Integration Plan, this sets the springboard for park development and further design, in phases, as funding is available.

[Next page](#)

Take notes as you go

You can use these notes later to provide your input on the Feedback 1, 2, and 3 pages.

sdgfsdfgdfg

Copyright ©2016 EnviroIssues

City of Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan



- Welcome
- Background
- Design Basis
- Draft Plan/Preferred Concept
- Feedback 1
- Feedback 2
- Feedback 3
- Thank You

Design Basis

Next

Community driven design

The City of Oak Harbor is excited to be working closely with the community on the development of the Windjammer Park Integration Plan. Through public meetings, City Commissions, and a Community Advisory Group, the Oak Harbor community has shared thoughts on park elements and design.

Who is the Community Advisory Group?

The Community Advisory Group was convened in January 2016 and represents diverse interests in Oak Harbor. The group serves as a sounding board for the Windjammer Park Integration Plan design team. Members were selected based on areas of expertise and expressed interest in the project, after advertisement to the entire community. All proceedings of the CAG are public, and materials are available on the [project webpage](#).

What feedback has been received so far?

- Prioritized park elements – A combination of park elements have been identified for inclusion in the draft plan, based on their degree of prioritization by the community.

Prioritized Park Elements				
GIVEN ELEMENTS	HIGH PRIORITY	MEDIUM PRIORITY	LOW PRIORITY	REMOVE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Automobile infrastructure* Canopy Existing wetlands Kayak campsite Kitchens Parking Restrooms Site furnishings - contemporary or materials found in Oak Harbor Windmill 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Event plaza Lagoon (renovate) Splash park Stage/amphitheater Waterfront trail/ park trails 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beach access Educational elements Gateway entrance (grand) Landscape and gardens Linkage to downtown Multi-purpose lawn North park commercial redevelopment Playground RV park* Safe connection bike trail to park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseball fields* Boat launch Fitness trail/equipment Gazebo Multi-use hard court/ basketball court* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City dock Site furnishings - traditional Wading pools

*Items are listed alphabetically, not in order of priority

*Relocate in or out of park

Windjammer Park Integration Plan | February 2016

[click to enlarge prioritized park elements](#)

- Location of park elements – Once elements were prioritized, CAG members helped the design team understand where they should be placed in the park and how each element should relate to the surroundings.
- Aesthetic of park elements – CAG members and the public provided feedback on the various types of treatments for elements included in the park through open house boards and imagery. They told us that park elements should feel like they belong on Whidbey Island and have a contemporary design.
- Reaction to initial design ideas – CAG members provided feedback on three potential integration plan concepts developed by the design team. The current draft plan, which is available for comment on the next few tabs, was developed based on feedback received.

Key terms:

Conceptual design: A preliminary design stage that focuses on ideas instead of exact treatments.

Park element: An activity, design feature, or structure that could be included in the final design of Windjammer Park. In any park, these might include play structures, water features, landscape, gardens, restrooms, and open spaces such as plazas.

Prioritized park element: Elements identified by the Community Advisory Group and City Council for inclusion in the Windjammer Park Integration Plan.

Given element: Elements prioritized to be included in the park regardless of design concept and include standard elements like parking, restrooms, and site furnishings, such as benches.

3/8/16 draft park concepts:



[click to enlarge 3/8/16 concept #1](#)



[click to enlarge 3/8/16 concept #2](#)

City of Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan



- Welcome
- Background
- Design Basis
- Draft Plan/Preferred Concept
- Feedback 1
- Feedback 2
- Feedback 3
- Thank You

Draft Plan/Preferred Concept

Next



[click to enlarge the draft plan](#)

The project team created a draft plan (preferred concept) based on the Community Advisory Group's input and public feedback from the [February open house](#). You can click the image to view the plan in a larger format. You will have the opportunity to give feedback about the plan on the next page.

The draft plan includes the following elements:

- Beach access
- Events plaza
- Gateway entrance
- Lagoon
- Landscape and gardens
- Multi-use lawn
- Playgrounds
- RV park
- Splash park
- Stage/amphitheater
- Waterfront trail
- Windmill

Diagrams illustrate how each element is incorporated into the plan.



