

## Phillips Creek Trailhead Open House and Public Meeting – 3/7/19 Meeting Summary

### General Observations:

1. 60 people signed in. Staff estimates put total attendance near 80 people. Most people that showed up early stayed for the entire presentation and Q&A session at the end. Former Commissioner Mark Richard was in attendance as was current Commissioner Mary Kuney.
2. Set-up worked great with open house from 4:45- 6:00 pm, presentation from 6:00 pm until 6:30 pm, and Q&A from 6:30 pm until 7:30 pm. We had several trailhead renderings as well as the site plan and trail plan printed on E-D-size posters and available for viewing. Sticky notes were made available to record comments. Coffee and one “flat” of Costco cookies were consumed. Comments received regarding the meeting overall were positive, so this format should be repeated for similar projects.

### Comments Received / Staff Response:

1. There was a mix of positive comments and negative. Most if not all negative comments were from neighbors as follows:
  - a. Security – Is this going to be the new party spot? How will Spokane County Parks prevent overnight campers, fires, parties, etc.? **Staff response:** *lighting, webcam, park ranger and Sherriff’s Office, signs, good design, location, neighbors.*
  - b. Speed limits are not being followed by Iller Creek users and with the school close by, how is Spokane County going to ensure safe speeds? **Staff response:** *Staff will work with City of Spokane Valley see if reduced speed limits are possible and / or the addition of speed limit signage facing the other direction to address folks leaving the trailhead.*
  - c. Iller Creek / Holman Road Trailhead – Concerns about how popular that trailhead is and past challenges there. Several spoke-up expressing how much better it’s gotten in recent years – no fires last year with many applauding those statements. **Staff note:** *Staff will look into how County Parks can improve the site through potential widening, lighting, and webcam installation.*
  - d. Forest Management and Fire Risk. **Staff response:** *Glenrose Unit is likely to be the next property to go through a forest management plan process.*
  - e. Capacity concerns – Will this lot be large enough to accommodate demand? **Staff response:** *We have the future expansion designed in.* Concerns over parking along Sunderland and a request to post “no parking” signs. **Staff response:** *We’ll need to work with City of Spokane Valley on that request concurrent with construction of the trailhead.* Several requests to work with Ponderosa Elementary to handle overflow or parking prior to construction of the trailhead. Staff noted that folks are likely to park along Sunderland rather than walk 2 blocks more. **Staff response:** *Staff will contact Ponderosa Elementary to discuss options.*
  - f. Concern over design related to equestrian use by S.C.O.P.E. **Staff response:** *Staff will adjust trailhead design to widen the gravel shoulder (1 ¼” minus) to the east where the area will double as a snow storage area.*
  - g. Karl Wilkinson brought up MacPhee’s future development. Several audience members expressed doubt that the development would ever happen because of costs. He also brought up the upper location and ADA access. **Staff response:** *Staff shared with Karl*

*afterwards that Parks could look at ADA improvements elsewhere. This area is difficult because of topography and road improvements necessary to create an ADA parking spot at Location #2.*

- h. Concern expressed over impact of trails on wildlife. Since Iller Creek has grown in popularity, wildlife sightings have dropped. **Staff response:** *We work with WDFW to review trail plans for impact on wildlife. I would like to see WDFW perform wildlife surveys to determine and potentially quantify the impact.*
- i. Timing – Several questions regarding funding and timing. **Staff Response:** *Construction could be a year from now, could be five years. Just don't know. There are several potential funding sources.* Can County Parks open public access to the site without a trailhead in place? **Staff response:** *County Parks will plan to discourage public use until a trailhead is in place. We don't want to create an attractive nuisance that will negatively impact neighbors, however, the site will technically be open to the public.*
- j. Neighbors expressed concern about visitors feeding livestock. **Staff response:** *Staff will look into adding signage (Example: "Do not feed animals").*
- k. One attendee expressed a desire to open trails to class 1 e-bikes. **Staff response:** *Trails on-site will follow county-wide policy for e-bike use on conservation futures property.*
- l. One attendee expressed concern about cleanliness of portable restrooms. **Staff response:** *County Parks staff to monitor cleanliness of restrooms and request additional service by contractor as needed.*
- m. Several neighborhood residents expressed thankfulness that the site is being conserved and thoughtfully designed for conservation and recreation (as opposed to a private residential development).