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PROJECT LOCATION

Pow Wow Park and Judicial Rims Park are located in the Heights Neighborhood of Billings, Montana. Nestled between two prehistoric shorelines, the project is in the current-day valley of the Alkali Creek Corridor. The main arterial road that services these areas is Alkali Creek Road.

The project boundary generally begins on the east side of the BBWA Canal along the east and end at Senator's Boulevard. The sandstone cliff face creates the north boundary, with the south bank of Alkali Creek generally completing the park land boundary.

Single-family homes dot the edges of the boundaries, with the ages of these homes ranging from the 1950’s to present-day construction. The Alkali Creek Elementary School lies adjacent to park lands, in approximately the center of the project area. Current enrollment at the school is 401 pupils, grades K-6. The enrollment boundaries for Alkali Creek Elementary are shown in figure 2, but these boundaries tend to change frequently due to changing needs from School District 2. No multi-family or commercial property is adjacent to the planning area.

HISTORY OF PUBLIC LAND ACQUISITION

According to the Parks 2020 Plan, there are several parcels that comprise Pow Wow Park. They are indicated by Tax Code Numbers: A10569A, A14552B, A14535C, A14552A, A24663, A14552 and the planning area also includes Judicial Rims Park which is parceled by: A24621C.

According to research compiled by Peaks to Plains Design, the first park dedication took place in 1956 with the platting of Spring Valley Subdivision. It included 7.377 acres immediately east of what is now the elementary school parcel. However, in 1973 the plat was amended and the original
The dedication parcel was renamed lot 10A with the south boundary moved further south. During this time, the park was rededicated to the south along the homes along Indian Trail, with an increase in land size to 16.024 acres. A private lot parcel named 10B still separated the park from the cliff edge in that area.

In 1978, another 4.1961 acres were dedicated with the Terrace Estate Subdivision plat filing. In 1979, additional 1.854 acres were added with the Galaxy Subdivision, which also established Judicial Rims Park, 3.8874 acres located on the north side of Judicial Avenue. Also in 1979, Logan Acres Subdivision filed for a plat, which dedicated “two unnamed parks” south of Quiet Water Avenue. The acreages include 1.2630 and 2.485 acres.

The lot renamed parcel 10A in 1973, was bought by the City of Billings from the Deaconess Billings Foundation for $60,000 in 1993. Two lots located on the far east end of the park, north and west of the end of Quiet Water Avenue are assumed to be acquired through deficient tax properties. These two parcels may be been acquired in the mid 1990’s and are a part of the Logan Acres Subdivision.

The City of Billings acquired parcel 10B in the Spring Valley Subdivision through a direct donation from Montana Bank of Billings in the early 1990’s. This parcel contains 14.978 acres.

These park lands, in addition to Terrace Estates Subdivision Park, North Swords Park, etc., create the Alkali Creek Corridor Park System.

**HISTORY OF PARK LAND DEVELOPMENT**

**Park Improvements**

The park parcels are identified in the Parks 2020 Plan for the Heights Central Neighborhood. This plan identifies these parcels as “Natural Resource Parks” and is identified as important natural features which should continue to be preserved and enhanced as greenway connections. The implementation recommendation for Pow Wow Park (46.767 acres) is to “maintain” it under the austere model and develop 5 acres under the affirmative and abundant models. Judicial Rims Park (4.187 acres) is recommended to “maintain” for all three models.

For the most part, nothing has been done to actively manage or develop the park lands since their acquisition. There was at one time a bridge crossing near the school, but it was destroyed by flooding. Several projects have been proposed, including Boy Scout projects, which proposed replacing the bridge access and other minor projects, all of which were either never constructed or were also washed away by floodwaters.

For the most part, foot trails traverse the park, in addition to a few kids’ forts and fire rings. All of these examples are “pioneering” efforts and not formally managed by the Parks Department. The users and neighbors are currently the only source of upkeep in the park, often citing that they themselves will collect and dispose of refuse found in the park.

**Surrounding Improvements**

Several construction projects are proposed and will soon be implemented in this Alkali Creek Valley. Each of these projects has an affect on the use and future development needs of the park land. In 2005, Alkali Creek Road will be reconstructed from Black Pine Street to Senators
Boulevard. This project will include a multi-use path from Alkali Creek Elementary School to Black Pine Street in various widths and distances from the road. This path is an off-street route, generally separated by a boulevard.

In 2007, Airport Road will be under construction to widen the highway and improvements to the 27th Street intersection as well as the Alkali Creek Road section. The current proposal includes a tunnel connection from the Alkali Creek Valley towards Swords Park for a multi-purpose pathway.

The City also recently received a Transportation and Community Systems Preservation grant from the congressional delegation totaling $495,654 for purposes of constructing a “bike/pedestrian path in the general vicinity of Alkali Creek.” Although initially targeted for use to build a concrete multi-purpose path through the park, it is unknown of the final use of those grant funds.

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

Slope Analysis
The land that makes up the Alkali Creek Corridor is unique in many ways. Because it is situated below the sandstone rims and contains a creek bed, this produces some very complex grades and slopes within the park. A representative section of the slope assessment is shown below. The colors on the map indicate the percentage of slope in that area. A key is given next to the map to show the different slope ranges and how that translates to the navigability of the areas.

Key:
- **Blue** (0-2%) General, Flat Surface
- **Green** (2-5%) Easy to Moderate Slope
- **Red** (5-12%) Difficult to Climb Without Assistance
- **Yellow** (12%-100%) Highly Steep Slopes, Highly Difficult to Navigate

As is evident by the map, much of this section of the park ranges from 5-100% slope, making navigation a challenge. The moderate slopes and flat areas are mainly found within the creek bed.

Soils Analysis
The general soil classification for this area of Yellowstone County falls under soils of the shale and sandstone uplands. It is described as undulating to rolling, moderately deep and shallow soils that have a dominantly clay loam subsoil. Aside from the rock outcrops that comprise the base of the rims, the majority of the park land is considered sandy loam, with a few areas being clay loam or loam.

According to the Yellowstone County Soil Survey, the area near Alkali Creek is classified as alluvial land, seeped. The alluvium is more than 5 feet deep and ranges from sandy loam to clay in texture. Closer to Black Pine Street, the soils are part of the McRae loam series of deep, well-drained, nearly level slopes.
Most of the main useable area of the park consists of McRae-Bainville loams that are deep, well-drained soils formed in loamy alluvium. Deep coulees extend from the valley top to the base of the valley rim. Erosion is active in large coulees.

The cliff face consists of the Bainville-Rock outcrop complex that consists of sandstone and shale uplands that have been deeply eroded and are cut by many coulees and dry stream valleys. The sandstone layers that separate the soft beds of shale are exposed on the side of deep valleys. Runoff is rapid during short, heavy summer rains and erosion is active on the steep barren slopes.

All of these soils described in this area are desirable for range and irrigated pasture according to this 1972 publication.

**Vegetation Analysis**
Existing vegetation in the Alkali Creek Corridor is varied, depending on the specific area of the park. Along the creek bottom, in the alluvial soils, you will find Russian Olive trees, sedges, reedgrass, cattails, and willows. In the corridor near Black Pine Street, vegetation consists of needle-and-thread grass, blue grama grass, broom snakeweed, western wheatgrass, big sagebrush, silver sagebrush, winterfat and skunkbush sumac. The main park area also contains similar vegetation to this. Along the cliff face, the vegetation is mainly grasses and forbs, with a few scattered pines, junipers, and cedar on north-facing slopes and in deep coulees. On the upper cliffs ricegrass, needle-and-thread grass, yucca, sagebrush, sand reedgrass, and dry land sedges are among the common species found.

**Hydrology Analysis**
A major component of this park is Alkali Creek, which runs through the length of the park. The existence of this creek creates a need for flood awareness in the area. The major hydrologic component in the park is Alkali Creek, which is classified as a perennial stream by the Army Corps of Engineers. Alkali creek has a watershed of 40.7 square miles. The park land area lies approximately one mile from the confluence of Alkali Creek and the Yellowstone River.

Alkali Creek is subject to flooding, most often caused by sudden rain storms upstream of the planning area. FEMA has delineated the flood boundaries, indicating the areas of the 100-year and 500-year floodplain.

Other hydrologic features include a natural ground water spring which is located in the vegetated coulee to the east of the school. In heavy rainstorms, water flows over the rimrocks through gulleys towards the creek bed.

The airport has a storm water outlet off Indian Trail and a new outlet will be constructed as a part of the improvements to Alkali Creek Road in 2005. Most of the surrounding subdivision drainage flows towards the creek with on-surface flow.

**Constructability**
Due to the steep slopes and creek in this area, constructability is relatively difficult. All of the soil types have low to medium bearing capacity, with erosion and slopes cited as issues for potential construction on these sites. There are areas within the corridor, however, that are suited to building if it is deemed appropriate.
Limited Access to the park lands will contribute to this difficulty with dead-end access at Judicial Avenue and Quiet Water Avenue. Existing housing hugs the remaining park boundaries which limits access and causes disruption during construction periods.

**Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines**
The Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) apply to all projects in which the public has general access to the site and projects receiving federal and state funding. The published standards in 1991 include nine sections specific to the built environment, but do not address designing sidewalks and trails. However, public and private entities who design these items are still obligated under the ADAAG to make them accessible to people with disabilities.

The term “accessible” is to refer to environments that meet the specifications defined by the U.S. Access Board. These specifications define “accessible” environments to include the current version of the ADAAG, as well as the report of the Regulatory Negotiation Committee on Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas (www.access-board.gov/outdoor/outdoor-rec-rpt.htm) and the U.S. Access Board’s recommendations for sidewalks contained in “Accessible Rights-of-Way: A Design Guide.”

The needs of people with disabilities should be considered in every aspect of design, development and maintenance of public facilities. The level of accessibility varies in outdoor environments due to natural characteristics, such as terrain or archaeological significance. In general, facilities on trails that are in highly developed area should be most stringently accessible. Recreation amenities, such as picnic tables and fire grills should always provide for accessibility regardless if the route to those amenities is fully accessible. Access routes should be provided that connects facilities such as parking areas and restrooms. Accessible design criteria should be incorporated whenever feasible. When developing construction documents, it is highly advised to read the entire current regulations and apply them accordingly.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND REGULATIONS**

**Floodplain**
A large portion of the park land lies within the Alkali Creek floodplain. As defined by the Floodplain Regulations, a floodplain is the area that would be covered by a base (or 100-year) flood, except for designated shallow flooding areas that receive less than one foot of water per occurrence (a 100-year, or base, flood is a flood having a one percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year). The floodplain itself consists of both a floodway and a flood fringe. The floodway is the channel of a stream and the adjacent bank areas that must be reserved in order to discharge a base flood without cumulatively increasing the water surface elevation more than one-half (1/2) foot. The area outside of the floodway but within the floodplain is considered the floodway fringe.

Plans for the park unofficially delineate the floodway and floodway fringe in the corridor. Because of the fact that much of this park lies in the floodplain, any improvements done would need to comply with the floodplain regulations. This includes stream crossings, structures, or any other artificial obstructions. Before any improvements are constructed in or near the floodplain, a site-specific flood study may be required and permitting for the floodplain is currently through the City of Billings Floodplain Administrator.

**Wildlife vs. Domestic Life**
Currently, many types of wildlife may be seen within the Alkali Creek Corridor, as well as domesticated dogs and cats. Wildlife includes beavers, mountain lions, deer, antelope, birds, and
fish. Dogs are allowed in the park at this time, but must be vaccinated, licensed, and on leash. Respondents from public meetings indicated their desire to retain dogs in the park. Current City Ordinance allows for this and it is recommended that this policy is retained.

Respondents also indicated a desire to retain the wildlife in the park as an amenity. A representative from the Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) spoke at the third public meeting regarding this issue. He indicated that the species found in the park are generally highly urbanized and would most likely not leave if any improvements were made in the park. He also indicated that the small acreage and location of the park lands makes it impractical for a wildlife management area. Any proposed improvements in the park would need FWP review and approval prior to construction through the MEPA process.

Other Regulatory Permitting Requirements
Both National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) are policies set forth to regulate the long-term affects of construction and improvements made to the land. These acts set forth checklists to use throughout a planning process to ensure that the outcome of the project is an alternative that both suits the needs of the project and has the least negative environmental impacts. However, once a plan is adopted and will be implemented, one of three things may happen. To satisfy NEPA/MEPA, you must complete an Environmental Assessment (EA), Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), or qualify for a categorical exclusion. If Federal funds were to be used, there is a high probability that the project would fall into a categorical exclusion. However, if not, because of the size and nature of the project, an EA, which is the less-involved of the two, would need to be completed. This process would commence when an implementation project is underway.

Other regulatory permits that may or may not be needed depends on the location, area or funding source for the improvements. The Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) administers the General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. Activity with a disturbance of one acre or more will need this permit. The Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) administers the Montana Natural Streambed and Land Preservation Act (310 Permit) and the Streamside Management Zone Law. The Montana FWP administers the Montana Stream Protection Act (SPA 124 Permit). Since Alkali Creek is considers “Waters of the United State,” the Federal Clean Water Act (404 Permit) will most likely be needed and is administered through the Army Corps of Engineers.

CULTURAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES
With Montana’s rich history and culture, both of these factors should be considered before embarking on any significant improvement project. According to a cultural resources specialist, the Alkali Creek area is significant because it provides a route around the rims. The Crow Indians have also used the valley throughout their existence in Montana, leaving behind such artifacts as bison kills and rock art. The necessary analytical steps should be taken to ensure cultural and historic sensitivity in the planning process. Three potential steps may need to be taken; survey, testing, and mitigation. Surveying is the basic step, and is required if Federal funds are being used on a project (County and State funding may possibly require this as well). Testing requires digging to locate resources and mitigation is the final step when significant sites are found. If cultural resources were found, it would not necessarily end the project, it may just mean moving the location of trails or amenities to avoid sites.
Typically, the site survey is done during the planning stages. It is recommended that a cultural survey be completed in the park to identify any potential sites prior to implementing any changes or improvements. A site survey for this purpose costs approximately $5,000 to complete.

ADJACENT LAND USES

**Alkali Creek Elementary School**

The location of the Alkali Creek School within the bounds of this project presents many interesting opportunities. Because there are residences along the park land, many children use the Alkali Creek Corridor as their route to and from school. At this time, there are man-made footpaths the children may utilize, but there is no reliable, safe way to cross the creek.

The relatively natural state of the park also lends itself to educational opportunities for the school. Teachers could take advantage of the school’s setting by using the park as an outdoor classroom; however, the limited access to the creek bottom is a deterrent for many of these programs.

**Residential Properties**

Another unique aspect of this project is the many single-family homes that abut the park land. The biggest concerns about current or increased use were about trespassing and neighborhood safety. Simple signage can deter any trespassers; in most cases, park users just need to be made aware of the boundaries.

In terms of crime, trail advocates cite that crime rates tend to decrease with the development of permanent trails. However, opposing data can also be found, showing that increased use increases crime incidents. Any of this data is subjective, though, and depends on various other factors. These factors include community demographics, population densities, adjacent land uses, and characteristics of the site. The demographic in the Alkali Creek area and the Heights in general has primarily middle-class, well-educated, single-family homes. Because all of the residences are single-family, the population density is relatively low. There are no commercial uses surrounding the park land; all land is residential aside from the school. These characteristics all suggest a low incidence of risk for any crime. The rugged terrain and limited access should also be a deterrent for criminals; both these factors make a getaway more difficult. History of crime in the Heights is very low in general, and though there is no record kept on how trails affect crime rates in Billings, there have been no overall increases despite trails being implemented throughout the Heights. It is the experience of the Parks Department that regular, legitimate use in a park often drives out abusive, undesirable uses. A final crime deterrent is the fact that residents in this area take much pride in where they live, and make an effort to keep a watchful eye on happenings around them. They are aware of who their neighbors are, for the most part, and “self-police” the area quite effectively.

OVERALL COMMUNITY NEEDS

**Parks 2020 Plan**

The Parks 2020 Plan discusses the status of Pow Wow Park and the Alkali Creek Corridor in several sections of the plan. On page 2 of the “Heights Central – Specific Recommendations” of the Parks 2020 plan, the following is indicated for Pow Wow Park:
Pow Wow Park extends along Alkali Creek from Alkali creek elementary southeast approximately ½ mile, encompassing over 46 acres. The park includes natural drainage as well as adjacent rims. Portions of the park near the school are suitable for recreational development, including a low impact play lot and trail improvements. Access is a problem and needs to be improved. This park is an essential greenway component, and when developed, would also satisfy the need for a neighborhood and subdivision recreational park. Development is recommended under the Affirmative implementation model. Development and maintenance costs should be shared with the school district.

On page 5 of the “Heights Central Neighborhood Summary” of the Parks 2020 plan, it indicates the following:

**Natural Resource Parks:**
The Heights Central neighborhood contains abundant natural resource parks including over 200 acres of the Alkali Creek floodplain, rim rocks and wetlands. Many existing natural areas present opportunities for multifunctional use, including recreation. These parks include Sahara, Pow Wow and Holfeld.

The Parks 2020 Plan defines natural areas as “lands set aside primarily for conservation of significant physical or biological resources…The majority of the parks are located along sandstone rims or the Yellowstone River and its tributaries. Recreational opportunities are secondary to resource conservation, occasionally including trails and interpretative opportunities, picnic areas and passive recreation.”

The following is the list of recommendations for natural resource lands from the 2020 Plan:

- The City should continue to protect and provide public access to an interconnecting network of natural resource lands.
- The responsibility for protecting natural resource lands with limited recreation potential should be pursued through the Planning department and private land trusts.
- Fiscal constraints may require protection of natural resource lands using creative voluntary techniques in combination with regulation. Examples include conservation easements and floodplain or hillside preservation ordinances. These and other techniques are described in greater detail in the Implementation Section.
- Fiscal constraints may require use of recreation trail easements in lieu of outright acquisition.
- The City of Billings and Yellowstone County should map and maintain a database of resource-sensitive lands as a reference in selecting future park sites and for reviewing development of proposals.

Furthermore, the plan discusses Pow Wow Park in terms of development under the “affirmative” plan:

Parks that are recommended to be developed to multifunctional park standards include MetraPark, Two Moon, Mystic, Sharptail, Coulson, Pow Wow, Sahara, Centennial, Kiwanis Trail, Meadowlark and Oxbow Parks. An attempt should be made to develop all parks for multiple functions if the opportunity is present.

Table 2 on page 48 ranks Pow Wow Park at number 7 in terms of importance to the community with a functional value of 40 with the recommend to maintain the park under the “Austere” model, develop five acres of the park under the “Affirmative” and “Abundant” models. The functional values for all parks ranked from a high of 54 to a low of 0.
The park is not specifically classified in the Parks 2020 plan in terms of “neighborhood,” “community,” or “regional” park status. Upon review of the general criteria for these classifications, including size, users, and in comparison with other parks in Billings, Pow Wow Park and the Alkali Creek Corridor is considered a “community” park in the system.

Heritage Trail Plan
The Heritage Trail Plan, adopted in 2004, states three goals for the greater Billings area: to be a comprehensive multi-use trails plan that serves the Greater Billings community and emphasizes safety, implementation, preservation, conservation, interpretation, recreation, transportation, access, education, utilization, cost effectiveness, and maintenance; to be consistent with the Yellowstone County Growth Policy Plan, City of Billings Transportation Plan, and City of Billings Parks Plan; and to create links throughout Yellowstone County, connecting communities, neighborhoods, natural and cultural features, commercial and employment centers, schools and parks. Creating a trail in the Alkali Creek Corridor would help to reach the goals set forth by this plan, by connecting homes and schools, providing access to recreation and education and the opportunity for interpretation, and serving as a link to future trails.

