

NOTE ON THESE COMMENTS:

This document includes verbatim comments from constituents on the topic of McEuen Park.

I have removed their names from the emails and the only slight editing that I might have done is to try to protect their privacy by removing family names, etc., or removing extraneous personal notes that constituents may have included. Even so it may be possible to know who some of the correspondents are, but please know that I have tried to be discreet while not editing out any passion or editorial content.

I think it's important to read unfiltered what constituents are saying, and I add that these are NOT simply supporters or opponents, it's from the list of newsletter emails I send out which is to a pretty broad cross-section of the public.

I haven't compiled the comments of the many people who have talked with me personally or called me in this format, but they run pretty close to this in terms of concern – support and opposition, and questions.

The comments are all from January 5th – January 19th, and so it doesn't include any additional feedback on the idea that was in the newspaper about a boat launch at NIC.

Mike Kennedy
Coeur d'Alene City Council
mkennedy@cdaid.org
mike@idahokennedys.com
208-661-7337

I have not kept up with McEuen issues, but my two cents is that you consider tennis courts....at least 4 but hopefully 6. Note that one needs 6 to run a good tennis tourney. I got thru college on the tennis courts, and anyone can play from age 5 to 85. Those courts were precious when I was here in the late 70's but went downhill from there. Lighted tennis courts!

As to McEuen Field, I think there are a number of great concepts that should be pursued. My greatest concern is that this will become so political due to the cost that it creates an election fallout.

I have studied the McEuen Field proposal thoroughly and compared it to previous studies. Here are my thoughts (please excuse the length of the comments):

1. I had my reservations at first about losing the boat launch but I've gotten over them. My dad and I launched there for the first time after moving back here in 1963 so there is nostalgia about the place. However, the area is much too valuable to have for that purpose, especially since it's mostly Spokane boaters who still launch there.
2. I love the parking garage concept. My hat's off to whoever thought that up because it is brilliant. I know the cost is a factor but what a nice alternative to utilizing valuable open space to park cars. I also know there should be a large Parking Fund Balance that has accrued over the years to help pay for it. Very well thought out.
3. Ball Fields: I think it will be important to show where they are going. I've heard about the west Riverstone site (where the old mill grounds are too contaminated to be used for anything else) and other options. I think it would relieve a lot of tension on that subject if people were assured the ball fields will have a new home, and a better one at that.
4. I've also read with interest what the OpenCDA 'criers' feel about it, especially the timing of moving ahead at this time in a down economy. I know the reasons for moving ahead now are tied to LCDC's Lake District funding life and the sooner you move ahead the lower the annual debt service will be on the bonds to pay for it. I think this may be an inflaming issue, but it might make sense to 'flesh this out' if anyone brings that up.
5. To continue on that theme, I think funding is very crucial to this and I believe it should be part of the discussion now. That is so no one is concerned that their taxes will go up on account of the construction. I think this is very crucial as I noted above. I don't think it is too soon to reveal the sources of the funding, including the bonding authority of LCDC, its 12-year remaining life, and also the other sources of funding (i.e. the Parking Fund reserve, any Water and Wastewater funds that will be used for those improvements, street funds for reconstructing Front Avenue (including impact fees), parks impact fees, and any others I may not have considered. The plan will gain momentum if people actually think (as I know) that there are funds available to make much of it happen.

Thanks for the info Mike. I am totally against changing what we have. I have lived here over 40 years and like the idea of being able to drive down to the water, launching a boat, taking in a baseball or softball game. Just the other day I was able to drive my mother in the car where she could view the resorts lights, take in the beauty of the lake and tubs hill with out getting out of the car as she is disabled. I understand this may benefit some down town business folks and especially the big man, but we need to look at the community as a whole.

Even if it is good for the community and gets community support, I believe it is the wrong time to be spending money on designing and or implementing a construction project.

I will try and make it Thursday night to get more info on the parking and expense.

I think the proposal is GREAT. I think there could be a few tweaks, of course, but all in all it is a fabulous idea. That real estate is SUCH an asset that this city has never taken advantage of. Look at the Boardwalk in Portland on the river...the areas on the coast in San Diego... Every town that has a waterfront setting should take full advantage of its beauty and charm.

Obviously, Mike, the big deal is how to afford it as I don't think it can be done piecemeal (the parking garage must be built at the same time to accommodate the current traffic loads, much less the increased loads from utilizing this great new asset.

I think there will be some fallout from boaters but again, I think that is a small sacrifice to pay. I know the BLM launch on the river is many times full, but maybe there is an option to expand parking there...

Good luck...and thanks for having me on your list.

Mike, thank you for the opportunity to respond. From the comprehensive plan I have seen in The Press, I am very supportive of the concept. As they say, the devil is always in the details, but from a broad overview, the plan looks great. My only comment at this time is WAIT. Wait until the economy has bounced back, wait until unemployment is substantially reduced, wait until the housing market recovers. Now is not the time to invest property taxpayer monies in such a broad costly project. WAIT until the time is right when I believe the City will receive property owner support.

The McEuen plan certainly does have a lot to offer to our citizens. My only concern would be the American Legion Ball Field. Years ago—I think after the Walker/Macy study, the Council promised the citizens that no amenity at McEuen would be removed unless it was replaced somewhere else by "equal or better". LCDC has looked for at least 5 years for a replacement site, to no avail. The softball fields, basketball courts and tennis courts have all gone to better homes.

Thank you for requesting input on the McEuen Field project. I would like to begin by saying that the project design is beautiful. I'm also a tennis player as well as my family, so I was glad to see that tennis courts were included in the design.

Thanks for the contact! I'm not sure I can make the meeting on Thursday, but the McEuen Field project has my full support. I think it's a totally underused park and obviously one of the nicest pieces of real estate in our city.