[click to enlarge](#)






[click to enlarge](#)



[click to enlarge](#)



[click to enlarge](#)



[click to enlarge](#)

[Next page](#)

Take notes as you go

You can use these notes later to provide your input on the Feedback 1, 2, and 3 pages.

sdfgsdfgdfg

Copyright ©2016 EnviroIssues

City of Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan



- Welcome
- Background
- Design Basis
- Draft Plan/Preferred Concept
- Feedback 1**
- Feedback 2
- Feedback 3
- Thank You

Feedback 1

Next

The easiest way to provide feedback is to complete the survey questions on the following pages. The survey will take you about 10-15 minutes to complete. After answering each set of questions, don't forget to click SUBMIT. After you click SUBMIT, you will be taken to the next feedback page.

1. The project team has worked with a community advisory group, the community and City Council to prioritize park elements, which are reflected in the draft plan shown. Looking at the plan in its entirety, to what level are you satisfied with the plan in a draft stage? (You will get the chance to comment on individual elements on the next pages.)

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Windjammer Park hosts a range of community activities: events at 4th of July, boat races, daily walkers, lunch time storm watchers, young families, at playgrounds, Little League tournaments, pick-up basketball, lagoon swimmers and many more. Please indicate how well you think the draft plan represents the Oak Harbor community and the activities that could be enjoyed at Windjammer Park.

5 - very much	4	3	2	1 - not at all
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. There are several "given elements" in the park, including the park's wetlands, kitchens, parking, restrooms, the windmill and site furnishings. These items have been prioritized to be a part of any future Windjammer Park. On the whole, how satisfied are you with the treatment and quantity of the given elements in the park?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the treatment and quantity of the given elements in the park?

Submit



[click to enlarge](#)

City of Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan



- Welcome
- Background
- Design Basis
- Draft Plan/Preferred Concept
- Feedback 1
- Feedback 2**
- Feedback 3
- Thank You

Feedback 2

Next

After answering each set of questions, don't forget to click SUBMIT. After you click SUBMIT, you will be taken to the next feedback page.

1. There are several distinct areas of the draft plan for Windjammer Park. The project team has looked to connect all areas of the park. By creating physical connections between areas, the intent is to enhance the park's use in all seasons and for many different events. Do any of the quadrants seem disconnected from the other quadrants (see map)? If so, click the appropriate circle below. If not, select the last option.

- Quadrant 1
- Quadrant 2
- Quadrant 3
- Quadrant 4
- None seem out of place

2. Quadrant 1 of the draft plan includes rentable spaces, kayak campsite and non-motorized boat dock, hardcourts and playgrounds, and park-and-view parking. Park users can easily access these features from the parking lot and take advantage of the various spaces for recreation, play or picnicking. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 1?

4. Quadrant 2 of the draft plan includes a grand entrance with the windmill, crescent parking, multi-use fields, lagoon and stage. The grand entrance with the iconic windmill will identify the park at Beeksma and draw users into the park. This entrance takes advantage of the clear views and access leading into the park via the parking lot through the multi-use fields to the harbor, lagoon and stage. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



[click to enlarge](#)



5. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 2?

6. Quadrant 3 of the draft plan includes a large events space/plaza, splash park and overlook with beach access, taking advantage of the north-south promenade. The promenade leads from SW Pioneer Way and traverses through the plaza to the overlook. The large plaza connects the east side of the park with west side and provides spaces for events like farmers markets and car shows. From the plaza, users can access the Clean Water Facility visitors' center, stage, lagoon and splash park. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 3?

8. Quadrant 4 of the plan includes a multi-use field, large playground, vehicle access and a park-and-view parking lot. These elements take advantage of the physical proximity of and connection to the historic downtown. To what degree are you satisfied with the program in this area of the park?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with Quadrant 4?

10. The draft plan includes a waterfront trail which traverses the southern edge of the park, taking advantage of the harbor views. The trail is raised and moved into the park in areas to provide a diverse walking experience. There are nature walks and wind shelters that spur off of the trail so users can enjoy the dunes and picnic closer to the harbor. The waterfront trail connects users, downtown businesses and residents on the east side and the Freund Marsh on the west side. To what degree are you satisfied with the waterfront trail?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the waterfront trail?