Due to the nature of Pow Wow Park and the Alkali Creek Corridor, the Heritage Trail Plan supports the use of soft-surface trails. These firm, but stable, surfaces allow for bikes and wheelchairs, as well as walkers and joggers. They also are “the preferred alternative for areas that require minimum impact to natural surroundings, such as within nature preserves.”

Heights Neighborhood Plan
The Heights Neighborhood Plan was in draft form during this master plan process. Issues such as trail connections were cited as needs to link parks and recreation facilities together and to provide an alternative mode of transportation. Also cited was the need to adequately sign parks for pedestrian safety. The master plan supports both of these issues.

City/County Growth Policy
The master plan provides solutions that support the following goals of the growth policy:
- Accessible public lands
- A multi-purpose trail network integrated into the community infrastructure that emphasizes safety, environmental preservation, resource conservation and cost effectiveness
- Protect and increase the availability of public access to natural areas and trails near the rims
- Identification and protection of the historical, archaeological and cultural resources of Yellowstone County

LONG-TERM MAINTENANCE
General (Parks Department)
If trails and other improvements were to be implemented in the Alkali Creek Corridor, maintenance would become a necessity. The Parks Department would need access to clear debris, maintain trails, manage refuse, etc. Vehicular access would be necessary using the least intrusive means possible. Routine maintenance could be done on foot (trash collection, etc.) to reduce impact on the trail surfaces.

Electrical Lines (Northwestern Energy)
Northwestern Energy was contacted in regards to their needs and/or concerns for maintenance in this corridor. They indicated that they periodically inspect the structures for stability and decay. If signs of decay are found, insecticides are injected into the wood. They have indicated that this routine maintenance could be conducted on foot.
If a structure fails, a line and bucket truck will need access to the site. This occurs less frequently with major replacement projects done every 10-30 or even 100 years. In the past, however, they have taken their trucks through the park as is to access utility lines without any major problems.

**Fire Suppression**
According to the fire chief of Billings, Pow Wow Park presents no unusual challenges when it comes to fire suppression. It would be dealt with as a routine wild land response, which the crews are all familiar in dealing with. Their smaller brush trucks can access the park from Quiet Water Avenue, and they can draft water from Alkali Creek to replenish their supply, if necessary. In a memo from the Fire Department, the Chief indicated that if access from other areas of the park were part of the master plan, it would be helpful to the Fire Department if the access point would support their brush trucks.

**Flood Management**
Almost all of the proposed amenities are out of the floodplain. A short section of potential trails (if implemented) may cross the flood fringe and may be subject to submersion and wash out. This will be an ongoing maintenance issue for the Parks Department. Staff has requested the right to pave any small portion of the trail for purposes of reducing wash-out.

Downed trees and beaver dams back up water and in major flood events, can proliferate flood damage. With improved maintenance access, a proactive strategy can remove downed trees allowing the water to flow more freely for this purpose.

**Wildlife/Animal Control**
Wildlife control was not an expressed concern by residents. People in this area see the wildlife as a benefit to where they live. As far as domestic animals are concerned, people almost unanimously agreed that dogs should continue to be allowed in the park, as long as owners cleaned up after them. No other input was received on wildlife problems in this corridor.

**Storm Drainage Outfall**
Two piped outfalls will be flowing into Alkali Creek from the Airport and from Alkali Creek Road. Access to these outfalls is from the dedicated right-of-way on Indian Trail and is maintained by the Public Works Department.

**PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES**
At the second Town Hall meeting, six master plan alternatives were presented to those in attendance for review. Each was a separate entity, allowing for a number of possible combinations. The following are descriptions of each alternative presented.

*Alternative #1: Judicial Avenue Overlook*
The Judicial Avenue Overlook consists of a boardwalk structure made of composite wood materials. This boardwalk is accessed from Judicial Avenue and provides an overlook to the Alkali Creek Corridor. Construction of the overlook would create minimal disturbance to existing vegetation and would be accessible to all users. Although it would not be an access point into the park, the overlook would provide seating areas and an opportunity to view wildlife in the area.

Alternative #2: Judicial Avenue Connector
The first proposed connector for the master plan, this alternative provides access from Judicial Avenue to the parkland near Alkali Creek Elementary School. To make this trail connector navigable for the majority of people, the route mainly follows the creek bottom. This area has the least slope and would avoid cross-cutting through slopes, making it less obtrusive. The entry to the Judicial Avenue cul-de-sac would be the steepest grade. This connector would be an 8' wide soft-surface trail, with a minor bridge crossing where the ground water spring meets up with Alkali Creek. The trail alignment is such that it avoids the specimen pine trees near Judicial Avenue. Because of its close proximity to the creek, the trail would also provide opportunity for student study of the riparian habitat.

Alternative #3: School Access Option #1
Shown below, the first school access option provides a 150’ bridge crossing near Alkali Creek Elementary, as well as improved sidewalks and parking for the school. This would serve as the main entrance to the park, with a landscaped trailhead including benches, interpretive signage, and trash receptacles. With this option, the school and park would have joint use of this access point. After crossing the bridge from the school, users will be on top of a knob, above the old creek oxbow. The trail will wrap around the knob, then drop down closer to the creek and meet up with the trails to the north and south. The connecting trail to the south will be a reduced width of only 5 feet (see Alternative #5), while the northern trail would be the 8’ Judicial Avenue connector. The old oxbow area would be mowed 3-4 times per year, allowing for unprogrammed open space.

Alternative #4: School Access Option #2
School access option #2 shares many of the same ideas as #1, with a few minor exceptions. As seen in the illustration below, option #2 accesses the park south of the school, separating the two
user groups. It would provide a separate parking area with handicap accessible spots. There would again be a 150’ bridge to span Alkali Creek and take park users over to a peninsula. On the peninsula would be benches for an overlook spot. After leaving the peninsula area, the trail would again meet up with the Judicial Avenue connector trail to the north, and to the east connector trail to the south (8’ and 5’ wide, respectively). Again with this plan, the oxbow would be mowed 3-4 times per year.

**Alternative #5: East Connector**

Alternative #5 is the connection from the school area to the eastern limits of the park. This plan shows two pathways, high and low, following existing trails as much as possible. In cases where the trail departs from what exists, the intent was to “hug” the contours, creating a more accessible route. Some minor footbridges would be needed (as shown) to accommodate runoff in gullies. There is some difficulty with this trail near the terminus at Quiet Water Avenue. The terrain becomes especially steep and provides a challenge to make this access traversable for all users.

**Alternative #6: Far East Connection**

The final alternative presented is a connection from the far eastern part of the Alkali Creek Corridor to adjacent uses. After exiting the park at Quiet Water Avenue, the trail would become on-street. It then continues in a park parcel to the west of the BBWA Canal, eventually meeting up with the BBWA. This portion of the trail could then connect to future trail systems to the east, as well as be a link to accommodate users from the roadway. Vegetation would be used as screening where park property is directly adjacent to private property.
PUBLIC PROCESS

Executive Summary
This project consisted of conducting one focus group and three town hall meetings with area residents and general public. The focus group was conducted with city/county/government officials for the purpose of identifying professional perspectives on development of a park master plan for the Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor area. The focus group was held before the three town hall meetings.

The purpose of the first town hall meeting was to inform the public about the purpose and current status of the park master plan and of current development activities in the area, and to solicit public attitudes and opinions on a series of questions about usage, access, current perceptions and future of the Park area. Public responses were solicited in a group format.

The purpose of the second town hall meeting was to present key findings from the first town hall meeting and to solicit public attitudes and opinions on six preliminary master plan alternatives. Public responses were solicited in a group format.

The purpose of the third town hall meeting was to present key findings from the second town hall meeting and to solicit individual responses from participants to a recommended master plan alternative. Public comments were also recorded at this meeting.

In addition to the focus group and three town hall meetings, the public was able to provide comments via comments cards and/or on the project website.

Focus Group Summary
The focus group participants provided general input on the development of a master plan from their unique perspectives (transportation, planning, city engineering, parks & recreation, Montana Dept. of Transportation, and City Council) and identified issues/concerns. General comments included: focus on a broader scale plan for a regional park; incorporate school needs/desires; preserve in natural state as much as possible; avoid overdeveloping with concrete; make ADA accessible; and incorporate bike trails that could be connectors to other trails. Issues included: flood plain, easements across private property, increased access, maintenance concerns, fire and safety concerns, wildlife issues, hard vs. soft trails, development vs. leaving natural, ensuring an open public process; using a facilitator; and conflicting user groups (e.g., adjacent property owners vs. community residents who want greater access).

First Town Hall Meeting Summary
A total of 87 individuals signed in at the first town hall meeting on March 29, 2005. Public responses were collected in a small group format. From a show of hands, participants identified themselves as primarily adjacent property owners or residents living in the Alkali Creek area and in the Heights. There were some individuals from the greater Billings community and some representing specific groups, such as Bike Net. The following key findings emerged from the group work at the first town hall meeting.

Usage: The majority of participants indicated they use the Park area on a daily, weekly or random basis, primarily for walking/running/jogging/hiking, nature walks and watching wildlife and would like the Park area left as natural as possible with limited improvements made.

Access: Access was a concern for most participants. The majority would like to see a stable, permanent pedestrian bridge connecting Alkali Creek School with the Park. There were a number
of comments about making the park more accessible and connected to other areas but at the same time preserving its natural ambiance. ADA accessibility was mentioned numerous times.

**Trails:** The overall majority of participants favored only soft trails and many spoke against any concrete or hard surface trails. Comments ranged from widening trails to accommodate two people to concerns about duplication of trails with a multi-purpose trail along the roadway and to requests that a trail in the park be connected to other trails.

**Amenities/Park Development/Maintenance:** There were mixed comments about Park development with some wanting limited development to include garbage cans at access points, benches, bike racks, rest room facilities, and picnic tables and others wanting no development. The common denominator was to keep the natural setting of the Park. Comments were split between those who preferred to continue “self-policing” the area and those who would like an improved level of maintenance from the city.

**Current Perceptions:** Most comments favored maintaining the stability and aesthetics of the Rims. Most responses indicated concern about the lack of access for fire suppression and some concern about increased usage leading to greater fire danger. Concerns about flooding were expressed. The majority considered wildlife a benefit and to let individual homeowners manage situations of wildlife “nuisance.” The majority indicated concern that increased development and usage could lead to increased crime.

**Suggestions for Development of a Master Plan:** There was a clear preference to keep the Park in a natural state and to build a foot bridge by the school. Most comments expressed concern about adding any trails and indicated preference for only soft trails. There were concerns expressed about duplication of trails and some comments about improving access to public land and making sure trails are connected to the greater community.

**Park Amenities Survey:** Another portion of the meeting focused on what amenities people would like to see in the park, if any at all. Below are the results of this survey (results based on 49 total responses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lots</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Lighting at Access Points</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountains</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Signage</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprogrammed Open Space</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Bathing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Display</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were also asked what they would like to use the park for. Those responses are shown below, out of 49 total responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Bridges</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Biking</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Biking</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Access Routes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-line Skating</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Courses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian Trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-country Skiing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of the Second Town Hall Meeting**
A total of 104 individuals signed in at the second town hall meeting on April 27, 2005. From a show of hands, participants identified themselves as primarily adjacent property owners or residents living...
in the Alkali Creek area and in the Heights. There were some individuals from the greater Billings community and some representing specific groups, such as Bike Net and organizations for the disabled. Public responses to a choice of 6 possible alternatives and questions about access for dogs and need for park signage were collected in a small group format. The following key findings emerged from the group work at the second town hall meeting. Only one alternative was preferred by the majority of participants—#3 School Access Area #1.

**#1 Judicial Avenue Overlook:** The majority of responses were not in favor of this alternative for the following reasons: cost vs. utilization, parking concerns, traffic hazard (street too narrow), safety, litter, impact on neighbors, not a good location, and alternative too elaborate, unnecessary and not appropriate.

**#2 Judicial Avenue Connector:** There were more responses indicating that participants were not in favor of this alternative for the following reasons: to avoid infringement on wildlife habitat and vegetation, parking issues, possible damage during construction, impact on neighborhood homes and safety concerns. Some responses favored this alternative because it would improve the current trail and access. There were various and conflicting comments about trails: need to be ADA compatible vs. the difficulty of making them ADA accessible; should be only 5’ wide; are too close to private property; soft trails vs. hard trails; and trail maintenance concerns.

**#3 School Access Area #1:** Participants clearly favored this alternative because of the good parking, easy access, and joint use with the school. There were conflicting comments regarding the scope of amenities to accompany this option—from no trails or soft trails to ADA compatible trails, from benches and trash collection to limited or no amenities. Most were in favor of a bridge.

**#4 School Access Area #2:** The majority of responses did not favor this alternative because of lack of parking, being too close to private property and being less preferable for handicapped.

**#5 East Connector from School Access Area to Quiet Water Avenue:** The majority of responses did not favor this alternative for the following reasons: preference that area remains natural and habitat is not impacted; a difficult slope; too close to private property; and limited parking available at Quiet Water. Concerns were expressed about maintaining two trails and ADA requirements.

**#6 Far East Connector from Quiet Water Avenue to the BBWA Canal:** The majority of responses were not in favor of this alternative because participants prefer to keep the area natural, it’s too close to private property, and it’s dangerous around the Big Ditch. There were a range of responses pointing out that the negotiated trail agreement with Morningside Subdivision must be honored but that more study needs to occur about how this trail will be built onto in the future.

**Dogs:** All tables responded favorably to allowing dogs in the park. There were split comments about whether they be leashed or not, and additional comments that owners clean up after them.

**Signs:** Most tables responded favorably to having signs, particularly narrow signs that indicate private property and park boundaries.

**Summary of the Third Town Hall Meeting**
A total of 49 individuals signed in at the third town hall meeting on May 26, 2005. From a show of hands, participants identified themselves as primarily adjacent property owners or residents living in the Alkali Creek area. There were some individuals from the greater Heights area. No one identified themselves as representing a particular group. Individual responses were solicited to three questions about the recommended alternative. There were also public comments recorded during the meeting. The following key findings emerged from the third town hall meeting:
**Question #1: Positives about the Recommended Alternative:** The key positive theme evident in the individual responses was increased park access, especially bridge access at the school. While the majority of comments favored bridge access at the school, a number of participants stipulated only the bridge access and that they were not interested in the other trail components of the recommended alternative. Comments about trail development were mixed: no hard trails vs. wish the trails were hard. There were a number of comments indicating displeasure or non-acceptance of the recommended alternative and the public process.

**Question #2: Challenges Concerning the Recommended Alternative:** There were numerous comments expressing displeasure or non-acceptance of the recommended alternative based on unwanted trail development components and wanting to leave the park natural. Many of these comments also criticized the public input process as not considering their input at all, not listening to residents and not offering a “leave as is” option. There were also a number of comments in favor of the recommended alternative but acknowledging the challenge of getting the recommended alternative accepted and implemented by adjacent park homeowners and area residents. Some respondents indicated specific areas of concern: funding, maintenance and associated costs, reclamation of construction damage, problems with trash, kids partying in the park, increased traffic on narrow streets (Judicial, Quiet Water), safety, impact on wildlife, impact to adjacent property owners, grade elevations, keeping the park in its natural state, and too much visibility and upkeep.

**Question #3: Comments/Suggestions for the City in Moving the Project Forward:** Participant comments and suggestions ranged from some embracing the recommended alternative to many criticisms of the alternative and the public process. Those in favor identified it as a good or great plan, a reasonable direction and urged the city to move forward with the plan. They expressed concern that the majority of Billings residents were not represented at the meeting and that the park is a city park, not a park only for adjacent property owners. Ensuring greater access for Heights and Billings residents was urged. Those opposed were in favor of a bridge only alternative with little to no additional trail development and strongly urged city officials to leave the park natural and to listen to their comments. There were some specific suggestions made including: need to have the bridge but do not need 6’ hard trails by Judicial Avenue; do not duplicate trails; put the proposed project cost of $650,000 towards a pool in the Heights; do not implement a trail off Black Pine until Airport Hill project is decided; concentrate on extending the trail along Alkali Creek Road east out of the valley to connect with other city trails; because of the possibility of decreased property values created by adjacent trails, property owners should have weighted consideration; and seek an easement from the school for a trail on the school side of the creek to connect to the bike trail along Alkali Creek Road that can wind behind the school and playground and reconnect on the paved dirt road (Indian Trail) and then to Alkali Creek Road.

**Public Comments:** Public comments ranged from criticism of the recommended alternative and public process to some acceptance of the alternative to suggestions for continued involvement in a public process. There were many comments expressing displeasure and non-acceptance of the alternative and the public process including: not understanding why the consultant didn’t represent what the majority wanted—to leave the park natural with little to no trail development; not understanding the reason for all the public meetings when the majority said they want the park natural; and the consultant not having the data to leap from the public wanting a bridge to wanting trails in the park. Some participants spoke in favor of the recommended alternative, even as a compromise, and felt that not all the public was represented at the Town Hall meeting and that a small minority were being heard over the majority. A number of comments were put forth to encourage those critical of the public process and recommended alternative to continue to stay
involved by contacting city council members and being prepared to present at the city council meeting.

**Summary of Web Comments**

Web comments were collected from March 1 to May 31, 2005. These comments were collected in two groupings: web comments with names (98 recorded) and anonymous web comments (43 recorded). The web comments with names included some multiple entries by single individuals with the result that the comments do not represent the views of 98 different people. With the 43 anonymous comments, there is no way to identify how many individuals sent them.

In both groupings, respondents self-identified in one of a number of affiliations: resident in the Alkali Creek area; resident of the Heights not living in the Alkali Creek area; resident of Billings not living in the Heights; special interest representative; living outside the Billings area; former resident; and visitor. There is also a category called “not identified” for individuals who did not include their affiliation with their entry.

**Web Comments with Names:** Most comments were identified with the affiliation of resident of the Alkali Creek area (45), followed by resident of Billings not living in the Heights (21) and then resident of Heights not living in Alkali Creek area (16). A number of themes were identified in terms of frequency of mention. The most common ones included:

- in favor of adding trails to the park, whether soft or hard (26)
- in favor of improved park access including the addition of trails (22)
- in favor of leaving the park natural with no hard trails (21)
- in favor of adding hard trails in the park (15)
- in favor of bridge access only with no trails added to the park (14)
- advocating trails that will connect to other trail systems/neighborhoods in the city (12)
- in favor of adding ADA access (7)

**Anonymous Web Comments:** Most comments were identified with the affiliation of resident of the Alkali Creek area (18), followed by resident of Billings not living in the Heights (16) and then resident of Heights not living in Alkali Creek area (5). A number of themes were identified in terms of frequency of mention. The most common ones included:

- in favor of leaving the park natural/no development/no concrete (28)
- in favor of improved access for everyone (6)
- in favor of adding hard trails (4)

**Common Themes**

There were themes that ran across all of the public input, from the focus group and town hall meetings to the website comments. In most cases, public viewpoints were mixed or conflicting regarding the specifics of each theme and reflected the differences among the user groups.

**Leave the park natural:** All public input recognized the unique natural environment of the park area and recommended its preservation. Viewpoints were split in terms of what level of development would ensure a natural environment and how a natural setting should be defined. These ranged from a “leave as is” perspective to one of limited development that included primarily “soft” trails.

**Park access:** Almost all public input recognized the need for some improved access. Viewpoints were split in terms of how extensive that access should be. These ranged from adding only a safe, pedestrian bridge at Alkali Creek School to adding a bridge and some trail development. Concerns were expressed that access needed to be increased for all users vs. concerns that increased
access would lead to increased crime and safety issues. Concerns were expressed about access to deal with fire and flooding issues.