I've been all over the facebook page and viewed all of the renderings and I am truly impressed.

Here's some feedback:

Moving the parking lot away from the waterfront to underground or somewhere else is the most important place to start. Developing that whole waterfront area with it's various points of interest is most important to me. I like the plaza areas and the connection down 4th to Sherman.

The large green spaces are key so that the park doesn't look overdeveloped -it's a park after all.

On the flipside, the various sports courts near the library are vital so there are activities available and it doesn't become a dead space. A good balance between the two is crucial, like city park.

I like the idea of the pedestrian area on Front St. By the way, I am in the minority because I would also favor turning Sherman Ave into a pedestrian/semi pedestrian mall, however, I'm not sure where the traffic would go if we did both streets. I've lived in Santa Cruz and Boulder where the main streets are pedestrian. Santa Cruz has one lane of traffic with lots of sidewalk space and

planters. Pearl St in Boulder is completely pedestrian and the traffic is diverted to the surrounding streets very effectively. Both are extremely successful destination areas for locals and visitors alike and both downtowns are thriving. Something to think about, but with regard to the park, I hope we can at least move forward getting one section done at a time.

I know the softball folks are going to be upset, however, it's a relatively small percentage of the population and completely seasonal, not the best use of the space. The ball fields can be moved and when people are watching a ball game, they're not necessarily looking at the scenery anyway. It would also alleviate the parking problem on game days. You could keep one ball field so folks could have a friendly game on their own, but not the league games.

If (when) the budget gets tight, scratch the Tubbs Hill stuff, do the park first and do that later. Also, I'd love to see the carousel come back, but I'd put it in City Park-the kids are already there because of the beach and play structure. The plans for McEuen Field give it a more mature feel. Just my opinions, thanks and good luck with this project-let me know if you need help!

One issue that I saw that was of concern was a skate park. I loved skate parks when I was a kid and I'm sure our community kids will also enjoy anything we do for them in regards to these activities. The problem that I foresee is that the kids have changed. I purposely keep my family away from our current skate park because of the kids that seem to congregate there. Between the language, graffiti, and alcohol/tobacco/drug violations this is definitely not a safe family environment. If we include a skate park in the McEuen design, this activity will surely follow. I believe that it is very difficult to change peoples behavior, but it is very easy to control where they chose to misbehave.

One of my favorite sayings is, "If it is predictable, it is preventable." This is very predictable. I hope you take this into consideration.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to provide this input, and more importantly, thank you for what you do for our community.

Good to hear from you! As you can imagine, I am all for the plan as I am on the steering committee! We have worked hard and agonized at times but I think the plan is a great one.

I've already given you feedback about McEuen and the blatant attempt to include Tubbs Hill in this development. (See my letter to you and the CC from last week.) What is unbelievable is that a few of the people who have fought for decades and decades to keep Tubbs a natural open space with no development are now proposing clearing trees on Tubbs, putting in artificial features, clearing another path through rock, changing the Third St. entrance, etc.

If you want to read the protections of Tubbs that have been built in for years, see the Tubbs Hill Foundation's mission statement and separate management plan: All focus on protecting the hill with no development. There are many Friends of Tubbs Hill who have contributed to the Foundation over the years, and they will be adamant, loud, and active in resisting any of the

team's (LCDC's) attempts to change a much-revered landscape. This will become a BIG public issue, and I predict that very few citizens will support any changes to Tubbs.

Baseball, in the summer is most enjoyable when played at McEuen Field. It recalls days gone by to all who participate. To remove the fields is a big mistake. We have a very short season in N. Idaho for outdoor sports, when it is actually enjoyable to watch, without bundling up. And summer ball gives us that opportunity. Not track, not football, not soccer. And to watch basketball gets into snowy roads, icy parking lots etc. People need a place to recreate that is outdoors and healthy.

My first review of the plan for the site is very positive. They have really done a good job of including as many activities as possible given the space and various interest groups involved. The focus on multi-use versus the previous limited use should draw many more to our downtown and over time will result in stronger neighborhoods in the city core.

Many will argue this will use public monies to benefit a small handful of elite business owners downtown. Any improvements in a city's infrastructure and amenities inevitably helps those around the improvement but that's no reason to not go forward with a project like this one that has so much for all our citizens.

I believe this project can be the greatest legacy the city can leave our next generation of citizens since the city acquired Tubb Hill. Only the future education corridor has the potential to rival this opportunity. The same individuals who oppose this also oppose the ed corridor and all the progress we are making as a community. I suggest they relocate to a nice coxy corner in Iran since our positive growth seems to always offend them.

Count on me for my vocal support and willingness to help move this project forward.

Mike, I've been on the Tubbs Hill Committee (Foundation) since it began, at least 20 years ago. I differ from most of the members in that I think at least the main trail around Tubbs Hill should be ADA--just the main trail, and the rest of the hill should remain as natural as possible. A handicapped person in a wheelchair or motorized cart can't even get up the first switchbacks at the Third Street entrance. My wife's brother with severe M.S. and in a cart is one example. Even a person pushing a stroller or buggy has a hard time.

An ADA trail does not have to be paved--just relatively smooth and not too steep. It doesn't have to make a huge cut in the hill. Judge Hosack, also in the committee, and I fight about this all the time. He says too verbally that an ADA trail across the north side (facing McEuen and part of the proposed plan) would look like the road cut into Canfield Mountain. He's wrong. Also possibly on the north side, the plan calls for a sledding hill, which I think is fine but other Tubbs folks disagree, and a man-made "fountain" and stream headed north toward McEuen, which I agree is too much.