Submit

[Next page](#)

Take notes as you go

You can use these notes later to provide your input on the Feedback 1, 2, and 3 pages.

sdfgsdfgdfg

Copyright ©2016 EnviroIssues

City of Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan



- Welcome
- Background
- Design Basis
- Draft Plan/Preferred Concept
- Feedback 1
- Feedback 2
- Feedback 3**
- Thank You

Feedback 3

Next

Today's Windjammer Park has many park elements that have been used for generations in Oak Harbor. Choices have been made to include park elements in the future Windjammer Park and others have been removed based on priorities identified by the community and City Council. The following questions are about those specific elements. After answering each set of questions, don't forget to click SUBMIT. After you click SUBMIT, you will be taken to the next page in the online open house.



[click to enlarge](#)

1. There are several park elements that could become "signature elements" for Windjammer Park, helping define the park's character and place in the Oak Harbor community. With that in mind, as they exist in the draft plan, which of the following park elements is your favorite in the draft plan?

-- Please Select --

2. Based on community priorities, the existing baseball fields have been identified as a park element that could potentially be removed, only if a separate location can be found to accommodate formal baseball games and tournaments. Instead, the design team has placed multi-use fields in the park. What choice for formal ballfield activities best matches your opinion for inclusion in a future Windjammer Park?

- Include baseball fields as they exist today, only for specific baseball use
- Include a limited number of multi-use fields, which could be striped for baseball or other sports
- Remove and relocate elsewhere in the city; formal ballfields are not necessary at Windjammer Park
- Unsure

3. An RV park is not shown in the draft plan for Windjammer Park. Staysail RV park currently has 57 stalls and is primarily used in summer months. When designers considered rebuilding an RV park in the same footprint/area for an RV park at Windjammer Park, approximately 17-20 RV stalls that could accommodate current RV lengths could be included in the facility. This greatly reduces the number of patrons who could use the facility. In addition, community advisory group members have prioritized other activities for inclusion in Windjammer Park over an RV park. There is potential that the RV Park could be relocated to another property in Oak Harbor and be run by a private enterprise rather than the City, which is common for RV Parks.

With this in mind, to what degree do you agree an RV park should be removed from Windjammer Park?

- Somewhat agree (with removal of RV park, as shown)
- Strongly agree (with removal of RV park, as shown)
- Neutral/unsure
- Somewhat disagree (keep a City-run RV park at Windjammer)

Strongly disagree (keep a City-run RV park at Windjammer)

4. The Windjammer Park Integration Plan will be built over a series of years as funding is available. Phasing will begin with areas adjacent to the Clean Water Facility once construction is complete. If you could choose, which two elements do you believe should be prioritized to be built first?

- Beach access
- Events plaza
- Gateway entrance
- Lagoon
- Landscape and gardens
- Multi-use lawn
- Playgrounds
- RV park
- Splash park
- Stage/ampitheater
- Waterfront trail
- Windmill

5. What additional comments do you have about the draft plan?

For example, are there any items you would most like to see included or made more prominent? What, if anything, could be improved in the draft park plan?

Submit

[Next page](#)

Take notes as you go

You can use these notes later to provide your input on the Feedback 1, 2, and 3 pages.

sdfgsdfgdfg

Copyright ©2016 EnviroIssues

City of Oak Harbor Windjammer Park Integration Plan



Welcome > Background > Design Basis > Draft Plan/Preferred Concept > Feedback 1 > Feedback 2 > Feedback 3 > Thank You

Thank You

The City of Oak Harbor appreciates your time and feedback. Please visit the [Windjammer Park Integration Plan page](#) on the [Clean Water Facility website](#) to learn more.

If you would like to receive updates on news and construction progress for the Clean Water Facility, please sign up for email updates below.

First Name

Last Name

Location

- I live in Oak Harbor
- I work in Oak Harbor
- I visit Oak Harbor

Email address *

Submit

Take notes as you go

You can use these notes later to provide your input on the Feedback 1, 2, and 3 pages.

sdfgsdfgdfg





Graphic created by Ecem Afacan from Noun Project.

