



---

PROJECT NUMBER: # 15-065PLN                      ISSUE DATE: April 21, 2015  
PROJECT NAME: Clark County Parks & Recreation Comprehensive Plan

---

RECORDED BY: Jean Akers & Leanne Mattos  
TO: FILE  
PRESENT: Debbi Hanson, Battle Ground  
Pete Capell, Camas  
Jeff Niten, Ridgefield  
Jody Bartkowski, Woodland  
Barbara Anderson, PAB co-chair  
Kelly Punteney, PAB co-chair  
Bill Bjerke – Clark County Parks  
Leanne Mattos – Clark County Parks  
Jean Akers – Conservation Technix

---

**SUBJECT: Stakeholder Session Meeting Notes: Park and Rec Providers (04/09/15)**

---

Bill Bjerke welcomed the representatives from Battle Ground, Camas, Ridgefield and Woodland to discuss the county parks plan. Participants introduced themselves and shared their relative roles within their jurisdictions. Bill provided a short summary of the project and thanked the stakeholders for their time. (After the meeting, additional emailed comments were submitted by Suzanne Grover of Washougal who was unable to join the meeting.)

## DISCUSSION / COMMENTS

**1. What do you see as key priorities for regional park and trail system within, affecting or adjacent to your jurisdictions? What regional facilities are missing? Where are the regional recreation facility gaps??**

- Gaps in regional trails need to be connected. Especially the second phase of the Chelatchie Prairie Railroad Trail into Battle Ground.
- Relationships should be developed so it's easier to know who to contact for more information about parks, recreation and trails.
- Consider the need for a regional aquatic facility through a multi-jurisdictional partnership.
- Potential acquisition in the works for the Brush Prairie softball complex (private) that could provide space for Battle ground Little League to move out of Battle Ground's Fairgrounds Park to allow that park to complete the build-out for its master plan.
- Sports fields are in high demand. Camas is serving Camas, Washougal and portions of east county and could use more facilities. Camas has an interest in partnering.
- Connecting regional trails – Camas is ready to partner.

## Stakeholder Session Meeting Notes: Park and Rec Providers (04/09/15)

Clark County Parks & Recreation Comprehensive Plan

Project Number 15-065PLN

Page 2

---

- Consider the future of Camp Currie and how it can serve the growing urban area (of Camas).
  - How can Green Mountain, Camp Currie and Lacamas county properties relate with trails and growing population? Suggests the need for a broader, more regional master park/special facility plan.
  - Camas is conferring with the Port of Camas/Washougal to create a connecting trail system all along waterfronts – Stiegerwald NWR to Washougal River Greenway Trail.
  - Trail connections for a regional system (including sidewalks to bridge off-street connections)
  - RV camping is missing. William Clark Park is the perfect solution for East County.
  - Trail connections are important to Ridgefield.
  - The Lewis River-Vancouver Lake Water Trail has huge potential to draw people to Ridgefield.
  - The proposed regional trail from Vancouver Lake to the Ridgefield NWR Carty unit is desirable.
  - Flume Creek property (purchased by Conservation Futures funding) could be helpful connection.
  - Woodland is working on their park and recreation plan update. They just did their survey. The top results indicated trails were priority and people wanted more trails and more connections.
  - Woodland has a new 40-acre property with plans to build a sports complex. Rotary Club is doing a management plan to review the operations and maintenance requirements/expectations.
  - YMCA has purchased property for a future facility in Woodland.
  - Woodland has participated in the initial LRVL water trail planning and is interested in being more involved. Recent city ownership of a parcel on the river on the east side of town could serve as a future launch access.
2. **What do you see as the future role for the County in providing regional parks and trails that should be incorporated into this Plan? Are there critical themes, issues or policies that need attention?**
- Traditional county role is to provide the regional approach with cities taking care of themselves. Usually there is a clear distinction between roles. However, park and recreation users do not know boundaries between city/county jurisdictions
  - Most cities have very limited capital resources. County has very little regional park/trail capital resources. New money is needed. The regional MPD could be the answer.

**Stakeholder Session Meeting Notes: Park and Rec Providers (04/09/15)**

Clark County Parks & Recreation Comprehensive Plan

Project Number 15-065PLN

**Page 3**

---

- Discussions in the past about a potential regional MPD were not supported by some cities who did not want to cede local control. Now with resources that are not adequate for needs/demands, there may perhaps be a more open receptive attitude.
  - Promoting the Intertwine and being engaged can help local cities get the message out (about parks and trails).
- 3. Are there opportunities you would like to explore for collaborating on special projects that would benefit by county park participation; with recreational programming within county facilities; or to increase collective resources through grant funding, volunteer programs or other pursuits?**
- Woodland got some RCO grants due to “partnership” value.
  - Camas would like to have more collaborative discussions more regularly.
  - Past attempts to have regular P&R leaders meet to discuss shared topics were unsuccessful but could be time to try again.
  - City public works directors meet monthly. A less frequent interval could work for parks and recreation. Same person from smaller cities would be the representative (so meeting too often would be too much).
  - There’s a need for more available recreational programming in the Vancouver urban growth area.
  - Battle Ground is ready to explore the opportunity to get after-school and summer camps to more of the community. Providing recreation programs gets folks engaged in the rest of the parks and trail system.
  - The county could have a role to facilitate recreation programming by providing infrastructure.
  - New (proposed) park and recreation leadership group could explore collaborative recreation programming. Meetings could meet quarterly and at different jurisdictional locations.

Every effort has been made to accurately record this meeting. If any errors or omissions are noted, please provide written response within five days of receipt.

-- *End of Notes* --

cc: Bill Bjerke  
project file