The Tubbs Committee does (mostly) agree that a good walkway around the north base of the hill bordering the (former?) ballfields would be OK. This would link the waterfront to a parking lot near City Hall, a much better place for a parking lot than the present one on the waterfront.

Thanks for the email update. We think this is a fabulous idea, but as you mentioned, I'm certain that there are many who do not. I wanted to let you know that the Government Affairs department of Boat U.S. has sent emails out to area boat owners stating that the boat ramp will be closed if this "idea" goes through. We are members of Boat U.S. and Hal received an email from them today encouraging boaters to voice their concerns.

I believe the vision for the park is outstanding and if we are fortunate to have half the ideas come to fruition we will be that much further ahead as a community.

I'm all for moving a rejuvenated McEuen forward but this new plan is too grandiose. I don't understand why the City paid to redo what the Committee of 9 did 8-9 years ago. We held public workshops where people sat at tables with maps and pencils and came up with a worthy plan that would have cost far less. Can the City afford this now? If we couldn't move it any farther during better economic times I sure don't see where it will go this time around. Too bad the Council didn't have the vision/wisdom to revisit the previous plan and save another bundle of bucks on yet another consulting firm. Good luck with this.

I likely won't get to the presentation, but I have heard one issue mentioned that shouldn't be overlooked. Apparently, over the years, many folks have given significant plants & trees to the park as part of their legacy. Records of all of that are probably thin, but to the extent that they exist, it would be nice to make sure they get acknowledged in the new design. Some things may be transplantable, or an experienced person can take cuttings to start new plants from originals. But that won't be universal. Maybe, if there are records, some sort of memorial acknowledgement plaque could be included. And going forward, as that sort of thing continues, some sort of process for maintaining the information could be done. And if there aren't records, you could get some "feel good" PR by asking folks to tell you about any such things they know of.

Otherwise, I read the recent lengthy article that outlined all of the features. Pretty pie-in-the-sky, but it has to start somewhere – and I didn't see anything I thought inappropriate. This family is all over the ice rink. We've been driving to Cheney since KYRO collapsed. I know two very knowledgeable folks on that subject, if ever needed – neither are KYRO related.

Thank you for asking me for input on the McEuen Field project. While I think the plans are very intriguing, I thought the public had decided to leave it untouched in accordance with the family's wishes who gifted it to the city. If this is true, I'm not sure why we keep

revisiting it other than to give the downtown businesses an opportunity to bring more tourists and citizens downtown and to finally push through a plan to increase traffic to their businesses. How was this idea resurrected?

I tend to believe we should have something besides Tubbs Hill left in a relatively untouched condition. Certainly the creation of the ball fields changed the pristine nature of the field, but I'm not sure we have to further add to the "destination resort" feel for our downtown area. That said, I think you need to have citizen input on any steering committee, if indeed the public even wants to pursue this. It appears only Lynn Morris represents the general public. Is Lynn Lewis a downtown business owner or related to one? The rest of the steering committee members seem to be very pro-growth and undoubtedly favor change.

Can we put this before the voters?

Initially Mike I am a cynic I am afraid. That being said, I think public development and less special interests (Hagadone) is the right direction and I favor it. I also think that if there are enough public access boat launches available, then the one at 3rd street could be done away with. As I attend more events downtown, there is a conflict there and that area does deserve to showcase CDA better and be a more active part of Sherman and the downtown area. All for it!! Events like Ironman are awesome and build area up.

The LCDC at times I like and at other times it confuses me a little. But over-all, I look at projects like the Kroc Center and figure it helps to silence the critics as well as my doubts.

With that being said, I offer the following cautions:

- The Accessibility of Tubbs Hill needs to be limited in its ADA compliance. There needs to be a compromise so that the main part of Tubbs Hill is not disrupted and remains a natural state preserve as much as possible. I think there should be a way for the beauty of the lake vistas to be enjoyed by ADA standards without building, cementing or hand-railing the hell out of Tubbs.
- Special Interests through private donations need to be limited as much as possible so that they don't "lop-side" drive the projects. I am in favor of exhausting grants and LCDC as much as possible as a first round of funding.
- The project should focus on pedestrian use and be looked at as an extension of the downtown. The initial drawings bear that out and it is the right direction.
- I am not a Hagadone hater, and I like other capitalist types that have done well for themselves. No worries, I just want there to be as much integrity about the project as possible. With that said, i also do not want a high levy or a raise in my property tax that is high. So, I can be bought I guess. If you get my drift.
- From a county perspective, is the Post Falls Baseball complex over or under utilized? I know Ramsey seems to stay busy. I know that will be one of the push backs on that park. I think it can be overcome.

- Someone will point out that Hagadone is trying to move the Boat Ramp to distance the common guys from his resort. He still has his 36 slips, so what, it s resort(!). Be prepared o point to people that there are participants on the barod froma federal agency to secure the interests of past funds used for that boat ramp. Stick to it. The boat congestion in that part of town (down to 2000 launches notwithstanding) needs to be redirected anyway.

For now Mike, Until we get further into it, look at the project long term, generations to come type of stuff. Stick to the Community Profile. I will get to the meetings as I can and assist however makes sense. I am proud of this area. I travel like monkey to keep my family living here. I get offers to relocate quarterly to other parts of the country. It would eman far less travel for me, but I dont want to leave here and I want my kids and future generations to have a developing and progressive community they can cherish and take part. Hope that makes sense.

Around ten years ago the city paid a tidy sum to Walker Macy to come up with a plan for the down town area. One of the things that they recommended was removing the boat launch area. The outcry could be heard threw out Kootenai County. At that last public meeting the city council and the mayor voted amongst themselves and told the community that the boat launch would stay! They promised the only way that the city would remove it would be first to construct a comparable ramp at a location to be secured by the city and when that ramp was open they would close the existing ramp.

