

Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board

Agenda

Thursday, November 7, 2019

Louisville City Services

739 S. 104th St.

7:00 PM

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Staff Updates
5. Board Updates
6. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
7. Tree Removal Appeal
8. Review of 2019 Accomplishments and Planning Discussion on 2020 Board Goals
9. Agenda Items for Next Meeting
10. Adjourn

Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

Thursday October 03, 2019

Louisville City Services

739 104th St

7 PM

1. Roll Call: PPLAB members present: Shelly Alm, Laurie Harford, Ellen Toon, Ezra Paddock, City Council Liaison Susan Loo, Allan Gill Parks Project Manager, Director of Parks & Rec Nathan Mosley, Members of playground design team: Mark Taylor, Liz Loehmer, and Matt Adams.
2. Approval of Agenda: Unanimously approved
3. Approval of Minutes: Unanimously approved
4. Staff Updates:
 - A. Recognition to Susan Loo for serving as Council Liaison to the Board
 - B. Survey to help determine new outdoor amenities is live on the City website: Louisville Outdoor Athletic Amenity Survey
 - C. Colorado Dept of Public Health: New interpretation for re-use water will result in changes for the pond at the dog park at Community Park
 - D. Median Project: Drawings coming soon
5. Board Updates: None
6. Public Comments on Items Not on Agenda
 - A. PPLAB update from Outdoor Athletic Amenities group: Town is in need of additional athletic facilities. Example: Fall baseball has over 300 kids enrolled and not enough space for practices. Discussion to open Sports Complex for practice use. Discussion to implement multi-purpose fields.
7. Playground Replacement Project, Elephant and Keith Helart Parks. Allan Gill, PLA, Park's Project Manager
 - A. Review of Conceptual Layout Elephant Park: Adventure theme, Post and Deck play equipment theme. Lots of interest in Post and Deck equipment along with the Rope Climbing equipment.
 - B. Review of Conceptual Layout Keith Helart Park: Post and Deck play equipment theme, Obstacle course theme, and Nature Play theme. Park setting lends itself well to the nature play theme.

- C. Discussion around park concepts, email input from public. Discussion around mixing of popular concepts (traditional post and deck play equipment along with adventure and nature play equipment).
 - D. Public comment: Stacey Proctor – Post and Deck equipment is popular with kids. Likes a mix of young child, older child equipment with some separation.
 - E. Public comment: Terrance Keane – variety in parks is a plus, likes the mix and max concept; adventure, post and deck, nature all together. Advocates for retaining traditional play structure identity with added fun elements.
 - F. Discussion around addition of shade/structure.
8. Sundance Park
- A. Developed in mid-80s, seeded with native turf type species, buffalo grass. Current look is a spotty mix of tawny colored buffalo grass and patches of vibrant green bluegrass.
 - B. Discuss needs/desires of residents and users of Sundance Park; develop a study to outline steps moving forward for this site.
 - C. Discuss working towards a bluegrass park or reestablishing native grass. Park amenities could include benches, disc golf, additional trail connections, and maintenance of plant material.
 - D. Next Steps: Assess current condition of irrigation system; assess current health and vitality of trees and shrubs; gather initial thoughts of PPLAB; engage adjacent neighbors/users of park; develop potential phased approach to improvements.
 - E. PPLAB discussion: additional maintenance needed on some of the overgrown shrubs, trees. Current maintenance includes general mowing only. Discussion to reach out to neighbors and gather consensus. Discussion around adding a trash can near the existing post with dog clean-up bags. Discussion around taking an inventory of trees, esp. ash trees.
9. Prioritization of Subdivision Entryways
- A. Possible renovations in 2020, \$57,000 budget. Based on program goals and site needs.
 - B. Planning and design around areas with/without irrigation.
10. Agenda Items for Next Meeting
- A. Transportation Master Plan
 - B. Revisit park scorecard to help determine capital improvement wish list
11. Meeting Adjourned 9:15 p.m.

Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Hello Terence,

I received your email and will forward it along to the Parks Board.

Thanks,

Dean

Dean Johnson, Jr.

Parks Superintendent

City of Louisville

(303) 335-4774

deanj@louisvilleco.gov

Dear Dean,

You may have already seen the message below, as I sent it to Nathan yesterday, but I just read on the city website that comments for the Parks Advisory Board should be emailed to you. So I'm just forwarding this along to ensure that it goes through the proper channels.

Thanks very much for your time and attention,

Terence Keane

----- Forwarded message -----

Dear Nathan,

It was nice to meet you last week during the open house at Keith Helart Park and at the meeting for the Parks Advisory Board. Thank you for all the work that you and your team are doing to care for our town. As you requested, I'm sending this email to follow up and to ensure that you have my contact information.

I am excited and grateful that the city plans to renovate Keith Helart Park. As you know, like many of my neighbors, I support a traditional play structure at our playground. Like other neighbors, I also find the idea of a "nature play" theme attractive. The people I spoke to at the open house seemed particularly excited by a combination of the two concepts.

