TO:	City of Raleigh Parks & Recreation Department Falls Whitewater Steering Committee
FROM:	Cindy Szwarckop, AICP
DATE:	4/15/2010
REFERENCE:	Falls Whitewater Steering Committee Meeting #4 April 12, 2010
STEWART PROJECT NUMBER:	C09047

Meeting Attendees:
Seth Yearout, City of Raleigh
Shari Bryant, NCWRC
Tom Wright, River Mill HOA
Carol Banaitis, USACE Falls Lake
Sarah King, Paddler
Alissa Bierma, Neuse Riverkeeper
Bob Zarzecki, Paddler
Elizabeth Gardner, Paddler
Bob High, Paddler
Kathy Capps, City of Raleigh
Vic Lebsock, City of Raleigh

Design Team:
Garry Walston, RLA - Stewart
Cindy Szwarckop, AICP – Stewart

Meeting Agenda:
1. Full Value Contract – Kathy Capps
2. Branding Discussion – Cindy Szwarckop
3. NCWRC Site Visit Review – Shari Bryant
4. Updates
   - Project Webpage
   - Survey

Tentative Project Schedule:
- Data Collection/River Survey – March to April 2010
- Preparation of Conceptual Design – Late April to May 2010
- Community Meeting #2 – Late May 2010/Early June 2010
- Design Development Stage – May through August 2010
- Community Meeting #3 – August 2010
- Complete Design Development Drawings – September 2010

Full Value Contract - Kathy Capps led the group in a discussion related to the Full Value Contract – which is often used in recreation programs.
- This is a diverse group with diverse backgrounds.
- The goal is to work as part of the group.
- Need to reaffirm the commitment to the committee's purpose.
- Need to make sure that everyone is committed to the vision and goal of the group despite each individual's ideas/agendas – everyone needs to work together towards a common goal.
- A seat at the "table" is the place to make an impact – not individually.
- It is not appropriate to use information gained at the table to further your own individual goals/efforts.
- Alissa asked that the group reaffirm the vision statement. She noted that

she agrees in theory, but there are some things that she can't agree with now in the current vision statement. She noted that the "lacking part" is the lack of protect. She agreed with celebrate because there are certainly pieces that are celebrated in the current form – this represents the historical part.

- Tom noted that through this process we may find out that the goal/vision is not possible. We may not be able to sustain or improve habitat. May not disrupt but may not enhance either.
- Shari with NCWRC noted that this might not be the case. Different fish species could have an improved habitat and others may not. This project could change the fish species in the area.
- Tom wondered what is a "fair" amount of material to place in the channel to constrict it. He would like additional information from the consultants.
- Kathy noted that everything that we do as a group is public record.
- Alissa isn't sure how the project can be done. She isn't convinced that it can be done. She feels that if the vision statement is tweaked, then she can support it.
- Kathy noted that there will be people that are for and people that will be against the project and each will try to generate public sentiment. By doing this, it discredits the work of the entire committee.
- It does not benefit the project or the committee when Steering Committee members solicit support for the project without the collaboration of the City. Soliciting support as a single entity instead of in concert with the City weakens the overall project and process.
- Steering Committee members should not try to sabotage the project or generate negative support of the project.
- We should work out any differences while seated at the table.
- Vic noted that we come here to share information without bias. Each Steering Committee member should solicit comments and bring them back to the entire group.
- We will not editorialize on the information or data that is presented to the Steering Committee.
- Any comments that are brought forth by a member from their respective interest group will be discussed at the table.
- Everyone needs to commit to the process to the end, whatever the end may be.
- The group will balance all activities that could/could not happen in this stretch of the river.
- There was unanimous support of the process.
- There was discussion related to altering the vision statement. It was asked if the vision statement could be altered to include "protect".
- Bob noted that there are certain areas where no impact should take place. He completely believes in this – especially to protect during construction. But we can't set up a project purpose where the entire area is to be protected.
- Sarah noted that she was leery of the word "protect." In this segment of the river, we are trying to create a whitewater park. What about protecting a part of the river?
- Celebrate is an important word. If it is celebrated – more people will come to experience the river.
- Protection is more of a quality descriptor. Would have action steps to protect but not celebrate.
- It was asked if we should leave the mission statement alone but acknowledge that protection is high on the list.
- How about protected wherever possible, enhanced, and celebrated?
- A vote was taken of the attendees – 9 voted to amend the vision statement and 1 voted against.
- The ***revised vision statement*** reads: "To create a river park that provides multiple water-based recreational and educational opportunities throughout as much of the year as possible with the known historical release levels. The river and its natural habitat will be protected, enhanced and celebrated through the creation of this project."