That promise is still in effect today and if the city is entertaining the launch ramp removal you will hear the shot heard around the world. It's interesting but I received an e-mail today from Boat U.S. who I am insured with. They are located in Alexandria Virginia and they are 100% against the ramp removal. Looks like the shot has even been heard on the east coast. Listen to the people who elected you. Most don't want this project, myself included.

One of the things I feel is a big mistake is to get rid of the 3rd street boat ramp. There are a lot of people that go into town after they have been on the water all day and spend money in town. Like going shopping or to dinner. I just feel it is a wrong move.

Although I have not reviewed all the details, this plan has many very positive merits.

In addition to a formal presentation, will there be 'public' comments allowed Thursday night at NIC?

While we don't always agree with your suggestions and decisions of the Coeur d' Alene City council, we maintain a very strong interest in what is going on in an area that is so dear to our hearts. While Pat is a relative new comer to the area (20 years), I'm a 4th generation citizen of Hayden Lake.

Coeur d' Alene was important to my family for over 100 years as my grandfather treated my father to Harly Hudson's establishment back in 1907. My dad started taking me to the "Missouri Lunch" in 1942 and I started taking my son to Hudson's Hamburgers in 1968. My grandfather and father participated in many Coeur d' Alene community events as I did while growing up. My entire family attended Coeur d' Alene High School with my daughter being the last to graduate in 1988.

My uncle Frank Lee had the first steamboat on Hayden Lake (1904, see attached photo) and his "commerce" was directly tied to Coeur d' Alene, especially when the railroad came to the Hayden Lake area in 1908. My father was an area builder and did a lot of business in the Coeur d' Alene area. He was a member of both the Coeur d' Alene Elks and Eagles where a lot of his business deals were consummated. The last 15 years of my Forest Service career was spent at the Coeur d' Alene headquarters of the Idaho Panhandle National Forests (1979-1994). I continued to be involved in government service. spending an assignment on the Kootenai County Planning and Zoning Commission and then chairing several community boards in the Hayden area over the past 27 years.

While this is response is a bit longer than you likely requested, I think it is important for you to know that we have a very strong interest in what you do as a member of the Coeur d' Alene City Council.

While we are clearly non-voters in the Coeur d' Alene area, what you do often affects us in the outlying areas such as Hayden.

We sincerely appreciate the hard work that you do and appreciate the opportunity to comment, even as "outsiders".

I think I will make it Thursday evening, however, I was considering suggesting a point of view to you, (and all council), for you to consider and use.

I need Three things from the City:

Police Dept - so folks don't break into my home and steal my food.

Fire Dept - In case my beautiful, but sometimes forgetful bride leaves something on the stove too long.

Streets Dept -- So the streets are clear of snow, pot holes filled, and lanes/X-walks painted, so I can get safely to work.

After that it's all niceties.

So I would feel warmer about this project, and the 'corridor" project, if my fire and police chiefs and the head of streets dept. told me they had the budget they need to do their jobs. These Depts require trained staff, AND equipment. (side note: funding source is not relevant to average home owner, he pays them all, right? IE "LCDC, not city will pay" - same to landowner).

Naturally, being on the Ped/Bicycle committee, I'm interested in the routing of the Centennial trail as well.

I think this idea for McEuen area should be put to a vote. My husband and I are retired on Soc. Sec. along with a couple other incomes. We have to be very frugal and can't do any major items like newer vehicles. Perhaps the city should table this until there is less unemployment. One of our extra incomes is a small rental. We have had to lower the rent to keep it occupied. My point is - Why should the city just keep on spending, while the rest of us have to cut back. I think the best way to get a good feed back would be thru a vote.

Mike...thought the presentation was well done....as well as the plan....someone needs to come up with a 10 year staged development plan starting with the parking garage, resulting traffic redirection and Front St/fourth st pedestrian ways.....from that all else springs.

Another question....how does LCDC get repaid from a non-tax paying entity....this is the same problem I had with LCDC funding the Disability Act improvements to Sorenson School...that was clearly the responsibility of District 271...in the end it was a sweetheart deal between City Council and LCDC

The answer is probably an affordable start without raising taxes (if that's possible...which I doubt)...with more to follow when the economy...AND PROPERTY VALUES REBOUND....likely 5+ years from now.

We attended the meeting last evening on the redo of McEuen Field. We are excited and love the concept. It is about time that beautiful area will be available to be enjoyed by everyone--all ages, interests, and abilities--instead of only a few baseball players. As a native born Coeur d'Aleneite, I have seen many things evolve there since the 1940s. This is a great plan; we both feel we need to leave it to the committee and the council to decide how much of this we can afford after prices etc. come in. We REALLY hope this plan will be executed. Let us know what we can do. We are behind this project 100%!

Thanks for all of your hard work on this and everything else you do, Mike. Happy New Year.

Sick child on the night of McEuen Field meeting. Couldn't make it.

Plan to be there Thursday the 27th.

From what we have seen and heard we are very excited for the new park and all that it will bring to Coeur d'Alene.

On the other hand we have genuine concerns regarding Tubbs Hill. Tubbs Hill really is a special place for us and we spend a lot of time there during the warm seasons.

Therefore we plan on being informed in the progress of this planning.

See you on the 27th.

It was good to see you at that packed meeting!

The presentation was very well thought-out and presented. The more they proceeded, the more excited I became over the possibility of truly transforming that wonderful property into something that would attract people from a broad spectrum of our community and beyond.

From my perspective, there was nothing there to NOT like. A little something for everybody. The biggest issue would, of course, be the cost. I suspect that if Mr. Hagadone finds the plans appealing, (And he certainly has the most to gain, financially, from the improvement!) he might be coaxed, by the appropriate people to significantly support the project.