**Trail development:** Public input was split in terms of trail development in the park. Some users wanted little to no trail development whereas others advocated for limited to extensive trail development. There were wishes for a trail system that could connect the park area with other trails and other city neighborhoods and advocates for keeping the park “as is.” In terms of trail surface, there were more advocates for “soft” trail development than “hard” trail development. Trail surface discussion was often linked to maintenance concerns, specifically that soft trails are harder to maintain while hard trails in the long term are easier to maintain. A common theme across all viewpoints in the discussion of trail development was the desire to impact the park area and wildlife as little as possible. Viewpoints on ADA accessibility were mixed. Concerns were expressed about duplication of trails and viewpoints were split in terms of those in favor of duplicating trails in the park with a trail along Alkali Creek Road and those against duplication.

**Park amenities:** Almost all public input favored limited amenities. There was most mention of adding trash receptacles and signage.

**RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE**

The recommended master plan alternative is a result of comprehensive analysis of all of the design criteria outlined in previous sections of this report. The overall goal for the master plan is to provide parks and recreational opportunities that provide an improved quality of life for Billings’ residents. As indicated by the chart on the right, the final solution needed to respond to all of the issues indicated.

Public feedback from Town Hall meetings and from the website did not generate overall consensus on the direction of the park. However, after reviewing the data, some commonalities were discovered and were used as the building blocks for the final master plan. For example, in the first town hall meeting, the majority of attendees indicated that walking/jogging and wildlife viewings were common activities currently being used in the park. At the second Town Hall Meeting, almost all of the attendees indicated that they were in favor of school access area #1, which included a bridge over the creek and trails around the oxbow area. Other common themes that people indicated they wanted to see addressed were access, safety, maintenance, trespassing and resource protection. Compliance with the adopted planning policies, such as the Parks 2020 Plan and the Heritage Trail Plan were indicated to be highly desirable by PRPL staff.

The recommended alternative addresses the public’s concerns of access through providing centralized access at the elementary school. A 10 foot wide bridge structure will connect the park land immediately top of the bank of the creek over to a knob in the center of the oxbow on the east side of the creek. The bridge will need to have structural capabilities to withstand an ambulance to cross the bridge. The proposed bridge, as
shown in Figure 16, can be fabricated locally. By placing a bridge across the creek and by having a more formalized trail system, this route can provide a safe access route for school children. Also, by having a fully ADA compliant trail in the oxbow area allows all people of varying abilities to access the creek bottom as well as the park in general. The remainder of the trails in the park would be built according to the NRC’s Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas.

Safety is addressed in the recommended alternative in that a formalized trail system reduces liability and controls the risk for the City. Users will be recommended to stay on the trails in lieu of traversing over unstable terrain. Also, with the bridge crossing, emergency personnel will have easier access to a victim if an accident does occur. In the instance of a range land fire, an additional access point would be available to the fire department for suppression strategies, a stated desire for improvements by the Fire Department.

Overall maintenance of the park would be easier with the recommended alternative. Common requests are to remove downed trees in the park area. City personnel will be able to utilize standard equipment across the bridge and along the trails to provide those services. Special considerations of the overall improvements were to keep them out of the floodplain as much as possible to reduce maintenance. Small U.S. Forest Service-like footbridges cross a couple of the deeper gulleys to lessen the likelihood of trail washouts occurring during a flash rain event.

Generally with a park amenity such as a trail, the more intensive use would be confined to that trail system. Existing foot trails found in the park would have a greater opportunity for reclamation, thus reducing the overall impact to the park. However, people will still have the opportunity to walk the park off the trail if they so desire. A soft-surface trail will need more maintenance than a hard surface trail or even no trails at all. The soft-surface trail will not need winter maintenance, however.

Trespassing will be addressed through property boundary signage, located throughout the park. A recommended sign, shown in Figure 18, can be obtained from Carsonite International (800-648-7974) (www.carsonite.com). The narrow, wide design provides 48 inches of height above the ground and is easy to install. Depending on the style and size selected, these signs can withstand direct-tire impacts and cost as little as $13.90 in materials to obtain.

Finally, the recommended alternative addresses the need for resource protection. Overwhelmingly, responses indicated to leave the park as natural as possible. The soft-surface trail is in context with the native, rough, gravelly terrain of the park. The crushed stone used should match the color of the sandstone cliffs nearby. The locations of the improvements are sensitively sited to parallel slopes, which will reduce erosion potential and reduce the need for “cross-cutting.” Native grasses, forbs and shrubs will be left in a natural state, with no mowing, fertilizing or formal maintenance required. Even with the disturbance needed to construct these improvements, over 95 percent of the park lands are left “as-is” and in a natural state. These improvements are under half of the recommended 5 acres of improvements that the Parks 2020 plan suggests.
FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS

The recommended master plan alternative is a very minimal plan in terms of improvements for a community park of this size. Budgetary costs estimates were prepared based upon current construction prices. The overall cost for all improvements shown in the master plan alternative is approximately $655,325. Costs were broken down in different areas of the park, which could also be used as suggestions if the project needed to be implemented in phases.

Potential Funding Sources

The City of Billings has received a Federal appropriation for development of a “bike/pedestrian trail in the general vicinity of Alkali Creek.” This appropriation, known as a Transportation and Community System Preservation (TCSP) grant, may or may not be applied to the developments recommended in this park. This type of grant is a special appropriation from the Federal Delegation. The improvements that it can fund are specially outlined in the inter-governmental agreement.

Other options for funding may include the City’s capital improvements plan (CIP) which undergoes a public input period and is approved by City Council every year and includes funding for capital improvement projects within the City of Billings from the City’s General Fund. In addition, the City could consider a Park’s Special Improvement District (SID) to assess and additional tax on property owners within a specified boundary. However, because this park is considered a community park, this method of funding is not recommended.

Fish, Wildlife and Parks administers the Recreational Trails Program. Under this reimbursement grant program, the maximum grant available for large projects is $75,000 and the maximum grant available for smaller projects is $20,000. The maximum grant to any sponsor may not exceed 80 percent of the total of the project. The projects for this program are reviewed annually and are selected by the FWP and State Trails Advisory Committee.

The National Parks Service administers the Land and Water Conservation Program, which includes the grant program. For states to be eligible to participate in this program, the States need to have a Statewide Recreation Plan (SCORP) that assesses the demand and supply for recreational resources on local and state levels. The State Agency is the Fish, Wildlife and Parks through which the grants are administered. The maximum grant allocation is $75,000 with the grant funding up to 50 percent of the project costs. Once LWCF is used for development or acquisition of a project, the project must be managed for outdoor recreation in perpetuity. The applications are annual, but the level of funding is dependent on an appropriation from the U.S. Congress.

Community Transportation Enhancement Program (CTEP) is a grant program administered by the Montana Department of Transportation. TEA-21 requires that transportation enhancement activities must relate to surface transportation and expands the defined transportation enhancement eligibility categories as defined in the application process. The program requires matching funds, which vary from year to year. Currently, the matching funds are 13.42 percent. MDT recommends that the total project costs have a minimum of $10,000 to qualify. A local CTEP administrator (from the City) will administer the project once awarded. The projects need to comply with AASHTO standards and typically does not apply to soft surface trails. However, improvements at the school with the sidewalks, trailhead and bridges would be eligible for this source of funding.

Other funding sources may be available; however, long-term maintenance funding will continue to be an issue for the City-wide parks system. The initial request for a hard-surface trail through the Alkali Creek area was an estimated $1.8 million to $2.2 million dollars (pg. 86 Heritage Trail Plan,
2004). By providing a soft-surface trail the costs have been reduced by about a third, and provide a context sensitive design appropriate for this park environment.

**APPROVED MASTER PLAN**

The recommended master plan alternative was presented to the Parks, Recreation and Cemeteries Board on June 8, 2005. About a dozen people spoke during the public comment period, with the majority of those people supporting the recommended plan. The Board recommended approval of the proposed master plan alternative with a trail through the park using hard or soft surface materials, depending on whether federal funding would make construction of a hard surface trail less expensive than a soft surface trail.

On July 11, 2005, the plan was brought before the Billings City Council for approval. Staff recommended three alternatives for consideration. Alternative one indicated to not develop the park at all except for a bridge across Alkali Creek between the school and the park, and continue to depend on the existing random footpath system in the park to provide access around and through the park.

Staff did not consider this a viable option because of the following:
- Impacts from the ever increasing amount of public use the park will result in deterioration of fragile features.
- The continued proliferation of random pathways with results in washouts and wind erosion on ridges and side-hills, and disturbance of wildlife.
- The level of use of the park by children attending Alkali Creek School results in a level of higher liability exposure to the City that a well planned trail located for safe movement in and through the park would relieve.
- The adverse impacts of such random uncontrolled use throughout the park area may not address accessibility issues that the City is required to mitigate in its parks.

Alternative two, presented by staff, indicated to keep Pow Wow Park as a natural resource park but with a good bridge access between the school and the park and allow construction of soft surface trail six feet in width (as recommended by the Heritage Trail Plan Design Standards for soft surface recreational trails) from the bridge providing a fully accessible segment of trail that will link to a recreational soft surface trail from Black Pine Lane to Judicial Lane.

This was the recommendation of the staff because:
- It preserves the natural resource designation of the park;
- It protects the park by concentrating the bulk of the park use on an appropriately sized, designed and located trail allowing good views of the park resources;
- It minimizes the wear and tear resulting from uncontrolled park use by the majority of those entering the park and working their way through it along the web of randomly located pathways now there;
- It protects wildlife and plants sensitive to disturbance by routing the majority of human activity onto a single appropriately located corridor through the park;
- It provides an acceptable level of access to all users regardless of their mobility;
- It provides for a high level of use by the School for educational activities and by students traveling to and from the school through the park.
- It provides a trail constructed to standards that provide safe travel for users, and meets the design constraints of the varied steepness of the terrain that is in the park.
Alternative three as presented indicated to keep Pow Wow Park as a natural resource park but with a good bridge access between the school and the park with a fully accessible hard-surface interpretive trail segment into the park from the bridge and a hard surface fully accessible trail ten feet in width through the park from Black Pine Lane to Judicial Lane.

Staff did not recommend this option for several reasons:

- The steep and rugged park terrain makes construction of such a trail very difficult and would result in extensive excavation and grading to accomplish.
- The overwhelming opinion expressed during the public input meetings was that the park should be kept in as natural a state as possible.
- The recreational nature of the uses that could be expected to predominate in the park are best served with a soft-surface, less formal trail construction that preserves the natural resource designation of the park.

The staff recommended plan was to maintain Pow Wow Park as a natural resource park but with a good bridge access between the school and the park. It allowed construction of a soft surface trail six feet in width (as recommended by the Heritage Trail Plan Design Standards for soft surface recreational trails) from the bridge providing a fully accessible segment of trail that will link to a recreational soft surface trail from Quiet Water Lane to Judicial Lane. The proposed Resolution adopting the recommended alternative could have been approved as presented, with the conditions as recommended by the Parks, Recreation, and Cemetery Board, and/or with other changes.

Thirty-five people spoke during the public hearing, with the majority of them supporting an option for the bridge crossing at the school, but no additional improvements within the interior of the park. The City Council voted to adopt Alternative one for the master plan for Pow Wow Park and the Alkali Creek Corridor.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This project consisted of conducting one focus group and three town hall meetings with area residents and general public. The focus group was conducted with city/county/government officials for the purpose of identifying professional perspectives on development of a park master plan for the Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor area. The focus group was held before the three town hall meetings.

The purpose of the first town hall meeting was to inform the public about the purpose and current status of the park master plan and of current development activities in the area, and to solicit public attitudes and opinions on a series of questions about usage, access, current perceptions and future of the Park area. Public responses were solicited in a group format.

The purpose of the second town hall meeting was to present key findings from the first town hall meeting and to solicit public attitudes and opinions on six preliminary master plan alternatives. Public responses were solicited in a group format.

The purpose of the third town hall meeting was to present key findings from the second town hall meeting and to solicit individual responses from participants to a recommended master plan alternative. Public comments were also recorded at this meeting.

In addition to the focus group and three town hall meetings, the public was able to provide comments via comments cards and/or on the project website.

Summary of Focus Group

The focus group participants provided general input on the development of a master plan from their unique perspectives (transportation, planning, city engineering, parks & recreation, Montana Dept. of Transportation, and City Council) and identified issues/concerns. General comments included: focus on a broader scale plan for a regional park; incorporate school needs/desires; preserve in natural state as much as possible; avoid overdeveloping with concrete; make ADA accessible; and incorporate bike trails that could be connectors to other trails. Issues included: flood plain, easements across private property, increased access, maintenance concerns, fire and safety concerns, wildlife issues, hard vs. soft trails, development vs. leaving natural, ensuring an open public process; using a facilitator; and conflicting user groups (e.g., adjacent property owners vs. community residents who want greater access).

Summary of First Town Hall Meeting

A total of 87 individuals signed in at the first town hall meeting on March 29, 2005. Public responses were collected in a small group format. From a show of hands, participants identified themselves as primarily adjacent property owners or residents living in the Alkali Creek area and in the Heights. There were some individuals from the greater Billings community and some representing specific groups, such as Bike Net. The following key findings emerged from the group work at the first town hall meeting.

Usage: The majority of participants indicated they use the Park area on a daily, weekly or random basis, primarily for walking/running/jogging/hiking, nature walks and watching wildlife and would like the Park area left as natural as possible with limited improvements made.

Access: Access was a concern for most participants. The majority would like to see a stable, permanent pedestrian bridge connecting Alkali Creek School with the Park. There were a number of comments about
making the park more accessible and connected to other areas but at the same time preserving its natural feel. ADA accessibility was mentioned numerous times.

**Trails:** The overall majority of participants favored only soft trails and many spoke against any concrete or hard surface trails. Comments ranged from widening trails to accommodate two people to concerns about duplication of trails with a multi-purpose trail along the roadway and to requests that a trail in the park be connected to other trails.

**Amenities/Park Development/Maintenance:** There were mixed comments about Park development with some wanting limited development to include garbage cans at access points, benches, bike racks, rest room facilities, and picnic tables and others wanting no development. The common denominator was to keep the natural setting of the Park. Comments were split between those who preferred to continue “self-policing” the area and those who would like an improved level of maintenance from the city.

**Current Perceptions:** Most comments favored maintaining the stability and aesthetics of the Rims. Most responses indicated concern about the lack of access for fire suppression and some concern about increased usage leading to greater fire danger. Concerns about flooding were expressed. The majority considered wildlife a benefit and to let individual homeowners manage situations of wildlife “nuisance.” The majority indicated concern that increased development and usage could lead to increased crime.

**Suggestions for Development of a Master Plan:** There was a clear preference to keep the Park in a natural state and to build a foot bridge by the school. Most comments expressed concern about adding any trails and indicated preference for only soft trails. There were concerns expressed about duplication of trails and some comments about improving access to public land and making sure trails are connected to the greater community.

**Summary of Second Town Hall Meeting**

A total of 104 individuals signed in at the second town hall meeting on April 27, 2005. From a show of hands, participants identified themselves as primarily adjacent property owners or residents living in the Alkali Creek area and in the Heights. There were some individuals from the greater Billings community and some representing specific groups, such as Bike Net and organizations for the disabled. Public responses to a choice of 6 possible alternatives and questions about access for dogs and need for park signage were collected in a small group format. The following key findings emerged from the group work at the second town hall meeting. Only one alternative was preferred by the majority of participants--#3 School Access Area #1.

**#1 Judicial Avenue Overlook:** The majority of responses were not in favor of this alternative for the following reasons: cost vs. utilization, parking concerns, traffic hazard (street too narrow), safety, litter, impact on neighbors, not a good location, and alternative too elaborate, unnecessary and not appropriate.

**#2 Judicial Avenue Connector:** There were more responses indicating that participants were not in favor of this alternative for the following reasons: to avoid infringement on wildlife habitat and vegetation, parking issues, possible damage during construction, impact on neighborhood homes and safety concerns. Some responses favored this alternative because it would improve the current trail and access. There were various and conflicting comments about trails: need to be ADA compatible vs. the difficulty of making them ADA accessible; should be only 5’ wide; are too close to private property; soft trails vs. hard trails; and trail maintenance concerns.

**#3 School Access Area #1:** Participants clearly favored this alternative because of the good parking, easy access, and joint use with the school. There were conflicting comments regarding the scope of amenities to accompany this option—from no trails or soft trails to ADA compatible trails, from benches and trash collection to limited or no amenities. Most were in favor of a bridge.

**#4 School Access Area #2:** The majority of responses did not favor this alternative because of lack of parking, being too close to private property, and being less preferable for handicapped.

**#5 East Connector from School Access Area to Quiet Water Avenue:** The majority of responses did not favor this alternative for the following reasons: preference that area remains natural and habitat is not impacted; a difficult slope; too close to private property; and limited parking available at Quiet Water. Concerns were expressed about maintaining two trails and ADA requirements.

**#6 Far East Connector from Quiet Water Avenue to the BBWA Canal:** The majority of responses were not in favor of this alternative because participants prefer to keep the area natural, it’s too close to private property, and it’s dangerous around the Big Ditch. There were a range of responses pointing out that the negotiated trail
agreement with Morningside Subdivision must be honored but that more study needs to occur about how this trail will be built onto in the future.

**Dogs:** All tables responded favorably to allowing dogs in the park. There were split comments about whether they be leashed or not, and additional comments that owners clean up after them.

**Signs:** Most tables responded favorably to having signs, particularly narrow signs that indicate private property and park boundaries.

**Summary of Third Town Hall Meeting**

A total of 49 individuals signed in at the third town hall meeting on May 26, 2005. From a show of hands, participants identified themselves as primarily adjacent property owners or residents living in the Alkali Creek area. There were some individuals from the greater Heights area. No one identified themselves as representing a particular group. Individual responses were solicited to three questions about the recommended alternative. There were also public comments recorded during the meeting. The following key findings emerged from the third town hall meeting:

**Question #1: Positives about the Recommended Alternative:** The key positive theme evident in the individual responses was increased park access, especially bridge access at the school. While the majority of comments favored bridge access at the school, a number of participants stipulated only the bridge access and that they were not interested in the other trail components of the recommended alternative. Comments about trail development were mixed: no hard trails vs. wish the trails were hard. There were a number of comments indicating displeasure or non-acceptance of the recommended alternative and the public process.

**Question #2: Challenges Concerning the Recommended Alternative:** There were numerous comments expressing displeasure or non-acceptance of the recommended alternative based on unwanted trail development components and wanting to leave the park natural. Many of these comments also criticized the public input process as not considering their input at all, not listening to residents and not offering a “leave as is” option. There were also a number of comments in favor of the recommended alternative but acknowledging the challenge of getting the recommended alternative accepted and implemented by adjacent park homeowners and area residents. Some respondents indicated specific areas of concern: funding, maintenance and associated costs, reclamation of construction damage, problems with trash, kids partying in the park, increased traffic on narrow streets (Judicial, Quiet Water), safety, impact on wildlife, impact to adjacent property owners, grade elevations, keeping the park in its natural state, and too much visibility and upkeep.

**Question #3: Comments/Suggestions for the City in Moving the Project Forward:** Participant comments and suggestions ranged from some embracing the recommended alternative to many criticisms of the alternative and the public process. Those in favor identified it as a good or great plan, a reasonable direction and urged the city to move forward with the plan. They expressed concern that the majority of Billings residents were not represented at the meeting and that the park is a city park, not a park only for adjacent property owners. Ensuring greater access for Heights and Billings residents was urged. Those opposed were in favor of a bridge only alternative with little to no additional trail development and strongly urged city officials to leave the park natural and to listen to their comments. There were some specific suggestions made including: need to have the bridge but do not need 6’ hard trails by Judicial Avenue; do not duplicate trails; put the proposed project cost of $650,000 towards a pool in the Heights; do not implement a trail off Black Pine until Airport Hill project is decided; concentrate on extending the trail along Alkali Creek Road east out of the valley to connect with other city trails; because of the possibility of decreased property values created by adjacent trails, property owners should have weighted consideration; and seek an easement from the school for a trail on the school side of the creek to connect to the bike trail along Alkali Creek Road that can wind behind the school and playground and reconnect on the paved dirt road (Indian Trail) and then to Alkali Creek Road.