Branding Discussion – Cindy led the group in a discussion to determine the "brand/name" for the project. Vic first detailed the process for naming parks in the City.

- Naming is mostly based on geography, not person. Officially done at the Master Plan phase. This project is different, since there is not a master plan at this time. This will be named as a facility.
- Are there any words that can't be used? Not unless voted on and changed at master plan stage.
- Would there be a problem with naming now and using same later for the overall park?
- Cindy detailed the original options that were discussed at the January 19. 2010 Steering Committee meeting:
    - Falls Whitewater Park
    - Falls Paddle Sports Facility
    - Falls of Neuse River Park
    - Falls of Neuse Recreation Area
- Vic recommended that Falls be in the name.
- Alissa asked if people could confuse Falls of Neuse Recreation Area with Falls Lake Recreation Area.
- Falls of Neuse is a good identifier.
- Alissa noted that she is opposed to it being called a whitewater park.
- The Corps of Engineers (Carol) was asked if the Corps objected to whitewater park. Yes, because the feeling is that it is exclusive to paddlers.
- The Falls Lake Master Plan (1981) referred to whitewater park.
- Vic suggested eliminating Falls Paddle Sports Facility and Falls of Neuse Recreation Area.
- Alissa is concerned that there will have to be a lot of education associated with the name whitewater park and there will be objections from anglers.
- Elizabeth noted that all western facilities are called whitewater parks. The name needs to identify the use and create interest. Name should not confuse people or users.
- Alissa noted that with whitewater there will be required education of the public through signage, education, and explanations.
- Should provide clarification on use rather than design.
- Vic noted that historically this area has been called Falls and always had whitewater. Build on this history.
- The committee discussed who would use the facility and where they would come from to use it.
- Vic suggested Whitewater Park at Falls of Neuse.
- The group took a vote: Falls of Neuse Whitewater Park received 6 votes; Falls of Neuse River Park received 3 votes; and 2 members abstained from voting.
- The ***brand/name will be Falls of Neuse Whitewater Park***.

NCWRC Site Visit Recap – Shari Bryant

- Shari noted that she wouldn't detail word-for-word the report because it was provided to all Steering Committee members.
- She did note that there are concerns about the diversion weir. NCWRC needs more information from the design consultants.
- It was noted that some anglers have expressed concern about being forced out of the area. Need to figure out how everyone can co-exist. It is noted that the groups co-exist now.
- Tom mentioned that River Mill does allow some anglers to use the north bank – the City will need to discuss any improvements to the north bank with the homeowners.
- Alissa expressed a concern about removing subsistence fishing.
- Need to make sure that the project doesn't impede the areas where people fish for bass.
- If there were to be too big of an impact to anglers and subsistence fishers, could the park be moved down further?

Webpage Preview – Cindy and Kathy previewed the project website for the Steering Committee.

Survey Update – Cindy noted that the Stewart survey crews are actively working on the project with approximately 2 ½ weeks of field + office work remaining to complete the survey component of the project. This information will then be forwarded on to McLaughlin Whitewater Design.

Meeting Wrap-Up and Schedule

It was noted that the City and the Design Team would hold off scheduling another Steering Committee meeting until there were substantive items to discuss. The Steering Committee meeting will be held at least one week prior to the next Community meeting. It was also decided that the next Steering Committee meeting would be held at the Corps of Engineers Visitor Center. Prior to the meeting, there will be a walking tour/site visit. Additional information (time and place to meet) will be forwarded to the Steering Committee members via the meeting invitation.