It is exciting! ☺

It looks like a pretty exciting proposal. It is, however, just a part of a program to get more people to Idaho and especially to our fair city. Thus more need for services and more taxes etc.

I would, however, be willing to support this proposal if no city money went into it, and no urban renewal money, and no federal money, all with voluntary money, or possible grant money from private organizations.

At a time when we are seeing so many unemployed it does not make much sense to spend a lot of money on a project to beautify our fair city.

a few comments

baseball field relocation-we should consider moving it to the CDA ball field and improve that so it will get more use rather than temporarily put them there until we build a new one--if it grows to be needed then build-they could use both high school fields in the day and CDA at night with lights

boat launch- i think this is not the place for the boats to launch, but to suggest that the other places are fair replacements isn't fair. the day or weekend boaters need parking and they are losing a number of spaces with no effort of replacement-they are treated a bit flipant for their numbers-which probably exceeds the ball players where there was consideration for a new field while there is no cost to this "vision"-the expense will be high but the ongoing maintenance will be even more with the many "wish list" items on the plan--if i remember when DH was offering a garden to the city a big concern was the maintenance cost-seems it should be here as well the fountains are pretty but a maintenace nightmare

the parking garage location is great-there should be some thought to security in that dark zone and drainage to ??

a last blurb--i think i heard that the plan was to include the citizens in the process but not necessarily take the final plan to a vote--while i don't really feel strong about it -again i am reminded of when DH was presenting his gift to the city -it had to go to a vote because it was the right thing and he pulled the project

I was surprised and delighted to receive your email and to be included on your list and be invited to put in "my two cents" regarding McEuen Park.

I see you around town here and there and remember when I had the pleasure of meeting you face to face at Juan Williams speech a few years back. Hope you enjoyed that stack of books you got from his event!

Before we moved here 8 years ago, I lived and worked in Santa Cruz County- yes the "C" word state - California..... My last job was of all things, working as the secretary in the parks and recreation department for the small city of Scotts Valley, CA. It was a great job and I enjoyed going to the Parks and Rec Commission meetings and typing up the notes on their discussions. I know what happens when a small town "grows up". There are pros and cons of course and I saw first hand the outcome of those blessings in Scotts Valley as the town got more developed. (THE MORE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE THE BETTER!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!) If you are interested, you can call Conrad Sudduth - the Parks and Recreation Manager for the City of Scotts Valley for his expertise and experience regarding the growth in their community and the public's reactions and input to what the City did. He would be a great person to bounce some ideas off of since Scotts Valley is similar to Coeur d'Alene in population and size. That City did what CDA is considering doing to McEuen - so it would be interesting.

I did attend the public meeting last week and have to say the designers did a beautiful job in putting together what would indeed be an upgrade to the area. Annndddd, at the same time, may I just interject, that while I think alot of the ideas are stellar, it would be nice for the Council to consider keeping more green space and not pave over the area too much! Once paved over, its usually never restored to its natural state. Also, keep the view of the lake as much as possible and not put art that is too tall and not too funky.....I know we can get more federal funding if we put art - hopefully TASTEFUL art.....I dont own a boat, so I dont envy you having to deal with all those angry boaters about the launch and of course EVERYONE has their opinions about what should go there and what shouldnt.....I trust the Council will make their best effort to decide for us all, what will be good for the community looking toward the future. Please keep us poor little guys in mind when you decide not just for all of the out of towners! - dont let what happened to Lake Tahoe happen to CDA!!!!!!!!!!!!

One final thought - our children will inherit all of this and when we have to pass the baton we should remember- *"Treat the earth well: it was not given to you by your parents, it was loaned to you by your children. We do not inherit the Earth from our Ancestors, we borrow it from our Children."* Indian Proverb.

Mike - all the best to you and GOOOOODDDDD LUCK!!!!!!!!!! We will be rootin for ya! Again, thank you for letting me put in my opinion.

Let's just forget about redong McEuen park--especially right now. No one has the money to do a project of this size and I think the money paid for the study was a waste of time and money. Thank heaven I don't pay taxes to or vote in CDA--what a mockery you have made of both processes. With over 9% unemployment, why would you want to spend the hard eaned money of CDA folks on such an unnecessary project. The boat launch and ball fields should stay! And forget about an underground parking structure.

YOU'RE A JOKE. YOU AND THE REST OF YOUR CLAN NEED TO GO. YOU'RE NO GOOD FOR 4 CDA. HOPE THE LAW SOMEDAY CATCHES UP WITH YOU AND YOUR CLAN, BE IT MAN'S OR GOD'S LAW, ALL YOU DAYS ARE COMING

Hello Mike, Thank you for your informative email. I am copying you below on an email I sent last week to Doug East and copied to Mayor Bloem. While I live across the river outside the city limits, I am very concerned regarding

the possible loss of the 3rd Street Ramp.

I am writing to express my opposition to the City of Coeur d'Alene's apparent intention to limit public access to Lake Coeur d'Alene through the elimination of the 3rd Street Launch Ramp. As a life-long boater on Lake Coeur d'Alene and user of the 3rd Street Launch Ramp I am acutely aware of the value of this unique year-around access point for boating and fishing. Neither Higgins Point nor the Blackwell Island facility replace the year-around and central convenience of the 3rd Street Ramp.

Data that indicate a recent decline in use of the 3rd Street Ramp have a very plausible alternative explanation in the recent economic downturn that has reduced boating sales and boating activity nationwide. The loss of the 3rd Street Ramp would permanently damage public access. Coeur d'Alene Lake must not become a Hayden Lake with even more severely limited boating access for the majority of the public that trailer boat rather than afford a rented boat slip or private dock.