**Public Comments:**

Public comments ranged from criticism of the recommended alternative and public process to some acceptance of the alternative to suggestions for continued involvement in a public process. There were many comments expressing displeasure and non-acceptance of the alternative and the public process including: not understanding why the consultant didn’t represent what the majority wanted—to leave the park natural with little to no trail development; not understanding the reason for all the public meetings when the majority said they want the park natural; and the consultant not having the data to leap from the public wanting a bridge to wanting trails in the
park. Some participants spoke in favor of the recommended alternative, even as a compromise, and felt that not all the public was represented at the Town Hall meeting and that a small minority were being heard over the majority. A number of comments were put forth to encourage those critical of the public process and recommended alternative to continue to stay involved by contacting city council members and being prepared to present at the city council meeting.

Summary of Web Comments

Web comments were collected from March 1 to May 31, 2005. These comments were collected in two groupings: web comments with names (98 recorded) and anonymous web comments (43 recorded). The web comments with names included some multiple entries by single individuals with the result that the comments do not represent the views of 98 different people. With the 43 anonymous comments, there is no way to identify how many individuals sent them.

In both groupings, respondents self-identified in one of a number of affiliations: resident in the Alkali Creek area; resident of the Heights not living in the Alkali Creek area; resident of Billings not living in the Heights; special interest representative; living outside the Billings area; former resident; and visitor. There is also a category called “not identified” for individuals who did not include their affiliation with their entry.

Web Comments with Names
Most comments were identified with the affiliation of resident of the Alkali Creek area (45), followed by resident of Billings not living in the Heights (21) and then resident of Heights not living in Alkali Creek area (16). A number of themes were identified In terms of frequency of mention. The most common ones included:
- in favor of adding trails to the park, whether soft or hard (26)
- in favor of improved park access including the addition of trails (22)
- in favor of leaving the park natural with no hard trails (21)
- in favor of adding hard trails in the park (15)
- in favor of bridge access only with no trails added to the park (14)
- advocating trails that will connect to other trail systems/neighborhoods in the city (12)
- in favor of adding ADA access (7)

Anonymous Web Comments
Most comments were identified with the affiliation of resident of the Alkali Creek area (18), followed by resident of Billings not living in the Heights (16) and then resident of Heights not living in Alkali Creek area (5). A number of themes were identified In terms of frequency of mention. The most common ones included:
- in favor of leaving the park natural/no development/no concrete (28)
- in favor of improved access for everyone (6)
- in favor of adding hard trails (4)

Common Themes

There were themes that ran across all of the public input, from the focus group and town hall meetings to the website comments. In most cases, public viewpoints were mixed or conflicting regarding the specifics of each theme and reflected the differences among the user groups.

Leave the park natural: All public input recognized the unique natural environment of the park area and recommended its preservation. Viewpoints were split in terms of what level of development would ensure a natural environment and how a natural setting should be defined. These ranged from a “leave as is” perspective to one of limited development that included primarily “soft” trails.

Park access: Almost all public input recognized the need for some improved access. Viewpoints were split in terms of how extensive that access should be. These ranged from adding only a safe, pedestrian bridge at Alkali Creek School to adding a bridge and some trail development. Concerns were expressed that access needed to
be increased for all users vs. concerns that increased access would lead to increased crime and safety issues. Concerns were expressed about access to deal with fire and flooding issues.

**Trail development:** Public input was split in terms of trail development in the park. Some users wanted little to no trail development whereas others advocated for limited to extensive trail development. There were wishes for a trail system that could connect the park area with other trails and other city neighborhoods and advocates for keeping the park “as is.” In terms of trail surface, there were more advocates for “soft” trail development than “hard” trail development. Trail surface discussion was often linked to maintenance concerns, specifically that soft trails are harder to maintain while hard trails in the long term are easier to maintain. A common theme across all viewpoints in the discussion of trail development was the desire to impact the park area and wildlife as little as possible. Viewpoints on ADA accessibility were mixed. Concerns were expressed about duplication of trails and viewpoints were split in terms of those in favor of duplicating trails in the park with a trail along Alkali Creek Road and those against duplication.

**Park amenities:** Almost all public input favored limited amenities. There was most mention of adding trash receptacles and signage.
INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the findings of a public involvement process consisting of one focus group, three town hall meetings, and public web comments. The project was undertaken for Peaks to Plains Design for the City of Billings. The purpose of the project was to determine attitudes of various stakeholders (adjacent property owners, Heights residents, greater Billings’ residents, special interest groups, community organizations, etc.) toward the development of a park master plan for the Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor area. The timeline of public involvement events was:

Focus group with city/county/government officials 2/24/05
Town Hall I meeting 3/29/05
Town Hall II meeting 4/27/05
Town Hall III meeting 5/26/05

The original plan for the public involvement process included a second focus group meeting and two town hall meetings. The second focus group meeting was going to be with adjacent property owners to solicit the input of this key stakeholder group on a series of questions about the park. In response to neighborhood concerns that the focus group would not be open to the public, the second focus group was replaced with a Town Hall meeting open to all Billings residents, who were invited to respond to the same series of questions.

FOCUS GROUP

The focus group was conducted on February 24, 2005 for the purpose of identifying professional perspectives on development of a park master plan for the Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor area. The focus group participants provided general input on the development of a master plan from their unique perspectives (transportation, planning, city engineering, parks & recreation, Montana Dept. of Transportation, and City Council) and identified issues/concerns.

Focus Group Summary

Professional Perspectives

- Have it be a broader scale plan--more a regional park than a community park. If a trail is part of the park plan, people will want access.
- How will park needs be served? What about lots in the area? Is there interest in finding more space for school use? There are a few undeveloped lots south of the school. There are a number of lots owned by the school district and some have been built on.
- Park would need to be ADA accessible. Eagle Mount folks with their bike program.
- Should be preserved in its natural state as much as possible. Should be kept as natural as possible. Don't put buildings.
- Trails: question of connector trails - ways to access besides by automobile. Need loops, more natural looking and not overdevelop with concrete or asphalt surfaces. Have a spine along the roadway. Trail more appropriate along stream, etc. Users like a trail in a more natural area. A river or creek that can be accessed is a draw. Does the trail have to be hard surfaced? Has to be accessible. Morningside agreement signed as part of annexation - dedicated to Heritage trail but location not determined.
- There will be a separated bike path south of school starting at Indian Trail, paralleling the road. Problem is going east, past Black Pine with 8-10 foot path, along the road due to the narrow “S” curves. Reason to stop at Black Pine because width is narrow. There is a plan to widen the sidewalk - a potential corridor - into Aronson Ave right of way - BBWA Canal border - right of way continues and bisects at Swords Park -
provides opportunity to make trail connections. Separating at Black Pine allows connections to Swords - -
airport - - area north of road - - east of canal all the way to Swords.

- **Funding:** Available funding for bike trails could come through CTEP and the City could compete for it against
  the County and other entities. There was a direct appropriation of $500,000 from TCSP (congressional
  funding) to develop a trail to connect with Metra Trail. Some of it has been used on planning. Road
  improvements project funded by the City bond measure passed by voters.

- **City flood plain:** there is the flood way and flood fringe (further from center). Fringe is easier to deal with;
  anything with the flood plain starts requiring permits. Best to stay away from flood way. There is a permitting
  agent with the City. Get on FEMA website. If a plan comes through for a trail will probably need crossings -
  culverts. Can't raise the base flood elevation by more than half a foot. If trail would be above flood elevation,
  there's a need for permits. Bridge needs to go up high enough to span flood plain. Have seen stretches of trail
  right alongside - water just flows over.

- **There's a fisheries value. Need permit from Fish, Wildlife & Parks.**

### Identification of Issues

- **Floodling:** Concern that Main Street is a spillway. There can be serious flooding, e.g. back in 1998. Is there
  obtainable information on 10-20 year storm drainage so we can get closer to expectations? Who tracks it?
  What is the frequency of flooding? Not good to have trees on flood ways. Removal of some trees would help.
  Who is liable for blockage? There are 14 houses in the floodplain, along Teepee Trail. Don't know whether
  houses in flood plain have insurance. Flood plain area is good for recreation use because nothing else can be
  done with it. Not sure. Problem with trail being flooded over a period of time if adjacent to the creek. So
  portions of trail are underwater at times - consideration for hard surface vs. soft surface. People are not
  happy if trail can't be used. Would help to know where the flood way is and maybe try to avoid trails in the
  floodway.

- **Trails:** There is local opposition to any trails without natural materials and surface and that don't follow natural
  terrain. There is a difficulty with easements across private property. Some people adjacent don't want
  anything built; some have extended yards into the park. Another concern is that some vocal people have
  intimidated others who want a trail. There are a lot of people who use the park.

- **Trail surfaces:** On the issue of hard surface vs. soft, it is possible to dye concrete to match the environment. It
  would be an option to blend in for a more natural look. What about an adjacent footpath? Maybe do both a
  hard and soft surface trail? MDT did a trail and put chip seal on top of it. Some surfaces (aggregate) cause
  loss of function for small-wheeled scooters, skate boards, and roller blades. You can lose a user group with a
  different surface and then the trail is less multi-purpose. Asphalt does eventually bleach out. Visual part of
  surface type is a concern but construction of surfaces is also a concern. Construction of a hard surface trail
  can impact on cliffs. There is also work with regard to grading.

- **Access:** Very difficult access right now. When we get calls at the Parks Dept. we go out with heavy equipment
  and we have to be able to get in, e.g., calls about beaver dams, limbs down, moving junk out. Most
  maintenance calls are for clean-up. The creek has old tires, trees, refrigerators, beaver problems. There's an
  issue of emergency access – debris, fire problems. Limiting factor now is parking—no access. Sometimes it's
  necessary to park on residential streets. Access overall is an issue.

- **Animal/wildlife issues:** There are conflicting feelings on beavers depending on proximity of residents to them.
  Are they an issue for emergency services? Do they have to be physically removed? There is a concern of
  blockage and flooding.

- **Maintenance:** What will be done about future maintenance that needs to be stated to the public? What are
  park directors required to do? There's a big difference between maintenance of a developed park vs. a
  natural park. Difference in liability. The more developed the trails, the more liability has to be assumed.

- **Funding:** Prices could be raised because of different access to lay the trail. Terrain issue in Swords Park
  raised bid cost by 25% - this case could be more extreme. If the end result of the master plan is not a hard
  surface trail, does the money go away?

- **Fire:** fire concern is a management issue. Surface type affects accessibility for fire management. Depending
  on area - either soft or hard surfaces can be advantageous.

- **Strategies to keep an open process:** Trying to strategize so it doesn't become a property war. Want to show
  this is an open process. Some of past problems had to do with no facilitator at meetings. Meetings need a
  facilitator so everyone feels comfortable speaking out and that will help reduce intimidation. Questions for
  town hall meeting are good.
TOWN HALL MEETING I

Meeting Agenda: March 29, 2005

Purpose: To incorporate public comments and suggestions on the development of a Park Master Plan project for Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor.

Outcomes
- Inform the public about the purpose and current status of the Park Master Plan project.
- Inform the public of current development activities occurring in and around the Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor.
- Solicit the attitudes and opinions of participants on a series of questions about usage, access, current perceptions and future of the Park area.
- Identify next steps of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Check in: open seating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|           | Welcome/Introduction
|           | Purpose, outcomes, agenda, meeting guidelines                             |
|           | Ask for a show of hands of the groups present: Heights residents, adjacent property owners, greater Billings community members, community groups/service clubs, other agencies, and special interest groups? |
|           | Purpose and current status of master plan project                        |
|           | Current development activities in the area                                |
|           | Master plan policy                                                       |
|           | Questions                                                                 |
|           | Presentation of master plan design process                               |
|           | Preliminary plan basis & Issues raised                                    |
|           | Questions                                                                 |
|           | Soliciting resident/community input                                      |
|           | Present public input process/group roles                                 |
|           | Present questions regarding usage, access, current perceptions, future, general questions. |
|           | Next Steps of the Study:                                                 |
|           | Written feedback: activities sheet, comment cards, evaluation form        |
|           | Town Hall meeting schedule/Final thoughts                                |
| 9:00 p.m. | Public comment period/Clost                                             |

Table Questions

Usage of Park Area
- How often do you use Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor?
  Indicate one: daily weekly monthly randomly never
- For what purpose?

Future of Park Area
- What is your vision for the Park corridor? What do you like best about it that you want to make sure continues into the future?
- What changes/improvements would you like to see in the Park corridor?

Current Perceptions of the Park Area
• What do you currently enjoy about living near/using the Alkali Creek Corridor?
• What concerns do you have about the Park in terms of:
  • Maintaining stability/aesthetics of Rims
  • Potential for fire and for flooding of Alkali Creek and their impact on adjacent property owners
  • Wildlife as nuisance vs. benefit
  • Crime increase vs. decrease with Park development
  • Level of Park development moving toward a more natural setting vs. building more amenities
  • More opportunities for public access to the park

Access in Park Area
• How often do you currently use trails in the Park area?
  Indicate one: daily weekly monthly randomly never
• For what purpose?
• What do you think about current access to the Park area?

General Questions
• How well do you think the Park area is being maintained? What, if any, improvements would you suggest?
• Any suggestions for the Parks Department as it guides the development of a master plan for Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor?

Key Findings

Usage:
• The majority of participants indicated they use the Park area on a daily, weekly or random basis, primarily for walking/running/jogging/hiking, nature walks and watching wildlife.
• Most participants would like the Park area left as natural as possible with limited improvements made.

Access:
• The majority of participants would like to see a stable, permanent pedestrian bridge connecting Alkali Creek School with the Park. A number of comments were made about easy parking available at that access point.
• The other areas mentioned for access were at each end of the Park.
• There were a number of comments about making the Park more accessible and connected to other areas but at the same time preserving its natural feel.
• ADA accessibility was mentioned numerous times.
• Some concerns were expressed about trespassing on private property.
• There were some comments that access is difficult and limited.

Trails:
• The overall majority of participants favored only soft trails and many spoke against any concrete or hard surface trails.
• Suggestions were made that the soft trails be available for walking and biking and be wide enough to allow two people abreast.
• There were concerns expressed about duplication of trails with a trail along the roadway. There were requests that a multi-purpose trail be near the road and away from the Park, back yards and creek.
• There were requests that a trail in the Park area be connected to other trails.

Amenities/Park Development/Maintenance:
• There were mixed comments about the idea of adding amenities or doing Park development. Some want limited development to include garbage cans at access points, benches, bike racks, rest room facilities, and picnic tables. Others want no development. The common denominator in both cases was to keep the natural setting of the Park.
• Comments were split between those who prefer that neighbors and residents continue to “self-police” the area as a natural park and those who would like an improved level of maintenance in terms of cleaning up garbage, noxious weeds, debris and downed trees.

Current Perceptions:
• Most comments favored maintaining the stability and aesthetics of the Rims.
• Most responses indicated concern about the lack of access for fire suppression and that increased usage increases fire danger.
• Concerns about flooding were expressed.
• The majority of participants consider wildlife to be a benefit. In cases where wildlife is a nuisance, individual homeowners can manage it.
• The majority of participants expressed concern that increased development and usage could lead to increased crime.

Suggestions for Development of a Master Plan:
• Most comments centered on concerns about trails and the desire to retain only soft trails.
• There were concerns expressed about duplication of trails.
• There were comments about improving access to public land and making sure trails are connected to the greater community.
• It was clearly expressed that the Park be kept in a natural state and that a foot bridge be built by the school.

Summary of Additional Questions/Comments
• How much of the grant money (TSCP) has been spent?
• Was land purchased or traded?
• The Heights NTF meeting is on April 26th. Please reschedule second town hall meeting.
• Please locate the legal papers regarding leaving the park in a natural state. Contact: Kim Gillan.
• Who asked for $500K federal appropriations?
• Is Pow Wow Park a neighborhood or community park?
• Road bond & final project boundaries? Why the difference?
• If we vote to keep as is—they’ll be no master plan. False: misunderstanding.
• The residents of Billings voted on a road bond, which included the reconstruction of Alkali Creek Road. Now we have found out that the project ends at Black Pine Street, shorter than what was promised to the voters. Why is this happening and who is accounting for the extra bond money to be contributed to the reconstruction of the “S” curves at Alkali Creek Road?
• No improvements to the park trail. Because money is there doesn’t mean we have to use it. Fear of vandalism.
• Need access to area with safe bridge at school site for the students to cross. We take our students to the park several times a year for nature study. The natural environment is very important for our students to experience.
• Venue should stay at Alkali.
• Do not have the bike net trail in the park but rather support the trail along Alkali Creek Road. There is no need for 2 trails so close together. The federal money should be used to connect the trail along Alkali Creek to the rest of the network to the east to allow an exit route from the valley.
• A concrete path would destroy natural environment for wildlife such as birds, deer and beaver to make a bike trail. If they make a bike path it should be dirt and at least be smaller, around 3 ft.

Please see Appendix A for a Summary of Tables Responses, a Collation of Table Responses and a Summary of Evaluations from Town Hall I meeting. One of the questions on the evaluation sheet asked participants for suggestions for the next town hall meeting. Because the majority of comments requested that the next meeting be held in the Heights area, specifically Alkali Creek School, the venue was changed from a downtown location to Alkali Creek School.
TOWN HALL MEETING II

Meeting Agenda: April 27, 2005

**Purpose:** To incorporate public comments and suggestions on the preliminary master plan alternatives being presented as part of the community involvement process for the development of a Park Master Plan project for Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor.

**Outcomes**
- Inform the public about the purpose and current status of the Park Master Plan project.
- Update the public on any current development activities occurring in and around the Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor.
- Present key findings from Town Hall I meeting.
- Present preliminary master plan alternatives for addressing Park neighborhood, community, technical, regulatory, fiscal, cultural, wildlife and maintenance desires and issues.
- Solicit the attitudes and opinions of participants to the alternatives presented.
- Identify next steps of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Check in: open seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Welcome/Introductions&lt;br&gt;Purpose, outcomes, agenda, meeting guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ask for a show of hands of the groups present: Heights residents, adjacent property owners, greater Billings community members, community groups/service clubs, other agencies, special interest groups&lt;br&gt;- Summary of Town Hall I meeting evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Purpose and current status of master plan project&lt;br&gt;Updates on any current development activities in the area&lt;br&gt;Response to questions recorded at Town Hall I meeting/Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Presentation of key findings of public comments from Town Hall I meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Update on master plan design process&lt;br&gt;Presentation of 6 preliminary alternatives/Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soliciting resident/community input&lt;br&gt;At tables, participants discuss the following questions, recording their responses directly onto flipchart sheets.&lt;br&gt;- What are our reactions to the alternatives presented? What don’t we understand?&lt;br&gt;- What would we add, delete or change?&lt;br&gt;- What alternative(s) or combination of alternatives would we support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Next Steps of the Study:&lt;br&gt;- Written feedback: comment cards, evaluation form&lt;br&gt;- Town Hall meeting schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Public comment period/Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Findings of Responses to Six Preliminary Alternatives**

**#1 Judicial Avenue Overlook**

*Not in Favor:* The majority of responses were not in favor of the Judicial Avenue Overlook and the following reasons were given: cost vs. utilization, parking concerns, traffic hazard (street too narrow), safety, litter, impact
on neighbors, not a good location, and alternative too elaborate, unnecessary and not appropriate. There was one comment mentioned in favor of this alternative. Most responses did not favor any access changes at Judicial.

**#2 Judicial Avenue Connector**

*In Favor:* There were some responses favoring this alternative including comments that it would improve the current trail and access. They included comments to narrow the trail and to make portions of it a hard surface.

*Not in Favor:* Most responses indicated that participants were not in favor of this alternative. They included comments to leave things as they are in order to avoid infringement on wildlife, keep out of vegetation and for safety reasons.