I am deeply concerned, however, that the "nature play" theme only be implemented if the budget will permit full realization of that vision with a wide variety of structures and activities that provide lasting entertainment and exercise for children of different ages and abilities. The possibilities shown on the sides of the "nature play" proposal are very interesting, yet the proposed execution of this theme shown

on the map actually offers a very limited set of options. It seems to me that these will only engage children of a certain age range and inclination -- and then only for a limited time. I do not think that a climbing net, a tree trunk, and a few rocks will keep even the most active kids engaged for very long.

The reason that I'm advocating for a single traditional play structure is that it provides a greater variety of activities for a greater range of children. Just the other day, I was at Keith Helart Park with three other families. Seven children ranging in age from 10 months to 9 years old were all happily playing together on the existing play structure. The older, more adventurous kids were climbing and cavorting on the higher levels; the smaller children were content with the stairs, tunnel, and short slide. Yet they were all able to play together in the same place.

I am very concerned that either of the two existing proposals that were discussed at the meeting would be a step backward from what we have now. The traditional proposal would install two smaller play structures that unnecessarily segregate children by age and actually provide fewer opportunities for older children. The nature play proposal would create a playground with even fewer activities, and only serve a certain type of child. Because the pictures shown on the edges of that proposal suggest a much more elaborate playground, I believe even the proponents of the nature play concept would be surprised and disappointed by that modest outcome.

I agree that the information that has been gathered is useful. It provides a window into the community's preferences, yet personally I don't believe the available information is sufficient to conclude that any of the proposals are favored as they currently stand. Even the committee's liaison to the city council, Susan Yoo, pointed out that data is being gathered in a manner that is highly subjective and doesn't offer significant, scientific, statistical conclusions. Before any decision is made on how to spend the money, I would love to see proposals put forward for feedback that show only what the city actually proposes to do.

I am anxious that we will end up with something like the compromise proposed at the meeting for Elephant Park, where the fans of a traditional playground end up only with a very small play structure for toddlers and the fans of nature play end up with only a single net to climb on. This actually provides fewer options for all ages, and seems like the worst of both worlds.

I know that this is a small neighborhood playground that will only obtain limited funding. For that very reason, I strongly advocate for a simple update of what we currently have. It seems clear that the city can't spend sufficient funds to fully implement a new grand vision for the playground, so please don't give us half a loaf.

If I can be of any assistance to you as this process proceeds, please let me know. As we discussed, Brad Pugh and I organize a neighborhood party in the park every year and have contact information for dozens of our neighbors. I'd be more than happy to help with outreach, data gathering, or anything else.

Thank you again for all of your work and your ongoing service to our community.

Sincerely yours,

Terence Keane

[2437 N Franklin Ave, Louisville](http://www.2437NFranklinAve.com)

To: Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board (PPLAB)
From: Dean Johnson, Parks Superintendent
Date: 10/22/19
Subject: Tree Removal Appeal

Purpose:

According to Article I, Section 3, B, 7 of the Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board Bylaws, "The role of the Board will include, but not be limited to, advising the City Council on such matters as...to hear appeals of decisions of the city forester concerning licensing of arborists and removal of trees as provided in Chapter 8.12 of the Louisville Municipal Code".

Justin Solomon is appealing a decision by the City Forester to remove a cottonwood tree at Cleo Mudrock Park.

Citizen Appeal Request:

Hi Dean,

I left you a voicemail this morning and I'm available to chat today between now and 2:15 PM. As requested, please accept this email as my submittal for inclusion in the PPLAB meeting packet. I will also plan to attend the November meeting in person.

There is a mature, healthy cottonwood tree located approximately 25 feet from my property in the Cleo Mudrock Park. I was made aware by the City Forester, Chris Lichty, that the tree is being considered for removal. The stated reason for removal was that the tree's roots are impacting a concrete electric utility box located adjacent to the tree. By the City Forester's own assessment, the cottonwood tree is not diseased or dying, but quite vigorous and healthy (virtually no dead branches). Chris also indicated removal would be a benefit to me in the event the tree is damaged in a storm. I do not see a potential threat to my residence and will happily accept any damage to my fencing or yard in the unlikely event a healthy limb breaks from the tree. Regardless, it is my understanding Colorado Law would hold the city blameless in the event the tree were ever to damage my property, so there is no need to remove the tree on my account.

It appears the sole driver for removal is the impact to the utility box and not anything to do with the health of the tree or a threat to public safety. Therefore, it seems any decision to remove the tree should be based on an economic evaluation of the available alternatives. I respectfully ask, that the City Forester and PPLB consider and answer the following questions (if they have not done so already) before proceeding with any removal:

1) Has the damage already been done to the utility box given the mature size and age of the tree? In other words, how much additional damage, if any, is risked by leaving the tree in

place? Is the box already damaged to the point that would necessitate rebuilding/relocating it?