Improve McEuen Field, but leave the 3rd Street Ramp for now and the future of our access to Lake Coeur d'Alene.

Next, I am pretty frustrated with the McEuen "process" over the years. My 50,000 view of this is that every time the people of the community get a chance to speak, they talk about the need to continue active recreation for local resident on this site. They also speak to protecting the main entrance to Tubbs Hill and the need to keep it with low development. Tennis courts and playgrounds have been removed. And this vision removes the ballfields and paves much of the space. While I respect Monte and Dick, I believe that this vision will not be embraced by the community that believes we already have event facilities but would lose a park with active recreation in a setting that is amazing. Through the years, I have had the opportunity to enjoy the field in Sandpoint. It is lightly developed and the football, soccer, baseball and music events I have attended there have benefitted from the outstanding location on the waterfront with mountain views. WHY would we give this up for an event venue that will be of primary benefit to commercial entities and tourists? WHY would we replicate the City Park?

This vision is not sustainable and the programming for locals (kayak lessons on the waterfront, tennis courts, etc.) either has been done or could be done without huge investment.

Just to let you know I have not turned into a CAVE person... I do think that the LCDDC funded parking solution and some plaza interface on Front Street make sense for Farmer's Market and other activities to connect local commerce to the downtown.

I would be glad to talk more with you about this at any time and again...

Thanks very much for your email!

Just want you to know that I like much of the McEuen Park proposal, but I do not favor removing the boat launch. The boat ramp serves MANY local CDA folks, like me. Low water prevents all season access to the B.I. ramp in the river. Higgins Point and the B.I. ramp are both VERY congested with little or NO parking available during the summer months. Not to mention the lack of security at the BI and HP parking lots. I use the 3rd Street ramp dozens of times monthly in the spring, summer, and fall. In the big picture, I believe that removing the 3rd St. ramp is very shortsighted. It has failed to meet the

community's approval in the past for good reason. I'm sure you have your own personal thoughts on the matter, but I want you to also know mine.

The one thing I would like you to keep in mind is the thoughts of some of our citizens who are no longer with us like Art Manley and others who did so much to improve the north Idaho area. You know how they would feel about this and I would weigh heavily the thoughts of the KEA and others who have worked so hard to preserve the boating and other activities on the lake. Please don't be influenced by D.H. and others who are only interested in the \$. Think about how Templens were pushed out of the area along with Murphy and others. Don't let money be the deciding factor. Let the people decide what they want. The one thing they failed to give us in their presentation is an alternative to include the boat launch and parking. This all can be done if we all work together and quit trying to be SO greedy. Thanks for your time Mike

I appreciate the fact that you are asking for input on the park. While I agree that an update would be very nice I have to comment about the third street ramp and parking area.

The city of Coeur d'Alene is known as the LAKE CITY for a reason. If not for the lake itself and the opportunities it provides then I think that we can agree that this city would not be where it is today.

I feel it a huge mistake to take that ramp and parking away from the residents as well as those who come here to enjoy our lake. To me that is of the most importance. It is the only access to the lake in a central location and the land it is sitting on is serving as its best possible use.

Putting in a seldom used ice skating rink and seating area will serve a much smaller interest than in the interest of lake access. Temporary seasonal rink(s) could be constructed in the park itself for winter use. At the same time I have always found that the current parking that is there has been adequate. I have never had to go look elsewhere to park for any activities down in the area. In the rare instances when it may become necessary there are other alternatives.

I think a lot of the park is well thought out and is a real possibility if the costs are kept within reason. I have heard no mention of the costs but hope that some research is done before and approval is forwarded. I also hope that even though they say there will be no vote that you as council representative will insist that expenditure of this size and importance must be brought before the voters for approval.

I truly hope this comment is not falling on deaf ears as I hope that the true feelings of the citizens of this city will be heard and adhered to.

Thanks for your time and I hope to see you address these concerns in the near future.

Mike, how much will McEuen Park cost the taxpayers? do you have a final cost for the project? I disagree with the mayor that the taxpayer should not vote on this matter. the economy is still in recovering, taxpayer are stretched to the limits. what about the past agreement with the McKuen family? have we got to the point where we start putting families at risk of losing their homes for additional tax burden to them. I ask you this, the council was elected by the people, is this project in the best interest of the residents that live in Coeur d'Alene and the surrounding areas. Thanks for your time

Mike, Whether or not the design proposed for McEuen is the right one, or even if improvement of the existing site is needed, are really not the relevant issues. The concern that many of us have is the timing and expense involved with the renewal. Currently, many of our neighbors are underwater on their homes and struggling to pay their existing high taxes. This is a difficult economic time - perhaps the most difficult in your and my lifetime - so it is hard to imagine committing more scarce resources to a facility that could continue to exist as it is for years to come. To undertake such a significant project now is to suggest to our citizens that we are unaware of the macroeconomic climate. In the coming months, many municipalities and even state governments will face severe cutbacks and even possible bankruptcy because they over-committed to too many constituencies. Regardless of the desire to 'improve' downtown for the few, we should instead consider what is best for all of our taxpayers - which may mean doing nothing at this time. Unless the funds for renewal come from outright gifts, the only other source of financing is the taxpayer. We can say that the money for the improvements came from government grants, LCDC funds, bond offerings or the general fund. Regardless, it is the individual taxpayer that will ultimately pay the bill. This is not 2006, and there is a new economic reality abroad that dictates prudence and fiscal responsibility for all - individuals, businesses and above all, for governments.