*Comments/Concerns/Questions:* Responses ranged from concerns about disturbing the habitat to parking issues, possible damage during construction and impact on neighborhood homes. There were various and conflicting comments about the trails: they need to be ADA compatible, it’s difficult to make them ADA accessible, they should be only 5’ width, they are too close to private property, soft trails should be supported, hard trails should be supported especially near the school; how will they be maintained; and people will adopt trails and clean them up.

**#3 School Access Area #1**

*In Favor:* Most of the responses showed participants favoring this alternative because of the good parking, easy access, and joint use with the school. There were a range of conflicting comments regarding the scope of amenities to accompany this option—from no trails or soft trails to ADA compatible trails, from benches and trash collection to limited or no amenities. Most were in favor of a bridge.

*Not in Favor:* There was only one comment not in favor of this alternative.

**#4 School Access Area #2**

*In Favor:* Some responses were in favor of this school access option in that parking would be separate from the school and less disruptive.

*Not in Favor:* The majority of responses did not favor this alternative because of lack of parking, being too close to private property and being less preferable for handicapped.

**#5 East Connector From School Access Area to Quiet Water Avenue**

*In Favor:* There were some responses in favor of this alternative because it follows the contour of existing trails, splits the trails and provides a connection to Heritage Trail goals.

*Not in Favor:* The majority of responses did not favor this alternative. They preferred that no improvements be made so the area remains natural and habitat is not impacted. It was also considered a difficult slope, too close to private property and offered limited parking available at Quiet Water. Concerns were expressed about maintaining two trails and ADA requirements. Suggestions were made that funds could be better used elsewhere such as for the trail along the highway.

*Comments:* It was pointed out that it is important for Quiet Water children and others to have safe access into/through the park. In contrast, another suggestion was to avoid Quiet Water and route along the creek.

**#6 Far East Connector From Quiet Water Avenue to the BBWA Canal**

*In Favor:* There was some response in favor of this alternative, especially using it to connect to other trails.

*Not in Favor:* The majority of responses were not in favor of this alternative because participants prefer to keep the area natural, it’s too close to private property, and it’s dangerous around the Big Ditch.

*Comments:* There were a range of responses pointing out that the negotiated trail agreement with Morningside Subdivision must be honored but that more study needs to occur about how this trail will be built onto in the future.

**Dogs**

*In Favor:* All tables responded favorably to allowing dogs in the park. There were split comments about whether they be leashed or not, and additional comments that owners clean up after them.

**Signs**

*In Favor:* Most tables responded favorably to having signs, particularly narrow signs that indicate private property and park boundaries.
Not in Favor: One table was not in favor of having any type of signs.

Reactions/Questions/General Comments

- Another alternative was suggested: that the City donate property to a non-profit wildlife protection organization to be left natural permanently and a later public decision on who the organization is.
- There were a number of table comments to leave the park natural, as it is now, or to have only soft trails and to include a bridge for pedestrians to cross only at the school.
- Other table comments preferred no trails, no motorized vehicles, leaving the trails natural and to preserve the area as a natural conservatory with very little disturbance.
- There were some comments about whether hard or soft trails would require less maintenance over time and which surface would be the least expensive to maintain. Comments were made in favor of colored concrete that would blend in, would allow for bikes and ADA and which may be lower impact in the long term.

Summary of Additional Questions/Comments

- Fish & Wildlife contacted regarding wildlife along the creek? Does Fish & Game have restrictions on a bridge crossing creek? Boy Scout Project. Bridge elevation in question.
- Why do we have to do anything to the Park – except clean it up and build a few bridges? Leave Park the way it is as an alternative.
- Check resolution on Alkali Creek property as nature reserve.
- Why can’t the City of Billings designate as a wildlife preserve or sanctuary that is left natural except at access points? How can we permanently designate it wildlife sanctuary? Can the City donate the property of Pow Wow Park to an organization (non-profit) that would be allowed to keep the area natural as a wildlife sanctuary?
- What are the additional designations we can consider BESIDES community and regional park?
- Concerned about limitations of designation options for area (i.e., neighborhood, community, regional) park. Can’t we designate outside the box to put focus on wildlife designations?
- Where is funding coming from?
- Are the park hours – opening 6:00 a.m. – closing 10:00 p.m. to remain the same? Will they be enforced?
- Shouldn’t the city undertake an archaeological and historical survey of the entire project corridor before designs are carried further? If federal money is used for trail construction then cultural resources need consideration. If significant historic/archaeological sites are discovered in the park and/or project corridor then the options for the city are avoiding the sites or mitigating the sites. Considering the cost of archaeological mitigation it seems likely that avoidance would be the only option so site survey should precede final design plans. The options presented on 4/27/05 could be “out the window” if significant historic/archaeological sites are discovered.
- Will we have a final say about – if any improvements are made? Whose idea was this park improvement?
- Is there a workable compromise?

Please see Appendix B for a Collation of Table Responses and Summary of Evaluations from Town Hall II meeting.

TOWN HALL MEETING III

Meeting Agenda: May 26, 2005

Purpose: To incorporate public input on a recommended master plan alternative being presented as part of the community involvement process for the development of a Park Master Plan project for Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor.
Outcomes

- Update the public on any current development activities occurring in and around the Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor.
- Present key findings from Town Hall II meeting.
- Present recommended master plan alternative and solicit public response.
- Identify next steps of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Check in: open seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome/Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose, outcomes, agenda, meeting guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ask for a show of hands of the groups present: Heights residents,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjacent property owners, greater Billings community members,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community groups/service clubs, other agencies, special interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of Town Hall II meeting evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus model (commitment vs. agreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purposes and current status of master plan project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Updates on any current development activities in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Response to questions recorded at Town Hall II meeting/Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of key findings of public comments from Town Hall II meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Visual of perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation of factors supporting recommended alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presentation of recommended alternative, common themes supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the alternative, drawbacks, cost analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants complete questions on feedback handout individually:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the positives about the recommended alternative selected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the challenges concerning the recommended alternative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What comments/suggestions do we have for the city in moving this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project forward?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Steps of the Study/Public Comment Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Findings from Individual Participant Responses

Key findings are identified for each of the three questions to which participants were asked to respond individually. The three questions were: What are the positives about the recommended alternative selected? What are the challenges concerning the recommended alternative? What comments or suggestions do we have for the City in moving this project forward? Individual responses were first collated under each question and then key findings identified from the collated responses. There were also public comments recorded during the Town Hall III meeting. Key themes are also indicated from those comments.

Question #1: Positives about the Recommended Alternative

The key positive findings ranged from bridge access at the school and favoring of the compromise alternative to displeasure/non-acceptance of the alternative and the public process.

Key Positive: Bridge Access

The key theme evident in the individual responses about what was positive was increased park access, especially bridge access at the school. While the majority of comments favored bridge access at the school, a number of them stipulated only the bridge access and were not interested in the other trail components of the recommended alternative. Some representative comments include:

- The bridge is very, very positive
• Bridge option #1 at the school is excellent.
• Bridge at school only. Leave the rest as is.
• The bridge at the school—other than that there are no positives.

Compromise Alternative Favored
There were a number of responses in favor of the “compromise” that the recommended alternative presented. Here is a sampling:
• We need a park here. 5% impact is nothing.
• This strikes me as a reasonable compromise between two very wide opinions.
• I would still prefer the Park be left as natural. However, I believe the proposed plan is a valid compromise.
• It is a compromise. Do the bridge at the school but leave the rest natural.

Mixed Responses about Trail Development
Comments about the trail development components of the recommended alternative were mixed. Some representative comments include:
• No hard trails.
• Removing the upper trail on the Quiet Water end was a smart move. No hard trails.
• We didn’t want trails to begin with. By voting for bridge at school, I didn’t vote for trail development.
• The trail will reduce impact to the rest of the park.
• I like the plan but wish it was a hard surface.
• Soft trail 6’ wide seems large but I understand coupling with the Heritage trail plan.

Displeasure/Non-Acceptance
There were a number of comments indicating displeasure or non-acceptance of the recommended alternative and the public process. Some of these are:
• I still do not want any changes done to the park. I do not like things already decided—ask public opinion and yet do what they want.
• There are none [positives]. Leave it natural is not appearing as an option.
• I find this meeting frustrating. You are not listening. We don’t want alternatives—just leave the park as a natural preserve.
• If you can’t build the bridge without destroying everything else then don’t build it.
• Leave the park alone. No improvements.
• No positives.

Question #2: Challenges Concerning the Recommended Alternative
The comments regarding challenges ranged from non-acceptance of the recommended alternative to the difficulties inherent in getting the alternative accepted and implemented and some specific concerns.

Displeasure/Non-Acceptance
There were numerous comments expressing displeasure or non-acceptance of the recommended alternative based on unwanted trail development components and wanting to leave the park natural. Many of these comments also criticized the public input process. Some of these comments included:
• The citizens do not want the trail improved and do not want a 10’ wide super highway bridge into the park but you have already decided on the plan before asking us.
• The planners are not listening to the majority. We do not want trail improvement.
• Getting this whole process stopped and left natural…we aren’t being heard.
• I am outraged that the master plan is going to be presented with soft trails as a “compromise.” I think it does not represent the vast majority who want the park to be left natural.
• The majority of people still want to leave the park natural…the assumption that 99% of the people at meeting #2 wanted a bridge at the school meant that they wanted development is a gross error.
• Public support is not in favor of the proposed plan.
• The challenges are getting the city to listen to us and leave the park natural.
• We don’t want the park changed.
• They do not consider our input at all... what we have is unique and we don’t want to make it look like other places.
• You are not showing the “leave as is” as an option.

Difficulties in Getting Acceptance/Implementation
There were also a number of comments regarding the challenge of getting the recommended alternative accepted and implemented:
• Getting area residents on board this compromise proposal
• To instill the good of the public use of the park.
• Selling it to the adjacent park homeowners. Deciding to do what is best for all others who also want to use the park.
• Silencing the nimbys [not in my back yard]. ADA access. Wildlife living in PWP is compatible with human existence.
• We are just hearing from a number of adjacent property owners who don’t want a trail. Unfortunately, most residents aren’t as organized and vocal as those adjacent property owners. The adjacent property owners are not representing the community.
• Doesn’t meet everyone’s needs but no plan will--keep the plan as natural as possible.
• This should only go forward as a complete project – not done in stages – except I’d prefer you just build the bridge and stop. Piecemeal development will only engage a greater level of hostility to this plan and process.

Areas of Concern
Finally, some respondents indicated areas of concern:
• Funding. Cost of the project.
• Maintenance and associated costs. Who will do the maintenance of the park.
• Reclamation of construction damage.
• Problems with trash. Kids are partying in the park now. Who’s going to stop it now. The police cannot make it out. Increased traffic on narrow streets (Judicial, Quiet Water).
• Safety.
• Impact on wildlife.
• Impact to adjacent property owners.
• Grade elevations. Keeping the park in its natural state.
• Too much visibility and upkeep.
• Damage to the natural--not only during construction but permanently altering the natural hiking trails.

Question #3: Comments/Suggestions for the City in Moving the Project Forward
Participant comments and suggestions ranged from some embracing the recommended alternative to many criticisms of the alternative and the public process. There were some specific suggestions made.

In Favor of Recommended Alternative
There were a number of comments favoring the recommended alternative:
• I love it. Let's get moving.
• Good plan. Please move ahead.
• Great plan. Move ahead.
• Get it done. Kids and bikes need a place to go. Not all the people impacted are represented at the meetings... there are a lot of others like me who want this.
• The “majority” of Billing’s residents are not represented at this meeting. The meeting is hijacked by adjacent property owners.
• Be courageous. Represent everyone not just the few adjacent property owners who have had exclusive use of the 54 acres for 35 years. It’s time for others to be able to use it too.
• Good luck. Stay the course. Stand tall. Identify all adjacent and A/Creek corridor residents who will support so that nimby’s [not in my back yard] “alleged” majority does not control. Remember that PWP is
a city park, not a park only for the adjacent landowners. Remember that the area was compromised when area was subdivided and the first house was built.

- I think that the recommended plan is a reasonable direction for Pow Wow Park.
- At the 3rd meeting we basically heard from adjacent property owners who want their backyards left alone. Trails are an asset to a community. Heights and Billings residents should have access to this city park. Move forward with the plan.

**Criticism of Recommended Alternative/Public Process**

The majority of comments criticized the recommended alternative and the public input process and urged the City to leave the park natural and to listen to their comments. Some of these include:

- Stop—except for the bridge
- We do not want it to move forward. We asked for a bridge and that is all. Then anybody can get on the bridge and then decide how far they want to walk.
- Listen to the residents of the area involved.
- The city should drop this project and leave the park as it is. The majority at every meeting has said such.
- Stop, look and listen to us.
- Stop. Look. Listen. Leave the park as is—no improvements.
- Stop, look, listen to what the majority of us want—leave as is. Town hall meetings have been a waste because we aren’t being listened to.
- Listen to the people—they want to leave the park natural. Every time a bit of nature is chipped away and “improved” we are taking away a natural state.
- Seeking public comment was a “hoop” the city provided to attempt to satisfy the community members that live in Alkali Creek. The decision was made 2 years ago or longer and this process was not appreciated. The city should pay for our time that we spent especially when the question was asked the first night if this process was really going to be open to public comments that would be listened to.
- Why do we have these meetings when you do what you design not what we want.
- Most people I invited to come to the meeting said why—they have the plans done and marked on maps. You took away hope that we had a say about a park we care about and take care of.
- Through the town hall meeting process it was very evident that the majority of the attendees are not in favor of significant development of the park. That is not being represented by the proposal put forth by Peaks to Plains.
- We strongly urge the council to not adopt the proposed master plan for Pow Wow Park.
- Listen to the adjoining homeowners and the participants of the town hall meetings. Leave it as natural as possible.
- No one wants it. How hard is that to understand. Spend the money somewhere else.
- Do not proceed with this idea.

**Suggestions for Consideration**

There were a few specific suggestions related to the recommended alternative:

- They need to have the bridge but do not need 6’ hard trails by Judicial Avenue. It would be impossible to make the trail, in the first place.
- Keep in mind that another trail is being built along Alkali Creek. Let’s not waste more taxpayers’ monies. Private property owners will take a big impact in this project. Don’t forget them.
- Let’s put the $650,000 towards a pool in the Heights instead.
- Do not implement trail off Black Pine. It goes no where. Wait until Airport Hill project is decided.
- Either leave the park totally natural or build only the bridge. There is a bike path along Alkali Creek Road. This is a huge waste of tax $$$. Designate Pow Wow Park a natural park without changing the trails.
- Build a bridge—concentrate on extending the trail along Alkali Creek Road east out of the valley to connect with the other trails to the city.
- Studies are available that document decreased property values created by adjacent trails for example. Therefore these property owners should have a weighted consideration.
- Seek an easement from the school to put a trail on the school side of the creek. It can connect to the bike trail along the Road (Alkali Creek Road) but can wind behind the school and playground and reconnect on the paved dirt road (Indian Trail) and then to Alkali Creek Road.
Public Comments
Public comments were recorded during the third Town Hall Meeting. Most but not all comments were captured as some were stated before an “official” public comment period was identified. The public comments ranged from criticism of the recommended alternative and public process to some acceptance of the alternative to suggestions for continued involvement in a public process.

Criticism of the Recommended Alternative/Public Process
There were many comments expressing displeasure and non-acceptance of the alternative and the public process. Some of these include:

- Don’t understand why we are having all these public meetings and spending all this time when so many people said they want the park natural.
- Don’t understand why majority want natural but recommendation includes trails.
- The comment by consultant to leave as “natural as possible” doesn’t represent what the people said—just leave the park natural.
- Most of the 99% of us would say that if a trail is our option, we don’t want the bridge.
- Why bother filling out comment sheets when decision is made.
- Meetings were a waste of time if the majority wanted natural; people were not listened to.
- Should have prefaced all we said with “you will have trails”; would have saved lots of head/heart ache.
- That was a leap you didn’t have the data to make that if we wanted a bridge we wanted trails in the park.

Acceptance of the Recommended Alternative
Some participants expressed that they were in favor of the recommended alternative, even as a compromise, and that not all the public is represented at the Town Hall meeting. Some comments are:

- This proposal doesn’t have everything in it that I would like to see but I’m prepared to support it because it’s a proposal that does compromise and takes everyone’s views into consideration.
- Plan may not be perfect but with compromise you will never make people perfectly happy. Best solution usually has all sides unhappy but this was a difficult process. Many components, complex. Thanks to staff and consultants.
- So many people cannot access park, even those close by.
- Majority of people in Alkali Creek area are not adjacent owners and cannot access park so although people at meeting want natural park, they are being selfish and park should be for all. People with that thinking didn’t show up to meetings as much. They feel Council will know their wants and will speak for them.
- The park is not useful to a good share of the people who live right here. It seems to be some very selfish and inappropriate comments that they want to preserve 100% of the park for their use when only 5 percent would be compromised so everyone could use it.

Suggestions for Moving Forward
A number of comments were put forth to encourage those critical of the public process and recommended alternative to continue to stay involved:

- Process isn’t over; Council has final say. You can still make voice heard at Council meeting. (Swords Park example – project was pretty much stopped). Stick it out; don’t give up on things yet.
- A lot of people are sounding disappointed but the process isn’t over. Don’t give up—the public process does work.
- City council will see comment sheets. They do listen to people. They are worth filling out.
- Council members do try to look for best alternative for their constituencies but are looking out for whole city—want to find best solution for all.
- Better to have a plan than no plan. Parks board and Council can both amend plans before adoption.
- We need to be prepared for the Council meeting because the Bike Net people will be there in force.
- Concerned about east connector; may be duplicated when MDOT takes over construction past Black Pine.
Please see Appendix C for a Collation of Individual Participant Responses and Summary of Evaluations from Town Hall III meeting.

Website Comments

Web comments were collected from March 1 to May 31, 2005. These comments are organized into two groupings: web comments with names (98 recorded) and anonymous web comments (43 recorded). The web comments with names include some multiple entries by single individuals with the result that the comments do not represent the views of 98 different people. With the 43 anonymous comments, there is no way to identify how many individuals sent them.

In both groupings, respondents self-identified in one of a number of affiliations: resident in the Alkali Creek area; resident of the Heights not living in the Alkali Creek area; resident of Billings not living in the Heights; special interest representative; living outside the Billings area; former resident; and visitor. There is also a category called “not identified” for individuals who did not include their affiliation with their entry.

Web Comments with Names
Number of responses related to each affiliation are tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Resident in the Alkali Creek area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Resident of the Heights not living in the Alkali Creek area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Resident of Billings not living in the Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Special interest representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Living outside the Billings area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes identified in the comments include:
- in favor of adding trails to the park, whether soft or hard (26)
- in favor of improved park access including the addition of trails (22)
- in favor of leaving the park natural with no hard trails (21)
- in favor of adding hard trails in the park (15)
- in favor of bridge access only with no trails added to the park (14)
- advocating trails that will connect to other trail systems and neighborhoods in the city (12)
- in favor of adding ADA access (7)
- against having a trail next to Alkali Creek Road (4)
- advocating soft trails only (2)
- against any duplication of trails (1)
- concerned about fire hazard (2)
- in favor of amenities: add trash receptacles (4), add signage/identify boundaries (3), add benches (1)
- in favor of improving park maintenance (1)

There were also suggestions that the consultant check into the feasibility of an environmental impact statement for the park and that the city obtain an easement from the school for a pathway along the west side of Alkali Creek. There was one comment recognizing the consultant for excellent work.
Anonymous Web Comments
Number of responses related to each affiliation are tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Resident in the Alkali Creek area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Resident of the Heights not living in the Alkali Creek area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Resident of Billings not living in the Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Special interest representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Former resident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes identified in the comments include:
- in favor of leaving the park natural/no development/no concrete (28)
- in favor of improving access for everyone (6)
- in favor of adding hard trails (4)
- in favor of more amenities such as signs (2)
- in favor of soft trail (1)
- against duplication of trails (1)
- in favor of bridge access only with no trails added to the park (1)
- against Pow Wow neighborhood controlling the public process and master plan (1)
APPENDIX A

TOWN HALL MEETING I: MARCH 29, 2005

SUMMARY OF TABLE RESPONSES

#1 Usage of Park Area
A majority of participants who attended the first Town Hall meeting indicated they use Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor (hereafter referred to as Park area) on a daily basis (54 responses). Another 12 responses reported they use it on a weekly basis and another 11 responses reported they use it on a random basis. These numbers reflect a combination of individual and group responses.