2) What is the cost to the city for contractor removal versus the cost relocating the utility box? Is the cost of relocating the utility box more than the cost to remove such a large and healthy tree? What value do you assign to the tree itself, as it is irreplaceable in the near-term?

3) If the cost of relocating the utility box is in fact greater than the cost of removal, would the city consider allowing us and our neighbors to fund the difference in order to keep the tree?

Despite having to rake its considerable drop of leaves this time of year, my family and I truly love having this magnificent tree as our neighbor. From its summer shade to the rustling sounds of Fall leaves, the wildlife it attracts, and the privacy it provides, we can't imagine not enjoying this tree for years to come. As our neighbor, I respectfully ask that the City give full consideration to all available options and their associated costs/values. If there is an economic benefit to the City behind removal then please consider allowing your resident neighbors to financially "adopt" this tree, so it can be saved for the enjoyment of all.

On a personal note, I fully recognize that often trees do need to be removed. Growing up in Pennsylvania my family heated our home with a wood burning furnace and managed a large wood lot. I've personally cut down dozens of trees that were diseased, of poor resource value, or being crowded. I've also planted thousands of trees in my lifetime. At a time when the city is poised to lose hundreds of Ash trees to the emerald ash borer and Ips beetles are threatening our spruce trees (both species of tree are also present behind our house and in danger of being lost), I question the need and priority of removing such a large, prominent, and healthy tree if there is any viable alternative, which from my perspective, there does appear to be, especially if the City is willing to work with the residents most directly impacted.

I thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Justin Solomon
477 Lincoln Ct

City Reasons for Proposed Removal:

The cottonwood slated for removal is impacting utilities. Adjacent to the cottonwood tree is the irrigation pump house. A portion of these irrigation components in the pump house failed during this past summer and needs to be repaired before spring start-up. In conducting this project, best approach would be to remove the cottonwood at which all current issues caused by this species of tree in this location could be corrected. Issues are as following:

- The tree is in close proximity to an overhead power line and water line. The location of this tree is problematic due to the conflict with utilities.
- Roots have shifted the pump house structure. At which access has become extremely difficult to the pump house.
- Grading issues currently exists that need to resolved. Roots will need to be removed in order to correct this.
- The cottonwood tree overhangs a highly used trail by the school children. This species of tree in this location is less than ideal from a safety standard. Cottonwoods rank as one of the most hazardous trees in the U.S. Planting of cottonwoods are not recommend around structures, rights-of-way, gathering places, etc.

pictured below is the cottonwood tree



Mr. Solomon raises some excellent questions, which could be discussed in detail at the November PPLAB meeting, but specific answers to all questions may be currently lacking by staff. In order to provide some of this information, an engineer's analysis/estimate will be required as to feasibility of the request to relocate and to provide an accurate cost estimate.

City staff believes the removal of this tree is in the best interest of the general public and the request to keep may fall more in line with private interest. Public good versus private interest is unfortunately sometimes in conflict, at which, normal procedures align with moving forward with what is best overall for the community. City staff is hoping a decision can be reached regarding this cottonwood at the November meeting in order to plan for repair activities to occur this fall.

Next Steps:

PPLAB could elect to support the City Forester's recommendation, elect to support Mr. Solomon's request of not removing, or ask for additional information or engineer's assessment to be provided and discussed at a future PPLAB meeting.

Memorandum

To: Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board (PPLAB)
From: Dean Johnson, Parks Superintendent
Date: 10/30/19
Subject: Review of 2019 Accomplishments and Planning Discussion on 2020 Board Goals

Purpose:

The purpose of this agenda item is to review PPLAB's 2019 accomplishments and to discuss 2020 goals and objectives.

Background:

Meeting monthly means the Board in a calendar year will only meet 12 times. The staff liaison wants to make sure that appropriate time is given for all of PPLAB's goals and objectives and in knowing such, objectives can be prioritized and scheduled out accordingly.

Next Steps:

If needed, schedule out additional objectives on the Tentative Board Calendar.

Parks and Public Landscaping Advisory Board

TENTATIVE* Board Items Calendar

(updated October 24, 2019)

December 5, 2019	January 9, 2019	February 6, 2020
<p>Action Items:</p> <p>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nawatny Ridge Development <p>Updates/Discussion from the Board:</p>	<p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Election of Officers <p>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Current Use of Herbicides in Parks Review Bylaws <p>Updates/Discussion from the Board:</p>	<p>Action Items:</p> <p>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Joint Meeting with the Opens Space Advisory Board Revisit park scorecard to help determine capital improvement “wish list” <p>Updates/Discussion from the Board:</p>
March 5, 2020	April 2, 2020	May 7, 2020
<p>Action Items:</p> <p>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital Project Requests Review <p>Update/Discussion from the Board:</p>	<p>Action Items:</p> <p>Updates/Discussion from the Department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital Project Requests Review Operational Budget Request Review <p>Update/Discussion from the Board:</p>	<p>Action Items:</p> <p>Update/Discussion from the Department:</p> <p>Update/Discussion from the Board:</p>

*All items are subject to change.