Regards,

First and foremost not enough restroom facilities are provided. There should have been one by each parking area and docking area. From a management background I would like to know how you intend to provide security in the parking garages and in all the different areas of the park. It would seem at least five (5) security guards would be necessary during daylight hours to police skateboarders on the walkways, teens, persons with loose dogs, lost children, vagrants and belligerent or loud groups. Then there is the amount of litter to contend with and how are all the walkways and trails to be kept free of chewing gum, snow and ice? Chewing gum is a HUGE problem at the new library as are the skateboarders who jump the walls, handrails and stairs and come at all hours of the night (McKuen Tower has an ongoing battle to stop them from jumping from one parking lot to another every night).

There are too many waterfalls and/or fountains, they are repetitive and difficult to maintain (vandalism, clarity & cleaning not to mention the pumps!) Also for 4 months of the year they would have to be shut down so are not cost effective....the one big fountain is enough. There is already a water feature in front of the library not well maintained & there is the Lake!

Speaking of the Lake, the area where the current launch ramp is located is going to be a constant problem for security because every family and every teenager is going to IGNORE the no swimming & sunbathing on the steps rules...the City will have to contend with litter from food & drink floating in the shallow water 24 hrs a day, you'll have to skim the waters all the time to keep it clear for the well behaved visitors. If you don't think this will happen take a walk along the Tubbs Hill trails with frequent side trips down to the Lake's water line. There have even been mattresses discarded there along with clothing, underwear, toilet "droppings" and other garbage. We've hiked the trails with large garbage bags and still ran out of room in them!

Mike, I am writing to you to express my deep concern regarding the new plans for McEuen field. My son, played Legion baseball, coached Legion Baseball and has graduated from college

because of baseball scholarships. He is currently in law school. There has to be a planned and budgeted alternative if this plan is carried out. We cannot sustain our program using a high school field. We could not have night games, concessions or tournaments. This is an issue close to my heart. I have spent days volunteering at that field to help this baseball program thrive. My son was a pitcher and in 4 years of playing, he only lost 2 games there! Is there any plan for a new field? My impression from reading the CDA Press this am is that as a community we can offer input but there will be no public vote. You are my voice in this argument. Please do not put a dog park ahead of our hometown baseball program.

I felt the questions on the website were very poorly written. IE how can we answer as questions yes or no such as do you support a monument for VFW and Aerodome boats memorial all in the same question?...what if we support one but not the other?...why would they be combined in the same question?

Also who will run/manage and profit from such items as the ice rink, marina, and other public spaces? Will they be free to use? or will city residences have to pay a fee on top of paying taxes to pay for these improvements?

There are just too many questions and not enough answers.

Also I don't think the public should be asked to vote for something that doesn't present all the facts. The city has no idea of the costs of anything they are asking for votes on..

How can they ask us to support something that has so many questions left unanswered?

We NEED more factual answers, period. That is what I have heard from everyone I have discussed the issues with.

I just hope the city doesn't try to sideswipe its citizens for some personal agendas. Who are/is "Team McEuen", names would be helpful!

I hope you can make public all answers to my questions above!

Thank you for your news letter. We are in Arizona for the winter and it was nice to get some information about Coeur d'Alene. We are so pleased to hear about the warmer shelters for the homeless. I understand that the Union Gospel Mission is also working to build a home for homeless women. This is so encouraging.

On the other hand we find it very irresponsible that the city of Coeur d'Alene is even considering spending money on McEuen Park in these hard times. There is nothing wrong with the way it is at this time. The cities key word lately seems to be spend, spend, spend.

Concerned citizens of Coeur d'Alene.

I attended the presentation last week of the park plan and have spent some time digesting the proposal. My first thoughts were that like most of the planning here in CDA it is a proposal for a single entity and does not address the long range changes that the city will need over the next 10 plus years. I still have a copy of the proposal that was presented in 2002 which was a much more modest approach to the park and I think it missed the mark. As an Architect and planner

I want to look at the overall impact on each change and how it meshes with the long range vision for the City. How will it work with the future evolution of the civic uses adjacent to it and does it promote a positive growth or short circuit future opportunities.

Here are some of my thoughts on the present proposal:

I liked the idea of moving the 3rd St. boat ramp to another location, it is insane to have people moving large boats and trucks down Sherman Ave. The new plan for the area is great and would provide a welcome play area for everyone for all seasons. We need to find a location for the new ramp before we move the existing one and that should be a major focus for the City. I think the area around "Toni's restaurant has some potential as there is opportunity for parking, a bay that is quiet and not a lot of boat traffic and best of all not too far from town.

The traffic patterns are of great concern to me. I think the multilevel garage is the proper way to develop the site, but not under Front St. The grade along the park and Front St. will allow a multilevel garage without the gymnastics of placing it under the existing street. I think Front street should be developed as an alternate route from Sherman and have it connect to Sherman around 6th or 7th St. Not today but someday Sherman in the downtown will need to be a walking mall from 2nd to 5th or 6th with the North South streets left open to traffic. I know this has been talked about and rejected more than once, but if you notice the character of Sherman has changed in the last 10 years from a retail area to a boutique and eatery area. The sidewalks are congested and not pleasant for someone to window shop as the existing eating establishments want to expand into that space and provide diners with outdoor sidewalk experiences. The noise from trucks and motorcycles interferes with having a conversation. My wife opened the Tanglewood Restaurant and was one of the first to apply for a sidewalk permit for dining, we know how that works. I worked with the City of Burbank when they revitalized San Fernando Rd. into a walking street and the entire downtown became a place to go to. I know what can happen when you allow this kind of change to occur. But that is not what you ask for, just a little getting out some frustration as seeing piecemeal thinking and planning. The new park is an opportunity to redirect the growth of the downtown.