When asked for what purpose participants used the Park area, the majority of responses indicated walking/running/jogging/hiking (mentioned 13x), enjoying wildlife watching of animals and birds (mentioned 12x), enjoying nature walks (mentioned 3x), walking their dogs and exercising (each mentioned 3x). Other related reasons ranged from view/aesthetics to transportation/commuting, litter clean-up, recreation and kids’ play area. School field trips were also mentioned.

#2 Future of Park Area

Vision for the Park Corridor/Things to Make Sure Continue into the Future
In terms of USAGE, most participants indicated they would like the Park area left as natural as possible. They used words like natural state, natural character, natural habitat for wildlife and native plants, lots of wildlife, and it feels like “living in the country.” Other uses mentioned included: education site, dogs, and buffer between homes and Rims.

In terms of ACCESS, the majority of comments stated that access needs to improve by installing a pedestrian bridge at Alkali Creek School where parking is more readily available and which would connect the school with the Park. Other areas of access mentioned were at each end of the Park. There were some general comments suggesting that the Park preserve its natural feel yet be more accessible to people and provide connecting green space to other trails and to the neighborhoods.

In regard to TRAILS, the majority of participant comments favored only soft trails and emphatically spoke against any concrete or hard surface trails.

In regard to AMENITIES, there were a couple of comments asking for more development in the park and for varmint proof garbage cans at access points and one comment rejecting any need for Park development including a sports complex, lights, motorized vehicles or garbage containers.

Changes/Improvements Needed in the Park Area
In terms of USAGE, some participants indicated there was no need for any improvement. One table noted they would like to have enforcement of “no dogs” allowed or enforce that dogs must be on leashes and owners be required to carry dog poop bags.

In regard to ACCESS, a number of participants pointed out the need for a new foot bridge to connect Alkali Creek School to the Park area. Some participants at one table requested ADA accessible paths. The desire for distinct trailheads was mentioned and that bridges be made of natural materials and not concrete or steel.

In referring to TRAILS, again most participants requested only soft trails for walking or biking that could be wide enough for two people to walk together. It was suggested that trails could be of gravel or dirt. There were requests that trails be more than 5 feet from the roadway and that a trail in Pow Wow be connected to the roadway trail.

In talking about AMENITIES, benches were mentioned the most along with a couple of requests for bike racks and picnic tables.
#3 Current Perceptions of Park Area

**What Participants Currently Enjoy About Living Near/Using the Park Area**
Participants at all ten tables indicated what they most enjoyed about the Park area was its natural state, natural setting and beauty, green space atmosphere, natural vegetation and serenity. Observing and living amid wildlife was mentioned at eight tables. Qualities like quiet, security and safety were also stated. Country living was mentioned as well as open space and physical activity including biking and walking. Participants mentioned the Rims, the creek, access/fun for kids and the sense of community and neighborhood that the area provides. There was one comment about being unable to enjoy the trail because of lack of access and connection.

**Concerns about the Park Area**

**Maintaining stability/aesthetics of Rims**
Most comments favored maintaining both the stability and aesthetics of the Rims and a couple of comments added maintaining the natural setting.

**Potential for Fire/Flooding and Impact on Adjacent Property Owners**
The majority of comments centered on concerns about the need for an improvement in access for fire suppression and on that fact that increased usage equals an increase in fire danger. Litter and [lack of] no smoking signs were also mentioned as concerns. There were concerns regarding flooding and comments about not constructing anything that would aggravate a flooding issue and the need for clearing dead wood in the creek bed.

**Wildlife as Nuisance vs. Benefit**
The majority of participants consider wildlife to be a benefit and in instances of nuisance, such as beavers, individual homeowners can manage those situations.

**Crime Increase vs. Decrease with Park Development**
With the exception of one comment, participants expressed a concern that increased development/usage could lead to increased crime. The one exception indicated that studies generally find no increase in crime with parks and trails.

**Level of Park Development Moving Toward Natural Setting vs. Building Amenities**
Comments were mixed between those who favored some limited development and those who did not want any development. In either case, the common denominator was to keep the natural setting of the Park. Those who favored some form of limited development were interested in access, parking, restroom facilities, and connection to the Heritage Trail plan.

**More Opportunities for Public Access**
Comments about access ranged from concerns about trespassing on private property and limiting public access to requests for safe bridge access at the school and trail heads at each end of the Park area. There was a question about access to the Metra trail through the culvert.

**Other**
There were three comments about private property rights and encroachment on private property and a couple of comments about funding and maintenance.

#4 Access in Park Area

About 30 responses indicated participants currently use trails in the Park area on a daily basis, another 18 indicated on a weekly basis. There were 16 random responses. These numbers reflect a combination of individual and group responses. When asked for what purpose, the most comments stated walking/running/jogging (mentioned 14x), wildlife viewing (mentioned 7x), exercising (mentioned 3x), walking dogs and biking (each mentioned 2x). Other single comments ranged from rock climbing and cross country skiing to kid’s fun and school field trips.

When asked what they thought about current access to the Park area, the majority of responses focused on wanting a safe foot bridge to connect the school with the Park. There were a couple of comments about improving handicap access. There were a number of comments about access being difficult and limited. Other comments indicated a need for a
connected trail system, for a soft access near Indian Trail and for aesthetically sensitive trails of crushed limestone or sandstone or colored concrete (not black asphalt with yellow lines).

#5 General Questions

**Comments about Park Maintenance & Need for Improvements**
Comments were split between those who preferred a “self policing” by neighbors and residents to maintain the area as a natural park and those participants who would like to see some improved level of maintenance involving clean up of garbage, noxious weeds, debris, and downed trees. Other maintenance ideas included dogs on leashes and a soft trail option to eliminate ruts using Two Moon Park as an example.

**Suggests for the Development of a Master Plan for the Park Area**
The majority of comments centered on concerns about trails in the Park and the desire to retain only soft trails and to keep the multi-purpose trail near the road and away from the Park, back yards and creek. There were comments about not needing two bike trails (duplication of a hard trail) and to respect private property rights. There were other comments focused on the need for improved access to public land, that the area is a community park and that there is a need to connect to future trails and to enforce the Morningside division easement language for a bike trail. Additional comments highlighted the need to maintain the natural character of the Park (keep natural, do nothing, leave as is), to build a foot bridge by the school, and to apply remaining funds to extend the bike trail to connect to other trails.

**COLLATION OF TABLE RESPONSES**

The data recorded below represent a collation of responses produced by participants seated at 10 different tables. At some tables, participants recorded their individual comments. At other tables, participants recorded responses by consensus or vote. Still other tables had a combination of individual comments and group responses. Wherever table responses were indicated on the flipcharts, they have been identified in the responses below. These responses reflect the exact wording recorded on the flipcharts at each table. Total number of participants who signed in: 87.

#1 Usage of Park Area

**How often do you use Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Totals*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Some of the group numbers reflect group consensus instead of individual comments.

**For what purpose?**
- Walking/running/jogging/hiking (mentioned 13x)
- Enjoying wildlife/animals (mentioned 7x)
- Bird watching (mentioned 5x)
- Dog walking (mentioned 3x)
- Exercising (mentioned 3x)
- Nature/ nature walk/native plants (mentioned 3x)
- Transportation/commuting (mentioned 2x)
- Kid’s fun/play areas (mentioned 2x)
- Recreation (mentioned 2x)
- Litter clean-up (mentioned 2x)
- View/aesthetics (mentioned 2x)
- School field trips
Cycling
X-c skiing
Ice skating
Rock climbing
Solitude
Evaluate it

#2 Future of Park Area
What is your vision for the Park corridor? What do you like best about it that you want to make sure continues into the future?

Usage
- Leave park area as natural as possible (consensus of 10 at one table).
- Leave in natural state (5 at one table)
- Maintain natural setting, keep animal habitat.
- Natural habitat for wildlife. Native plants.
- Maintain for future- keep existing natural character of land.
- Some others say primitive.
- Leave it natural, no improvements
- Lots of wildlife, natural vegetation, feel like living in country, only neighborhood park we have, like it the way it is
- Keep area rich with wildlife
- Education site
- Dogs
- Buffer between homes and Rims. Important to preserve Rims.
- Define park and private property

Access
- Better connection to neighborhoods (3 at one table)
- Connect park with school and nature interpretation – outdoor classroom
- Connecting green space to the other trails, connect to downtown and to schools
- Keep nature preserve intact but make it more accessible to people
- ADA accessible/Access-ADA
- Improve access at each end and at Alkali Creek School.
- Pedestrian bridge access to the park by Nature trail sign where old bridge was located by Alkali Creek School (consensus at one table). Parking more readily available at this site.
- Safe bridge for school access.
- Additional access, bridge by Alkali School, parking by school access
- Access to school

Trails
- Paths for foot travel and mountain bike only - no concrete or hard surface (consensus of 10 at one table).
- Soft trails (mentioned 2x)
- Need maintained established trails, not pioneer trails that are not purposeful. (Look at destruction in Sword’s Park)
- Hard trail and soft trails next to maintenance
- Possible development of soft trail (e.g. wood chips)
- Do not want major development of hard trail. NO HARD trails.
- Attempt to maintain existing route of walking trail that is now in place.
- Option to upkeep of soft trails for future use.

Amenities
- More development (3 at one table).
- Varmint proof garbage cans at access points of park.
- Don’t want to see sports complex, no lights, no motorized vehicles (except wheelchairs), carry-in-carry-out garbage.
What changes/improvements would you like to see in the Park corridor?

Usage
- No improvement (3 at one table)
- Enforce no dogs or have dog poop bags, dogs on leashes
- Why has nature preserve/no development status changed?

Access
- ADA accessible path (2 at one table)
- Access improvement – each end and school – distinct trailheads at designated access points
- A new bridge (foot bridge) by the school to the Nature trail
- Bridge near school. Bridge at Alkali Creek School.
- Safe ‘foot’ bridge adjoining Alkali Creek School
- Where bridges are needed – keep them natural, e.g., wood, stone--not concrete/steel
- Trail heads

Trails
- Soft trail wider (3 at one table)
- Gravel trail
- Walking and public trails off the roadway more than 5’ from the road. Safe place to walk or bike that is not near the road.
- Loop the trail – connect trail in Pow Wow Park to the roadway trail.
- Two-person wide ‘foot path’, dirt only
- Soft trail only

Amenities
- Benches vs. no benches. Benches (mentioned 3x).
- Bike racks
- Picnic tables

Park Maintenance
- Better, more consistent clean-up effort

#3 Current Perceptions of the Park Area

What do you currently enjoy about living near/using the Alkali Creek Corridor?
- Quiet (mentioned by 3 tables).
- Security, safety (mentioned by 3 tables).
- Country living (mentioned by 2 tables).
- Open space. Open space buffer.
- Biking and walking opportunities
- Rims are a part of Billings
- Creek itself
- Privacy
- Appreciate and enjoy seeing families using the park and surrounding area. Kids. Kids access to school, fun for kids
- Enjoy sense of community. Neighborhood atmosphere.
- Accessibility.
- I can’t enjoy the trail – no access and no trail connection.

What concerns do you have about the Park in terms of:
Maintaining stability/aesthetics of Rims:
- Need clearly identified park boundaries
- Aesthetics- maintain natural setting
- Stability – erosion
No concern if left natural
- Stability of Rims - don't do anything to impact visibility or character of Rims
- Maintain stability

Potential for fire and for flooding of Alkali Creek and their impact on adjacent property owners:
- Concerns about fire and flood. Fire/flooding.
- No smoking
- Fire and flooding – don’t make it any worse, access for fire fighting, floodplain ordinances should be respected (trails in floodplain).
- Increased chance of fire with more usage? (signs- no smoking)
- More use=more fire danger; if left alone, little flood concern
- Litter, fire (increased usage), after hour parties
- Increased usage=increased fire danger, litter
- Fire/flood – access improvement would help fire suppression; be careful not to construct anything that would aggravate flooding issue.
- Fire access - medical relief access.
- Clearing of dead wood in creek bed.

Wildlife as nuisance vs. benefit:
- Benefit, it is an asset. Nuisance – beavers.
- Nuisance managed by individual homeowners – benefit is a part of natural living – maintain ‘as-is’
- Wildlife is a benefit
- Negative effect on wildlife [development]
- Wildlife is a benefit including rattlesnakes
- Wildlife damage – management

Crime increase vs. decrease with Park development:
- Crime-worry it will increase because of more people. Crime increase.
- Increased traffic in secluded areas means increased crime – local children put at risk.
- Crime increase because of access.
- Crime – keep natural character will minimize crime. The more structures, the more crime will likely occur, e.g. vandalism.
- Crime increases with increased development.
- Increased crime with park development/intruders.
- With park development increase in crime.
- Crime concerns with development.
- Studies indicate generally no increase in crime with parks, trails, address crime issue – facts and education.

Level of Park development moving toward a more natural setting vs. building more amenities:
- Access and parking for folks to be able to use park restrooms. Connection to Heritage Trail plan. Amenities need to be limited, concentrated and blend into natural setting.
- Restroom facility at Alkali School parking lot.
- Leave ‘as-is’
- All at this table feel strongly about maintaining the natural setting and not building more amenities (table of 6)
- We don’t need more amenities other than access bridge by school
- [Development would cause] disturbance of wildlife/habitat
- We want a natural setting.
- Overdevelopment, property value decrease
- Keep natural setting
- School education, field trips, day walks, bird watching

More opportunities for public access to the park:
- Concerned people will be using private property for access.
- If there was a dedicated pathway, would people be less likely to x-cross private property?
- Trespassing concerns of adjacent property owners
- Access to Metra trail thru culvert?
- Adequate access except at school
- We agree the designation of trail heads at each end and at the school will provide access to the public and residents (table of 6).
- No more public access – keep natural
- Bridge at school – parking lot near school.
- Parking for access
- Permanent and safe bridge at the school

Other
- Private property rights. Encroachment on private property. (mentioned 3x)
- Funding and maintenance a concern.
- Costs (building and maintenance)

#4 Access in Park Area

How often do you currently use trails in the Park area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Totals*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments from table of 6: Actual trail use varies from daily to randomly. Those using it randomly consider the passive use of driving or walking near or adjacent to the corridor just as important to our daily enjoyment of the park in its natural condition

For what purpose?
- Walking/Running/Jogging (mentioned 14x)
- Wildlife viewing/Bird watching/Nature walk (mentioned 7x)
- Walking dogs (mentioned 2x)
- Exercise (mentioned 3x)
- Biking (mentioned 2x)
- Rock climbing
- View
- Kid’s fun/Adventure for kids
- Commuting
- Litter pick-up
- School field trips
- Cross country skiing
- Skating
- Recreation
- Evaluate it

What do you think about current access to the Park area?
- Not good. Improve entrances/ exits
- Current access is a difficulty and limited
- No access and no trail connection
- Connection to Heritage Trail plan
- Improved access – no handicap access right now in the Park/access ADA
- Access through the park is poor, difficult to traverse once you are inside
- Safe bridge at school – all else is adequate
- Better access from Alkali Creek School – foot bridge
- Current access is adequate but need the bridge back by the school
- Need a new bridge by school to nature trails
- Connect park with school and nature interpretation/outdoor classroom
• Access needs to be clearly marked at each end and the access at the school improved and marked
• Access and parking for folks to be able to use Park restrooms
• Need bridge at school, another soft access near Indian Trail, o.k. at Quiet Water and Judicial, school access washed out – reestablish a bridge to withstand 100 yr. flood or put in 12’ culvert with passover on top
• Aesthetically sensitive trail – don’t want black asphalt with yellow lines – crushed limestone or sandstone colored concrete would be preferable
• Will not be a deluge of people if the trail goes in
• As gasoline goes up and air gets more polluted, we need a connected trail system
• Designated as a nature preserve – define nature preserve – does that mean no one can go there?
• Limited amenities

#5 General Questions
How well do you think the Park area is being maintained? What, if any, improvements would you suggest?
• O.K. – neighbors police fairly well
• No problem with garbage – being self policed.
• No one at our table has ever seen anyone from the city working in the park (correction – some weed spraying), but we’re o.k. with that because neighbors are doing it
• It’s a natural park – not maintained
• Not maintained and does not need it
• Residents clean it all the time and will keep doing it
• There is no apparent maintenance – treated as a natural park.
• Garbage clean up is needed (garbage cans?)
• Noxious weeds
• Clean out culverts along corridor. Clean up debris, downed trees, garbage
• In Alkali Creek, thistles and cockleburs are a growing problem
• Not being maintained at all. Need garbage picked up, crossing below Alkali Creek School, want some level of development. Dogs need to be leashed. (4 at one table)
• Soft trail option is desired to eliminate ruts. Two Moon Park soft trails should be used as an example of how the character of a natural area can be maintained

Any suggestions for the Parks Department as it guides the development of a master plan for Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor?
• As a member of the public, I want access to public land in Alkali Creek. Either give the public access or make adjacent land owners buy it and pay taxes on it to keep it private
• This is a Billings community park, as are all the parks in the area
• There are trails going through private property all over Zimmerman
• Connect to future trails – east, west, etc.
• Want city to enforce the Morningside division easement language for a bike trail
• Backpacking, picnicking
• In the development process, maintain the natural character of the park
• Leave alone with a new bridge.
• Bridge by the school (foot bridge)
• It should include the bridge by the school and otherwise mirror the existing natural condition. If it ain’t broke don’t fix it.
• Keep natural. Do nothing. Leave as is.
• Consider minimal development in this park and apply remaining funds to extending the bike trail by the road further west beyond Senator’s Blvd
• Why not use money to connect to other trails under Main?
• Involve neighbors prior to spending public funds; keep bike trail near road and away from creek; 2 bike trails not necessary; respect private property rights
• We already have a hard path along Alkali Creek Road – we do not need one in the park
• DO NOT DUPLICATE HARD TRAIL. Keep multi-purpose trail along Alkali Creek Road. Only soft trail in park.
• Why discuss two bike paths?
• Have only one bike path/multi-use path by Alkali Creek Road
• Because Alkali Creek Corridor is so narrow and close to homes, we recommend no access from Black Pine west. Keep away from back yards and creek.
• Keep trail on street from Black Pine to west end of Quiet Water.
• Actual building of path will upset animal habitat – ruin terrain in Pow Wow Park.
• Dirt paths are very functional-easy to maintain
• If you are developing Pow Wow Park – where do you think parking, restrooms, etc., will be located? (Not in our yards and driveways)
• In summary, maintaining Pow Wow Park as a natural preserve is beneficial to all of Billings and future generations. It is a jewel – do not destroy it.

**SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS**

**WHAT WORKED WELL IN THIS MEETING?**
• Group break out. Table focus groups. Small groups. Group work. Group discussion. Table discussions.
• Surprisingly, the group session worked well. We certainly don’t all agree but it was a good brainstorming session
• Small groups for discussion limited argumentative atmosphere
• Small groups, good control of negativity
• Good discussion level at all tables. There were both adjacent property owners and trail advocates but all were respectful of the opinions of others
• Table/group discussions and written down data – now you must read and analyze and not throw away.
• Good facilitator, good recorder [at table].
• Soliciting ideas. Hearing other viewpoints.
• We had a group meeting and wrote down what we felt rather than having a shouting match.
• I liked the open forum. The public was allowed to speak if they had concerns.
• The opportunity for open speaking. Open communication/ability to comment.
• Some comments allowed. Open public comments.
• Providing information and letting people express their opinions to the entire group
• Neighbors came together to voice their opinions
• Got neighborhood involved. Togetherness.
• We worked together to save our park. Working together for best interest of park.
• We all were working together for the best interest of community park as far as getting our comments heard
• It gave the Alkali Creek community members a chance to voice their concerns and wishes in a manner that will hopefully be strongly paid attention to
• Opportunity to document issues and comments (for the 3rd time by the way)
• Having the meeting in the Alkali Creek Area.
• It was well attended by the Alkali community. Good attendance.
• The majority of the people. It was well attended which shows there is a lot of interest.
• Facilitated well. Moderator handled crowd very well.
• Facilitator did nice job; needed as these are emotional issues
• Facilitator did good job of crowd control. Stayed focused on information.
• Ann Clancy did a great job of keeping the meeting under control.
• Ann did a great job keeping us on track and off each other’s back.
• Found out the majority of folks oppose a man-made trail in Pow Wow Park.
• We met and agreed we don’t want changes. Mutual agreement.
• Slide presentation. Hand outs were helpful. Info sheet distribution – maps, visuals good.
• Not much – we had a person who was determined to railroad her opinion through
• Keeping Darlene Tussing away

**WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?**
• Nothing.
• People should have been asked to state their name and address as a matter of common courtesy. Better identification of who was speaking.
• More time for public comment.
• Questions seemed redundant and therefore difficult to answer.
• More microphone for easy listening, focusing on speaker’s message.
• More microphones for better hearing.
• Have people walk up to microphone and state their question.
• Speaker should go up to the microphone. People to speak louder – more microphones.
• Individual opinion sheets.
• Not have table groups. Have each person fill out questionnaires and turn them in.
• Fill out green questionnaire and turn in for total numbers. Everybody is heard on paper this way.
• Don’t let the “nay sayers” set the tone for the meeting by opening floor to questions early on.
• Maps should have been included in Power Point presentation.
• Better preparation by the city in regards to history of the park and what the circumstances are for development.
• Facts should have been correct.
• Should have had more information on what the original master plan for Pow Wow was.
• More discussion about origination of original group or groups who started idea to walking/biking roads. Who authorized expenditures of $95,000 to date?
• Letters about this should have been sent to all Alkali Creek area residents. I feel this whole project has been a hush-hush so residents were not informed.
• Why did the Park’s Department spend money to develop this park before talking to the neighborhood to see what was wanted.
• Listen to us – we don’t want this and spending money on planning is foolish and wasteful use of city money.
• Ask for our opinion before getting to the point of wasting money.
• Do not have preconceived ideas and plans. Let the people speak.
• This meeting should have been held over 4 years ago. Maybe (we hope) Bike Net and Darlene Tussing aren’t running the show anymore.
• This meeting should have happened 4 years before Bike Net decided they were putting the trail through our backyard.
• Ability to comment prior to getting the $500,000 grant.
• You could have stayed away from a peaceful neighborhood.
• Have this and other meetings before you decided to put project in motion and we don’t want to destroy the natural trail that brought us home buyers to this area. Waste of time, money and the quiet enjoyment of our homes and caused a lot of angry people.
• Inform people better (like before this whole thing started).
• Get a show of hands from the people as to whether anything should be done in the first place, before spending tax dollars.

WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR THE NEXT TOWN HALL MEETING?
• Keep it at the Depot.
• I am very much in favor of involving the whole community and not targeting just the neighborhood – even though I live in the immediate neighborhood.
• Have all the meetings in the Valley at the Alkali Creek School.
• Venue remain in Alkali School due to ease of parking.
• Again at Alkali Creek School. Have it at Alkali School.
• Do not have at Depot. Keep at Alkali School. Do not conflict with other Heights meetings. Hold it at Alkali Creek School.
• Have all meetings in Alkali Creek. Hold it at Alkali Creek School.
• Meeting be held at Alkali School. That it be held at Alkali Creek School.
• We want the meeting to be in our community – Alkali Creek School. Alkali Creek School.
• Have meetings all at Alkali Creek School when talking about park.
• Have it here at Alkali Creek.
• Alkali School. Keep the next meeting at the school. Next meeting at Alkali Creek School.
• This meeting should be at the school not downtown. Alkali Creek School – not downtown. Have at Alkali Creek School. Not at the Depot outside of our area.
• Same location – Alkali Creek. To have it at Alkali Creek School not out of the area it is affecting. Keep it in the Heights at the school.
• It needs to be held here at Alkali Creek School. In our neighborhood and no charge to use the room. Different date.
• Meeting should be held at Alkali Creek School. It’s our community park. Not the Depot’s. Have all the meetings at Alkali Creek School instead of downtown where parking is a problem.
• Meeting needs to be in the Alkali Creek community.
• Keep it in Alkali Creek. Not consensus – downtown o.k. for 1 meeting.
• Keep them in the neighborhood.
• Have it in the community neighborhood where this is affecting – major issue- not Depot.
• Have it in the Valley. In the Valley. Here in the Valley.
• In the Valley. Hold it in the Valley.
• Keep them here in the neighborhood. Change the date. Conflicts with Heights Task Force meeting.
• Stay away. Stop spending city funds.
• Get Morningside annex agreement and other park dedication agreements and put them out for us to see.
• Find the nature preserve designation document.
• Do we need an opinion for City Attorney re: meaning of “nature” if in fact that is in language of origin?
• More details on planning. Believe there are “behind the scenes” decisions being made and the community opinion is really not being sought out.
• More discussion on what is going to happen.
• Do group work first – soften more caustic comments through group process before info sharing part – less anonymity for NIMBY members.
• Don’t have group sessions.
• Provide information and let people give opinions.
• Be prepared to demonstrate clearly that comments and concerns have been thoroughly reviewed and how they will be used not only in the plan but also on the ground.
• Let us each fill out surveys that are drawn up from the ‘flip chart’ comments – to weigh public opinion.
• Keep it shorter.
• Better pencils.

ANY OTHER COMMENTS?
• Thanks for all your work.
• Thank you for including us and our thoughts – we really feel it’s our tax money at work.
• Thanks for the chance to participate.
• Good job. This is an emotional issue.
• Must address the conception of participants that a pre-conceived agenda is driving the final result of these meetings so that whatever we say will not matter.
• Must defuse the appearance that currently exists that you have a predetermined outcome. Getting your $ prior to any planning or public input didn’t help.
• I feel there was a preplanned agenda which made it difficult to be on same level with city planners.
• As a property owner adjacent to Park, I feel like I am still having this forced down my throat and that someone already has an agenda.
• Don’t let the bike organization people dictate their agenda over the opinions of the local homeowners.
• Who is responsible for funds that have already been expended?
• Check into the history of this area.
• More accurate information and details of pertinent questions asked.
• The $500,000 that Sen. Burns got for the trail seems to be burning a hole in someone’s pocket.
• Do locals and adjacent homeowners have more weight in the decision? We should have. The outside neighborhood bikers can use other trails.
• Pow Wow Park should be maintained in its natural setting. The bike trail should be on the road – the current trail in the park can be used by bikes – I do myself. Anyone can use the park. There are no signs posted to keep people away.
• Just listen to us. We live here. We are glad to share our park but do not want concrete thru it.
• We bought here because of the natural park behind us and want it left that way.
• I would like to see a bridge by the school for access and parking. Keep the bike trail away from the creek and private property. Trails could be improved within the park. Bike trail by road. Park should stay unimproved.
• This park is fine the way it is. The neighborhood uses it and enjoys its beauty. We aren't interested in being a recreation center for the rest of Billings. Anyone who wishes to come is still welcome as long as they appreciate we live here all year long.
• Don't spend taxpayer's money until you determine community wishes from those that live in the area.
• You are not wanted. Leave our park alone. Leave the park alone.
• This project needs to be handled with sensitivity to the area residents. We are the ones that live here and will have to live with what is decided. Not those that come and use it just on weekends, etc.
• No meeting at Depot. Only in our neighborhood – very important keep it in our neighborhood.
• Meetings should be held at Alkali Creek School – more room, parking, etc.
• Meetings should be held at Alkali Creek School since it is our community park.
• Have all meetings at Alkali Creek School.
• Why spend money on this area when all who live here love the way it is. In other words, why fix what isn't broken? Use the funds elsewhere where needed.
• Use the tax dollars for something necessary.
• Think about not doing very much at Pow Wow. Try to keep it as is.
• This meeting should have been held 4 years ago before Darlene Tussing got federal money.
• Please list participants w/ name/address, phone and e-mail on the website.

APPENDIX B

TOWN HALL MEETING II: APRIL 27, 2005

COLLATION OF TABLE RESPONSES

The data recorded below represent a collation of responses produced by participants seated at 11 different tables. At some tables, participants recorded their individual comments. At other tables, participants recorded responses by consensus or vote. Still other tables had a combination of individual comments and group responses. Wherever table responses were indicated on the flipcharts, they have been identified in the responses below. These responses reflect the exact wording recorded on the flipcharts at each table. Total number of participants who signed in: 104.

#1 JUDICIAL AVENUE OVERLOOK

In Favor
• Outlook area is a positive. More people will walk instead of drive.

Not in Favor (Majority)
• 11 not in favor.
• Why? Not a popular idea with the group (9). May not be utilized much for the cost. Is that fair to Judicial residents? Little to no parking in area. Delete.
• No access changes at Judicial (9). Have access with ADA compliance (3). Parking on street interferes with home owners’ access. Curb access would be required for ADA requirement.
• Skip it all together (group consensus). What impact to the neighbors? How many people—estimated numbers? Cost benefit.
• Other locations better. Problem for neighbors. Parking big concern. What would they be looking at? What is the purpose? Not a good location – consider other options. School.

Comments/Concerns/Questions
• Parking would be a problem, develop plan for 3-4 cars (or more).
• Nice idea, but not a priority
• Did not understand exact location.
• Add parking. Not a priority for this group.
• Question expense for utilization.
• Another location—historic party spot in Heights.
• Concern about litter—not in favor.
• Question need at that location.
• Think would be used for intended purpose.
• Pier damage to vegetation?
• Safety factor?
• Unnecessary.
• Too elaborate.
• Eliminate overlook.
• Where on Judicial exactly? Unnecessary expenditure-use the money for a hard surface trail thru the entire park or use the right of way to get down to the creek and access a trail along the creek.
• What kind of policing policies will be available to keep people from parking in private driveways? No survey to determine if it would be used.

#2 JUDICIAL AVENUE CONNECTOR

In Favor
• 3 in favor of Alternative #2
• Yes, with narrower trail—3’ or minimum (9).
• Generally ok in group. Prefer hard trail. Hard just on Judicial section - not on knoll (1 person).
• Group: Improvement of current trail. Good plan.
• 2 in favor – 5’ wide trail.
• Like idea and approve of having trail on Alkali Creek Road and through park. Current access is not sufficient (5).
• Individual: Prefer 10’ hard surface, colored concrete consistent with City Bike Path Standard. Parking on public streets is adequate (not as difficult as adjoining landowners would suggest). I’ve never had a problem w/parking on Judicial or Quiet Water. Critical component for school children from a top Senator’s Hill to access school. Bridges, benches, trash cans excellent. Boundary signs excellent. No city $ for vegetation or other barriers for adj. landowners—let them pay.

Not in Favor (Majority)
• 9 not in favor.
• Leave things as they are (8). Too much infringement on wildlife area. Too much construction in fragile area. Dangerous for children around beaver ponds.
• No trail improvements (9 against). Keep out of vegetation. Poor use of topsoil area.
• Trail too wide – 36” most (9) / leave natural (1).
• No -11. Leave natural (10 of the 11).
• 8’ path not consistent with leaving this as a natural area.
• Individual: Leave it as it is.
• If it’s not broke don’t fix it, no need for entire project.
• Continue to support least amount of development.

Comments/Concerns/Questions
• Keep: Want the pine trees left as is.
• Change: Put path same 5’ width.
• Concern: Will this impact the meandering nature of the creek. Will it still be a “live” stream or will path effect this?
• Preserve privacy of neighborhood homes.
• What habitat will be destroyed?
• Minimal impact to landscape along creek.
• Discourage trail cutting. Alternate: Leave existing trails for kids to explore. Get off the beaten path.
• Why use $ on 2 trails in close proximity (2).
• Hard trail for ADA portion.
• Need to go lower route for ADA.
• 5’ not 8’.
• Proposed trail too close to private property.
• People won’t stick to new trails – more connections
• Use existing trail—make it ADA compatible.
• Can't make ADA accessible so don't do it—leave trail as is.
• Not all parts will be ADA, but areas that can meet ADA should.
• Support soft trail but has to be ADA accessible.
• The improved trail will focus use along it.
• Should be cement—hard surface trail 10’.
• People will adopt trails and clean them up.
• Hard trail close to school because of high traffic area.
• No more hard trail than necessary to accommodate school kids.
• If trails are necessary let them be soft trails.
• Close proximity to school lends itself to educational opportunities.
• Important access for getting on trail, especially for kids.
• Concern about lack of future maintenance.
• This access would be better for bikers vs. walkers.
• Concerns: Parking on Judicial.
• Parking concerns. Direct parking to school.
• How many out of neighborhood people expected?
• Needs to have parking facilities – 3-4 cars?
• In general, there is a problem with parking on Judicial.
• Concern @ damage during construction (2).
• Not a concern if managed and minimized during construction (4).

#3 SCHOOL ACCESS AREA #1

In Favor (Majority)
• Preferred by all 7 at table: Eliminate observation bridge at Judicial. Have trail circle under Judicial. No trail starting at Judicial. Have observation bridge at the school.
• 9 in favor of bridge location – bridge only. 2 in favor of bridge, soft trails – 5’.
• Group (7) all like the bridge for access and viewing of creek.
• Good idea. Good parking, easy access. Bridge in flood plane. More parking. Leave trail soft (8). ADA requirements must be met (3). Best access for school kids and school projects.
• Ends at top of knob and curve down and dead ends (leave knob out). (8-9)
• Yes-10 (with reservations). Paths limited to natural. Reservations: limit development (bench, trash, interpret) to school side only (7); limit development (bench, trash) to school side and knob (4).
• Group consensus (7 people): First choice – would prefer park left as is with bridge across from School (access option #1). If we have to have trail—soft surface 5’ maximum.
• No other amenities in park (9 to 1).
• Picnic next to school not on knob (1 for 1 on knob), (8 no picnic)
• Benches ok next to school. (10)
• No 8’ path—5’ big enough. Prefer none.
• Parking is good here (7).
• Like garbage collection idea (7).
• Like joint use w/school (7).
• Would like to keep existing trails with no improvement (2).
• Like idea of improved trails as presented in option (5).
• Good access and parking already available/like rest area with benches. Still prefer consistent 5’ wide trail.
• This is all we need to do. We like this.
• Like the parking.
• Suggestion: Keep hard trail lower to Alkali Cr. and Senator’s. Leave upper natural.
• Bridge ok there—Narrow foot bridge.
• Barrier for motorized vehicles.
• Support benches, etc.
• Don’t need to mow area
• Prefer to #2, school parking and further from private property.
• Bridge and viewing area ok, but no trail.
• Bridge needed but not that elaborate.
Individual: Bridge ideas excellent. Benches/tables/trash cans excellent. If not 10' hard surface, then widest possible trail thru entire park (8') - or a combination of hard and soft. Boundary signs excellent. Good use of existing school parking. Excellent idea to collaborate w/SD2.

Individual: Good plan. Puts the bridge where it existed 20 years ago. Parking at school.

Individual: Moderate trail improvement.

Not in Favor

No-1.

Comments/Concerns/Questions

Like bridge close to school.

Group: Don't like the idea of picnic tables on the knoll. How about the school? How about a new bridge and keep existing trails?

Concern about children's security.

Permission from school may not be best planning.

School could have own bridge to park.

Is school going to be ok with people parking in lot?

Mixed pavements ok- pea gravel hard for ADA, strollers.

LO's fought development project, now don't want to see this path.

Maintenance concerns.

May tie in with Alkali Cr. Rd. project trail better.

Parking concerns and general public on school grounds—safety concerns.

Have lookout on knoll.

Land title is clear.


Individual: No $ to provide vegetation buffers for adjacent landowners-let them pay.

#4 SCHOOL ACCESS AREA #2

In Favor

Most in group in favor. Make good walking path to school for extra parking to deal with overflow. (9)

No parking at entrance and use school parking so less disruptive (6).

Some still favor parking at trail head (3).

City property access - 2nd best alternative. Limited parking. Drainage possibly creates an unnecessary hazard. Further away from school. When you put people in the park you eliminate wildlife. No benches necessary.

We like parking is separate from school.

Maybe less disruptive. Leaves knob wild.

Off shoot overlook is good.

Pretty good option— but still should consider separate school access as well.

Individual: Bridge ideas excellent. Benches, tables, trash cans excellent. If not 10' hard surface, then widest possible thru entire park (8') or a combination of the two. Boundary signs excellent. Good to include parking. If this alternative is less expensive than #1 I'd be inclined to favor it and have overlook here, as opposed to Judicial Overlook as proposed. Overall, I like #2, over #1 and Judicial Overlook.

Not in Favor (Majority)

No bridge there (10 against).

11 not in favor.

NO (11). See option 1.

Group: No existing parking places like in #1.

Forget this— why build parking (only 6 spaces).

Don't like idea of being close to private home and designate parking there.

Parking (gravel road).

Too close to private property.

Less preferable option for handicapped.

Individual: I don't like this plan at all. It invades the privacy of a private home.

Comments/Concerns/Questions

Which option has fewer effects on beaver dams and other wildlife?
- Concern over maintenance of benches, picnic tables, etc., vandalism of same.
- Individual: Is this the right of way that is subject to the recently made abandonment request? Will this abandonment, if granted, adversely impair #2?
- Individual: Hard surface through entire park compliant with City Bike Path Standard (I want this alternative presented to Park Board and Council). Colored concrete.

#5 EAST CONNECTOR FROM SCHOOL ACCESS AREA TO QUIET WATER AVENUE

In Favor
- 2 in favor.
- 5 group members like idea as presented
- Cement trail—lower (1). Natural—upper (1).
- Split group: 1) Prefer lower trail route. 2) Build both. 3) Go back to 3 and stop.
- Yes-1 (wants upper, not lower trail).
- 1 for trail improvement.
- Surface the low trail only.
- Like “high” road to “low” road to remain – as soft trails and limited to those trails.
- Make one trail hard and one trail soft.
- Like that it follows contours of existing trails.
- Good connection to Heritage Trail goals.
- Individual: Use creek corridor rather than existing street for the path. Bring path across creek with a bridge before Appel property and back into parkland behind Appel property (Lots 1,2,3). What about making one path hard surface and the other path soft surface?

Not in Favor (Majority)
- 9 not in favor.
- No-10 (leave natural)
- No improvements (9 against trails)
- Leave natural (10).
- Leave as is (6 out of 7).
- 2 group members would rather leave trail as is.
- No parking.
- Habitat too fragile to handle impact.
- Two trails are not necessary in the valley-this is a waste of taxpayer money. If the city has money to waste reduce my property taxes.
- Existing funds could be better used elsewhere-like for trail along highway (Alkali Creek Rd.).
- Much to steep. Slope in extremely difficult. Parking on the end of Quiet Water is limited. Infringes on private property. Two trails requires double maintenance. High and low would be required to meet ADA.
- Individual: Keep as it is but with access to school with a bridge.