COST ESTIMATE





Conceptual Construction Cost Estimate
Windjammer Park Phasing | Summary

Submitted 05/4/16

No.	Description	Phase 1	Phase 1B	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5	
	General Features and Appurtenances	\$ 153,221	\$ 124,843	\$ 147,702	\$ 186,139	\$ 201,354	\$ 201,354	\$ 1,014,613
1	Mobilization	\$ 87,555	\$ 90,795	\$ 107,420	\$ 135,373	\$ 146,439	\$ 146,439	\$ 714,022
2	Temporary Traffic Control	\$ 21,889	\$ 11,349	\$ 13,427	\$ 16,922	\$ 18,305	\$ 18,305	\$ 100,197
3	Erosion and Sediment Control	\$ 43,777	\$ 22,699	\$ 26,855	\$ 33,843	\$ 36,610	\$ 36,610	\$ 200,394
	Earthwork	\$ 371,332	\$ 62,699	\$ 200,565	\$ 181,530	\$ 229,830	\$ 269,830	\$ 1,315,785
4	Construction Surveying	\$ 43,777	\$ 22,699	\$ 26,855	\$ 33,843	\$ 36,610	\$ 36,610	\$ 200,394
5	Site Demolition	\$ 87,555	\$ -	\$ 53,710	\$ 67,687	\$ 73,220	\$ 73,220	\$ 355,391
6	Embankment	\$ 240,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 160,000	\$ 760,000
	Utilities	\$ 150,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 700,000
7	Site Utilities (storm/gas/water, power, sewer)	\$ 100,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 400,000
8	Building Utilities (gas/water/sewer/power)	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 300,000
	Lagoon	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 375,009	\$ -	\$ 375,009
9	Perimeter edge treatment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000
10	Floating Dock	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ 75,000
11	Wier and Bridge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ 200,000
	Paving and Surfacing	\$ 1,201,260	\$ 529,000	\$ 686,980	\$ 486,500	\$ 249,300	\$ 313,760	\$ 3,466,800
12	Aggregate Base	\$ 296,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 146,720	\$ 122,600	\$ 36,000	\$ 58,800	\$ 730,120
13	Asphalt Pavement	\$ 64,800	\$ -	\$ 208,160	\$ 32,000	\$ -	\$ 21,600	\$ 326,560
14	Concrete Walkways	\$ 372,960	\$ 72,000	\$ 49,600	\$ 19,200	\$ 48,000	\$ 103,200	\$ 664,960
15	Special Walkways	\$ 450,000	\$ 381,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 157,500	\$ 115,500	\$ 1,629,000
16	Concrete Curbs	\$ 17,000	\$ -	\$ 57,000	\$ 12,500	\$ -	\$ 14,000	\$ 100,500
17	Paint Striping	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 300	\$ 1,500
18	Soft Surface Path	\$ -	\$ 6,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,800	\$ 360	\$ 14,160
	Landscaping and Site Amenities	\$ 835,700	\$ 685,700	\$ 329,700	\$ 1,692,800	\$ 643,400	\$ 1,560,500	\$ 5,747,800
19	Restroom/Kitchen	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 750,000
20	Restroom	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000
21	Picnic Shelter	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 500,000
22	Site Retaining Walls	\$ 40,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ 42,000	\$ 177,000
23	Clearing and grubbing (invasive weed control)	\$ 152,500	\$ 67,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 118,750	\$ 557,250
24	Tree removal	\$ 33,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 8,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 5,500	\$ 76,000
25	Overlook Viewpoints with canopy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 225,000
26	Misc. Signs	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 150,000
27	Interpretive Kiosks	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 120,000
28	Modern Windmill'	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000
29	Relocate and Renovate Existing Windmill	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,000
30	Benches (6' w/back and arms)	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 54,000
31	Freestanding Drinking Fountains	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ 14,000
32	Trash Receptacles (garbage/recycling)	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 12,000
33	Picnic Tables (8' with ADA)	\$ -	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 30,000
34	Wind Shelters	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000
35	Bike Racks - "U"	\$ 3,200	\$ 3,200	\$ 3,200	\$ 3,200	\$ -	\$ 4,000	\$ 16,800
36	Irrigation	\$ 228,000	\$ 32,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 420,000	\$ -	\$ 280,000	\$ 1,000,000
37	Lawn Areas	\$ 28,500	\$ 7,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 96,000	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ 196,500
38	Rough Seeded Areas	\$ 10,500	\$ 6,000	\$ 4,500	\$ 2,100	\$ 29,400	\$ 750	\$ 53,250
39	Plantings	\$ 171,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 54,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 336,000
40	Water Feature Sequence	\$ 75,000	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000
41	Splash Play Area	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000
42	Masonry Trash Enclosure	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000
43	Kayak Launch Area	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000
44	Water Quality Deck Overlook	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,000
45	Security Chain Link Fencing/Gates	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
46	Basketball Courts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,000
47	Bocce courts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000
48	Play Area - Small	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000
49	Nature Play - Large	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
50		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Construction Subtotal	\$ 2,711,513	\$ 1,502,242	\$ 1,514,947	\$ 2,646,969	\$ 1,798,893	\$ 2,445,444	
	Contingency (30%)	\$ 813,454	\$ 450,673	\$ 454,484	\$ 794,091	\$ 539,668	\$ 733,633	
	Total Estimated Construction Cost	\$ 3,524,967	\$ 1,952,915	\$ 1,969,431	\$ 3,441,059	\$ 2,338,561	\$ 3,179,077	
	Design Fees	\$ 281,997	\$ 195,291	\$ 196,943	\$ 344,106	\$ 233,856	\$ 317,908	
	Total Estimated Construction Cost & Design Fees	\$ 3,806,964	\$ 2,148,206	\$ 2,166,374	\$ 3,785,165	\$ 2,572,417	\$ 3,496,985	
	GRAND TOTAL	\$ 17,976,111						\$ 12,620,007