I think the depressed area adjacent to the street for the trail will be a disaster when it snows and I think people will not feel safe walking in the below grade space. We can achieve a separation from the traffic much easier by realigning the trail into the park area. See my comments above about the Front Street parking. Portland has the river walk park that has a somewhat mixed traffic and people situation that sometimes is troublesome, but most of the time works just fine. All over Europe people and cars cross each other on the way to a park or large open plaza that is just for people. People like to be in open space not in recessed channels.

The location of the tennis courts and adult and children play areas are well placed and will use the City Hall parking. I have some questions regarding the skate park in that location, but perhaps that is just an older person looking at the damage skate boards do to the public facilities where the borders gather. I would think 15th St. would be a better

place as that is where most of the younger people live. While on the subject of the City hall parking, the grade in that area would provide for the two level garage. The only drawback would be where would the City store the excess snow!

I think the added public boat docks is a great idea and well as the fishing dock. It is hard to find places to take young kids to fish in the lake if you do not own your own dock. Having a large public square available is something every city needs and this is a great opportunity to provide one. The skating and shallow water pool is terrific and a great place to people watch. A small water jet in the center would be a great addition to the space.

The idea of having an outdoor space for concerts and presentations has been something that CDA and this area has needed for some time. There is nothing better than laying on the grass and listening to great music in the evenings. We could be a venue for some outstanding events and draw people from all over the local area to our downtown.

The expansion of a handicap access to the north face of the Tubbs hill is long overdue and not just for the handicap but as we all age Tubbs hill becomes more challenging. The ADA aspect of the depressed trail and walking area in the Front St. proposal is also troubling.

Thank you for being interested in local feedback. I have been asking questions and making suggestions for a number of years, usually it seems just annoying the local planners and council persons. I am concerned that if we are not careful the city will be engineered not planned as a beautiful place just a more efficient one. We have so many areas in question that are under review but I do not feel we are looking at what CDA should be in the future, just solving zoning problems. Each time we do something that is different than what is there now we hear a lot of complaints and gripes about why are we making it different. It takes courage to look beyond next week but to the future of what can be the possibilities of this great city on the lake.

How are you planning on paying for McEuen Park? Based on the meeting last week and newspaper reports you don't have the money available to pay for this park. Please, please tell me you have the money, not "future" money, real money that exists today. The kind of money I would need to have to buy groceries, for instance. If you approve/go along with this project you will be spending money you don't have. Hasn't there been enough of this kind of government? Unemployment is what? 9 or 10 percent in Kootenai County? DO NOT spend money you don't have.

I am not in favor of McQuen Park because we simply cannot afford it and there are too many including your boss that stand to profit. My taxes are already unaffordable. You guys spend money like it is water. If you are really for the homeless, why is this the first time you have addressed it. I have donated to St. Vincents and Fresh Start before you said anything.

Nice to hear from you Mike,

I hope everyone is really cautious about removing the boat launch because once it's gone, it's gone and it will never be back.....we'll never be able to replace it. I would like to see a realistic price tag for this and perhaps just give the money to the homeless. Roger did remind us that we are our brothers keeper. Thanx for listening.

I help feed the homeless and working poor. Without medical care and living on a fixed income, I realize I could be joining the same people that I help now. I have lived in Cda. since 1984 and have seen the deterioration that is taking place within our city limits with the exception of downtown.

As a council person, how can you continue to allow this to happen? I asked a question that you never answered about who is going to pay for additional facilities in the downtown area including maintenance?

I promise you, that I will continue to vote for the rights of the people to have a voice in big ticket items before the council.

Look at the Cda. Press Vote on whether or not their should be a vote of the people. Our citizens want a choices.

Mayor Bloem's statement that people have a vote when they elected a new mayor or councilman is sickening.

I wrote you way back about the election when I emailed all involved about settling the whole thing without using courts and lawyers and was ignored by all but you. (You and I discussed your campaign financing and you gave me a good answer that put that to rest in my mind.)

Why am I writing now? Because Sandi is telling us we can't vote on McEuen field because we voted for her ant that's that and Hazel Bauman is telling us (taxpayers) that we can vote to support the latest levy (Hazel) but can't talk to her or the board for over 3 minutes. Both are coming across as dictators. I find this worrisome and anticipate that these things are likely to turn into more court cases. As as taxpayer, I can assure you that I'm not interested in lawyer-welfare. I'm sure you are not either.

I know you work with Sandi and not Bauman, but there is one set of taxpayers involved and we're getting killed by this stuff...or the potential costs of a McEuen field that would be overwhelming as it is proposed now.

No need to answer. These things are on the table and not done deals, but I do hope you can provide some reason in these and similar matters.

I really appreciate your concern for comments on the McEuen proposal. The meeting was well attended and overwhelming to grasp all at once. The first comments by Mr.Eastwood that there would be no boat ramp or ball

Field shocked me. I have used the Third Street ramp for over forty years and fought numerous plots by the city to eliminate or restrict use of the ramp the past few years. Mr. Eastwood's relining of the parking stalls has made it very hard for dual axle trailers to use. The removal of the permanent restrooms was a big loss to all citizens. The approach to the ticket gate should have been addressed a long ago. Not only do boaters use Third St. It is Coeur d'Alene's gateway to the beautiful lake that many people, residents and tourists enjoy. The drivable access to the seawall and the recreational activities that go on there will be a great loss.

The overall architectural plan is wonderful but very elaborate. In past proposals, we were given options like a deluxe plan, the medium plan and the budget plan. The survey limits you from making these choices and the on-line choices are confusing. I am also concerned about past surveys that have been done as far as parking. The city purchased the block between Lakeside and Coeur d'Alene Ave to construct a parking garage and the survey said that location would be the most beneficial for business growth downtown and I think that is right and at a lot less expense than an underground structure.