COST COMPARISON



Khunamokwst Park

Portland, OR

Built 2015

4 AC - \$450,000/AC

Park Program Elements:

Traditional playground, swing set, canopy with rain-garden, water play, stormwater management, skate park, multi-use lawn, paths, landscaping, restrooms

Funding Sources:

City General Fund



Milwaukie Riverfront Park

Milwaukie, OR

Phase I 2014

8.5 AC - \$1,060,000/AC

Park Program Elements:

Public plaza, amphitheater, playgrounds, parking lot, pathways, boat dock, landscaping, restrooms

Funding Sources:

Oregon State Parks Fund Local Grant, Oregon

Marine board



The Dalles Festival Park

Portland, OR
Built 2015

4AC - \$450,000/AC

Park Program Elements:

Pavilion, parking loop, paths, restroom, picnic facilities, great lawn, landscaping

Funding Sources:

ARRA Funding (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act)



Westmoreland Park

Portland, OR
Built 2012

0.6AC - \$1,000,000/AC

Park Program Elements:

Nature play, water and sand play, trails, landscaping, plaza

Funding Sources:

City General Fund, Metro Nature in Neighborhood Grant





AM Kennedy Park

Beaverton, OR

Built 2012

2AC - \$141,200/AC

Park Program Elements:

Community gardens, playground, picnic areas, trails, open grassy areas, courts, landscaping, restroom

Funding Sources:

THPRD Bond Measure



Engelman Park

Wilsonville, OR

Built 2012

1AC - \$350,000/AC

Park Program Elements:

Playground, picnic areas, paths, stormwater management, multi-use lawn, sports fields, landscaping

Funding Sources:

City General Fund, Oregon State Park Local Park Grant



Hood River Waterfront Park

Hood River, OR
 Built 2015

6AC - \$420,000/AC

Park Program Elements:

Beach and swimming access, playground, large lawns, riverbank restoration, plaza, restroom

Funding Sources:

City General Fund



Tanner Springs Park, Portland, OR

Built 2004

1AC - \$2,500,000/AC

Park Program Elements:

Wetland restoration, plaza, walkways, art

Funding Sources:

Portland Development Commission, Tanner Springs Development Community, Private Investments





AVERAGE COST per ACRE

\$640,000/AC



Windjammer Park
Oak Harbor, WA

28.5 AC - \$630,000/AC





Graphic created by Ecem Afacan from Noun Project.