Comment/Concerns/Questions
- Which is the upper trail? Would you reclimate upper part of original trail in this section?
- Keep upper trail natural.
- Put 5'/soft trail on lower trail.
- Provide access and viewing area but don’t do anything to trails.
- Creek floods frequently (4/15 years) and will damage trail.
- No parking at Quiet Water; school is only parking. Need parking at Quiet Water. 2 group members see this as a concern; 5 do not.
- Concerns about impacts to residents at Quiet Water. 2 members see this as a concern; 5 do not.
- Would like plan to consider avoiding Quiet Water and routing along creek (where Lot #1 is on map). 1 member opposes this; 6 like it.
- Individual: Important for Q/W children and others to have safe access into/thru park from QW. Parking on street in this area is not a problem. There is ample space on QW and Black Pine.
#6  FAR EAST CONNECTOR FROM QUIET WATER AVENUE TO THE BBWA CANAL

In Favor
- 2 in favor.
- Possible alternate path – cross Alkali Creek through church property then get on Alkali Creek Trail and back to park property (If not, 9 in favor of this route w/o alternative).
- Reactions: Like idea, need to build as much trail as possible and build to connect to Metra Park; 5 like idea.

Not in Favor (Majority)
- No trail (10 against). Goes nowhere.
- No-11. Leave it alone.
- 9 not in favor.
- Attorney’s dream.
- Would rather leave park as is, could use Alkali Creek for access: 2 like this
- Too close to private property.
- Dangerous around the Big Ditch.

Comments/Concerns/Questions
- Must honor negotiated agreement of trail going through Morningside Subdivision.
- Private property in Morningside. Aronson Road will eventually come across trail. End master plan. East of Black Pine. Highway project and Aronson connection have yet to be designed.
- Needs more study how this trail will be built onto in future—what will it connect to?
- Are there easements for future?
- Will you use existing sidewalk or make a wider path on Quiet Water?
- Does any alternative route exist for less impact on Quiet Water residents?
- Individual: Hold M/Side to its annexation agreement for a bike path through common area. Need foot bridges to access across the creek into public lands to extend to Morningside.

DOGS

In Favor (Majority)
- Dogs ok. Yes – dogs in the park.
- Dogs in park: Yes-11
- Receptacles for dogs, bags – 9 in favor of dogs.
- Dogs-on leash (7)/under control (4).
- Dogs ok on leashes (5). Dogs ok – let ‘em run, no leashes (2).
- Dogs on leash only and enforced so they can’t harass wildlife. Do not want this as a “dog park.”
- Dogs- should be on leash but allowed.
- Dogs in PWP should be leashed.
- Dogs allowed. Proper waste disposal.
- Dog and people receptacles – user ownership for cleanup.
- No problem with dogs on leashes or close verbal control. Need dog bags.
- Allow dogs so long as they’re under control and clean up after them.

SIGNS

In Favor (Majority)
- Boundary signs – narrow green ones are favorable. All in favor of signs (9).
- Signage (private property): yes 11.
- Narrow signs – 11.
- Signage – important-like minimal as shown – we all agree (7).
- Do want park boundary signs.
- Signs – stay out, private property.
- Yes - signs – the bigger ones.
- Signs: attractive ones that fit in-long, narrow. Like interpretive signs.
- Signs that say no glass containers, no alcohol, no litter, and park boundaries – stake style.
Not in Favor

- No signs. (10 against).

REACTIONS/QUESTIONS/GENERAL COMMENTS

- Another alternative: City donates property to a non-profit wildlife protection organization to be left natural permanently and a later public decision on who the organization is (Yes-10; No-1).
- In favor of leaving park natural, as it is now – 9. 2 want soft trail.
- Leave the park as is except bridge for pedestrians to cross (6 out of 7).
- This area is so unique and ecologically sensitive that I hate to see it chopped up.
- Keep the park natural (as is). There are too few places like this.
- No trails. (10 against).
- Same for horses [proper waste disposal]. No motorized vehicles. Leave the trails natural. This area should be a nature conservatory with very little disturbance. Enjoy the great outdoors.
- No additional access from Indian trail-only at school. One person objects to gravel as soft trail material. Use wood chips or soil additive.
- Consider “impact” of construction being similar for soft and hard trails, therefore is hard surface less maintenance over time? Colored concrete to blend in with hillside. Concrete allows all bikes, etc., ADA.
- Concrete may be lower impact in the long term. Colored.
- Which surface is lowest $ to maintain? Why no hard surface consideration?
- Like ADA access. Make sure all components are ADA compliant.
- Can we keep picnic and benches outside on school end?
- Community health – encourage walking.
- Should be a park for everyone.
- Give people (taxpayers) equal voice and access to animals/wildlife. They are not mutually exclusive.
- Please consider the historical significance of Immel/Blackfeet massacre.
- May 26 Town Hall III- TCEP grant requires Highway ADA requirements. 2 levels of ADA- 1)Built ADA guidelines; 2) outdoor rec trails guidelines.

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

WHAT WORKED WELL IN THIS MEETING?

- It went very well. Good meeting.
- Lots of good information. Thanks. Lots of input. Different plans.
- Excellent intro and information. You guys did your homework.
- Good information & format. Jolene’s presentation & responses were knowledgeable and diplomatic.
- Jolene did an excellent job. Many questions cleared up. Jolene is a great speaker.
- Jolene was great. She had a hard job. Very composed.
- Jolene did very well presenting a compromise plan based on views expressed at first meeting. Jolene did a good job presenting the options.
- Jolene, I think you worked really in trying to find middle ground. Somewhere between concrete and leave natural.
- Jolene did a nice job w/her briefing. Evidence that we were heard at the last meeting from all of you. Jolene was conscientious.
- Great homework by presenters. You all did a good job explaining things.
- People did their homework and got info out to the public.
- Presenters well prepared. Better presentation w/o antagonistic questions setting the tone at the meeting’s outset. Many people learned a lot from the presentations.
- Good leadership. It was good to be heard. Jolene did a lot of work. But we’d still like to see the park remain natural.
- Group discussions. (3x) Great discussion at our table.
- Small group afforded all to express opinions. Very good discussion level at this table.
- Small group meeting was systematic. Everyone got to comment and be recorded.
- Break out session good. Group breakouts. Good breakouts.
- The flipchart worked well. Charts worked well.
Everyone mentioned who they were. Questions were heard because of mikes.
Facilitated well. Good facilitation.
Facilitator did a good job getting people to microphone and controlling emotions.
Really helpful to use microphone.
Facilitation. We had a good facilitator which is key to this process.
Good facilitation. Answered questions from 1st meeting.
Organization. It was handled well.
Attendance was great. Everyone had input.
Civility-respect-ability to “mingle” between opinions.
Liked being able to walk to the meeting. Thanks for having it at school.
Public participation. The council listens to suggestions from homeowners.
Very well attended. Current set-up.
Good cookies. Thanks. Thanks for food and drink.
Tax-payers.
We were basically all in agreement for leaving the park as natural as possible.
Where were the city council and the major players in the city? If you are just going to do this no matter what, why the meetings?
Nothing.

WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?

- Very good meeting. Good job.
- Can help was missing something. What was presented was good.
- Let us have more clarification of options. For a time it appeared that we could only choose the lesser of two evils.
- I was not at first Town Hall meeting but I would like to have entire Heritage Trail Plan presented so community can see how this portion of trail connects with overall plan to reduce traffic and congestion by encouraging alternative modes of transportation and protect natural resources.
- Should have had a paved path plan.
- An in-depth review of the alternatives was a tall order w/out more opportunity to study.
- Why no hard surface option?
- Present the Heritage Trail concept of “backbone” trails and a system of...
- You did not have an overhead saying leave as is-that should have been presented.
- Better maps would be helpful. Many were having difficulty understanding the maps and illustrations.
- Hard trail not presented as an option. Needed more handouts to help at tables w/facilitation.
- Be better organized in the ques. Flipchart phase w/visuals.
- Goals not defined. Plans not explained.
- To scattered and cluttered. Better communication.
- I think we would have a more productive meeting if like-minded people sat together. That would keep the arguing down some.
- Much shorter. This thing lasted way too long. Stick to the time frame if you can.
- Ask folks to state their names and addresses as a matter of neighborliness and common courtesy at the outset.
- People should be asked to give their names and addresses when speaking as a matter of courtesy.
- Announce at the beginning of the meeting that stating names and addresses is optional.
- Address and phone was noted as not needed-good-names only.
- People could have been quiet and heard the plans. Ask for quiet and wait with explanation until it is.
- Hard to hear at table. More microphones.
- Don’t thump the microphone. We are not children.
- Take the microphone away from the facilitator. Just because the meeting is in an elementary school doesn’t mean we are 2nd graders.
- Microphone thumping was condescending.
- No beating on microphone-demeaning. Different consultant-Ann.
- No microphone banging. Stop tapping the microphone. Stop hitting your microphone, please.
- Facilitator allowed specific group to run an “off-shoot” (Rogue Talley) for leaving park natural.
• Public comments at the beginning.
• Question and answer session should not be done at the end when people are trying to leave.
• More time allowed for questions and answers.
• Stayed home. Leave the park alone.
• Really emphasize that this is not a voting process, or if it is, the audience is the city of Billings, not this small neighborhood—the NIMBY attitudes are extremely pervasive.
• I don’t know.

WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR THE FINAL TOWN HALL MEETING?
• Add an option that includes a bridge at the school with no changes to the trails.
• Meet as stated-Alkali Creek. Have presentation on Web before meeting to allow for public preview.
• Please put scenarios presented on power point on the website.
• Complete answers to who, where, why of park (Pow Wow) improvements at trail along Alkali Creek Road.
• Bring Heritage Trail map to show how this would fit in to that plan.
• Have clear language and plans set out for us to vote on. State the option clearly.
• Show top options and similar comments.
• All options nailed down and clear.
• Need to see Master Plan.
• Public comments first.
• Colored coded trails as handout to ease understanding.
• Have a final vote if this project should be constructed at all and have it a final decision.
• Take votes. Ballots. Give a show of hands—who wants what. Make it clear as to the true desires of the neighbors and attendees.
• Let people vote on what they want. Not a binding vote, but at least get a representative outlook.
• Have agenda posted on the web before the meeting. Make sure there’s good notice.
• A field trip of the park area with the land owners.
• Field trip to view this area. Potluck BBQ.
• Don’t allow out of area people here.
• Hold meetings in other areas of the city-adjacent landowners are not the only ones interested in this issue and process should not cater to them.
• Hold at an impartial location. Jolene’s resultant study was a soft trail b/c of local demand and response.
• Invite larger representation of entire Billings’s community—not just Heights residents.
• Someplace other than Alkali Creek School to see that entire community’s voice is heard.
• Hold in another facility to get a larger representation from the Billings area.
• Hold it in a town central location.
• Keep at school. Same place. Have it here. Thanks for keeping it here.
• Acknowledge the expectation that planners must respond to public at large not just special groups.
• Don’t do one? Tell all the people who don’t have property on the creek to stay home.
• A field trip sponsored by the adjacent landowners. Perhaps a potluck BBQ. Informal.
• Segregate small groups so not as much time is spent in debate.
• Pow Wow Park should be left alone. Quite evident by the applause.
• Dim lights for easier screen viewing.
• Open doors. It’s too warm. Have water available.
• Be sure and have one. Too noisy, hard to hear each other.
• Smaller tables so people can hear each other.
• Round table-couldn’t hear well.

WHAT QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS DO YOU STILL HAVE?
• Need to see Master Plan proposal.
• Put Heritage Plan on the website. Put M/Side annexation agreement on the website to avoid further misrepresentation as to what it says.
• Where is funding coming from?
• Are the park hours—opening 6:00 a.m.—closing 10:00 p.m. to remain the same? Will they be enforced?
• Shouldn’t the city undertake an archaeological and historical survey of the entire project corridor before designs are carried further? If federal money is used for trail construction then cultural resources need
consideration. If significant historic/archaeological sites are discovered in the park and/or project corridor then the options for the city are avoiding the sites or mitigating the sites. Considering the cost of archaeological mitigation it seems likely that avoidance would be the only option so site survey should precede final design plans. The options presented on 4/27/05 could be “out the window” if significant historic/archaeological sites are discovered.

- Will we have a final say about - if any improvements are made?
- Seems that all alternatives are more elaborate than I anticipated. Concern over $ and future maintenance. Also wonder why a ‘no-action’ alternative was not included as a requirement of the process. I still would prefer a relatively low impact level option. Apparent that some good work has taken place tho.
- Leave this park natural.
- Leave park natural. Build bridge at school and have ADA access with viewing bridge.
- Why not leave it the way it is?
- Why do anything. I am puzzled why we are identifying options that cost $.
- Whose idea was this park improvement? Most of us enjoy nature as it is.
- Still want a natural setting. What is wrong with natural habitats?
- I think it was clear at our table (11 people) that we favor a bridge at the school to allow for better park access but we do not favor significant changes to the park. Natural is best.
- Scale down.
- We would like to see a bridge build and the school children enjoy access to the park. But leave it natural.
- Leave the park as it is. Put in one good access at the school and leave the rest alone.
- Why do we not leave it the way it is. If we have to spend the $ build a bridge so the kids can get across the creek.
- Why do we have to do anything to the Park – except clean it up and build a few bridges? Why does it have to be so fancy?
- Most people have the common goal of keeping the beauty of the park in a natural state. Accessibility is the issue. Some want it to be exclusive, others want more general access.
- Concerns regarding predators near school. No invasion on personal property – including looking into people’s backyard; bridges built next to houses; keep neighborhood as private as possible; would like to see trails higher and further away from houses.
- Leave park as is except foot bridge.
- It seems there’s only one real public access-school. Possible other access may be possible at church property.
- Those who live here do not want any improvements. Use bond issue voted in as guide for bike path. Most bikers use roads anyway-why ruin the park.
- Make bike path totally along Alkali Creek Road all the way to Airport Road.
- Let's have the bikers meet with Ron Appel to hear his input.
- Looking forward to concrete, realistic factors like funding, i.e., trail plan and federal funding (ADA, secured maintenance plan/funding). I am concerned about connectiveness to Heritage Trail plan. I believe the trail should be hard surface for ADA and maintenance.
- I am very much in favor of a comprehensive trail system for Billings-one that is OFF the roadway and safe for children and adults. Soft trails are preferable to me as a runner, as long as they meet ADA standards. If this park is such a special and unique place with an abundance of wildlife, they everyone (including the disabled) should have access to it.
- I'm very surprised that a hard surface trail wasn't even an option. In the long run, it will be less intrusive than soft surface. The soft surface trail needs to be maintained often. Hard surface makes a mess once and it's usable by everybody.
- I think hard paths should be included-this area is to include many modes of use-bikes, strollers, kids on trikes, handicapped- I do not think soft surface or pea gravel is a good enough surface for wheel chairs-handicapped- I think you should have some hard surface and some soft surface.
- Hard surface is the best option if we are going to go with this. Lowest maintenance, best access for everyone.
- I still favor a hard surface “through” trail.
- I really strongly support maximum ADA availability and a 10 foot wide, concrete path will provide that. Provide benches, tables, shelter and facilities to make the experience enjoyable for the elderly, handicapped, families with young kids. Do not bow to this NIMBY attitude.
- Paths have worked well in many cities with good results.
• Why are we dead ending at Morningside? Let’s wait until the city decides what to do about Airport Hill.
• Is there a workable compromise?
• If people in Moon Valley want a concrete path, why not put it in their backyards.
• I was here for info only. We own the church building at 383 Alkali Creek Rd. These plans do not effect this property at all.
• Please do not tap on microphone.
• Can we make this shorter?
• Our group insisted on counting #s of people not present and they gave us their proxy excuse. Only 8 people at table. Used 10.

APPENDIX C

TOWN HALL MEETING III: MAY 26, 2005

COLLATION OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANT RESPONSES

The data recorded below represent a collation of responses produced by individual participants. Each attendee was asked to respond to three questions. These responses reflect the exact wording recorded on the participant feedback handouts. Total number of participants who signed in: 49

WHAT ARE THE POSITIVES ABOUT THE RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE SELECTED?

• The bridge.
• Bridge at school.
• Access at the school.
• Bridge access to the park.
• The bridge access at the school.
• The bridge is very, very positive.
• Bridge access at the school.
• Bridge option #1 at the school is excellent. No hard trails.
• Access to park for school children and community. So much work has been done on this and it’s really appreciated. Expanded use-should be a resource for everyone.
• The bridge at the school is a positive. Removing the upper trail on the Quiet Water end was a smart move. No hard trails.
• Better access for everyone-won’t feel like you’re in someone’s backyard-majority of park left natural.
• Access by all who live in the area. Will keep erosion to a minimum. The trail will reduce impact to the rest of the park.
• We need a park here. 5% impact is nothing.
• I like the plan. But wish it was hard surface. Please know that these property owners are not the majority in the Alkali Creek area.
• Compromise, access to more people.
• This strikes me as a reasonable compromise between two very wide opinions.
• I would still prefer the Park be left as natural. However, I believe the proposed plan is a valid compromise. Soft trail 6′ wide maximum seems large but I understand coupling with the Heritage trail plan. Please mark park boundaries clearly and soon.
• It is a compromise. Do the bridge at the school but leave the rest natural.
• The bridge at the school. Keeping trail 6 ft. Keep trail soft or as it is in its original state.
• Bridge access from school only.
• Bridge access at the school. No other proposals are positive but negative.
• Only the bridge. Leave the rest alone.
• Bridge only. You are doing what you want not what the community wants.
• The bridge is the only positive I see and it is more expansive that what might be needed.
• Bridge at school only. Leave the rest as is.
• The majority states to build the bridge at Alkali Creek with signs and handicap parking. That is what is needed.
• The bridge at the school—other than that there are no positives.
• The only positive part would be a bridge by the school and if that means improvement of any kind to the park, I say leave the bridge out too, and leave everything natural.
• The people of Billings in specific 99% do not want this.
• I still do not want any changes done to the park. I do not like things all ready decided—ask public opinion and yet do what they want—what has to be done to make people listen?
• There are no positives about the alternative selection. We asked for a bridge and a bridge only. Then the lady w/grandkids who went to church in their socks could go across the bridge and then get muddy.
• There are none. Leave it natural is not appearing as an option.
• I find this meeting frustrating. You aren’t listening. We don’t want alternatives—just leave the park as a natural preserve.
• We didn’t want trails to begin with. By voting for bridge at school, I didn’t vote for trail development.
• School access bridge. If you can’t build the bridge without destroying everything else then don’t build it.
• Leave the park alone. No improvements.
• No positives.
• No positives.
• None.

WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES CONCERNING THE RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE?

• That the citizens do not want the trail improved and do not want a 10’ wide super highway bridge into the park but you have already decided on the plan before asking us.
• The planners are not listening to the majority. We do not want trail improvement.
• Getting this whole process stopped and left natural. For some reason, unbeknown to us, we aren’t being heard.
• Remove the soft trail plan. Destruction of habitat. Destruction of natural beauty. Cost of maintenance is prohibitive. I am outraged that the master plan is going to be presented with soft trails as a “compromise.” I think it does not represent the vast majority who want the park to be left natural.
• I don’t think we’ve been heard. Build a bridge—leave the park alone.
• The majority of the people still want to leave the park natural. Jolene’s assumption that 99% of the people at meeting #2 wanting a bridge at the school meant that they wanted development is a gross error. You can have a bridge without development.
• Everything except the bridge.
• We don’t want anything but the bridge if we have to have anything. You are not listening to what people want/need. Meetings are too long.
• Should not have been any had you listened.
• Public support is not in favor of the proposed plan.
• The challenges are getting the city to listen to us and leave the park natural.
• We don’t want the park changed. I believe the neighborhood can build a bridge for less than $500,000 (this is the carrot you dangle before us.)
• They do not consider our input at all—we love what we have and do not want to ruin what we have. What we have is unique and we don’t want to make it look like other places.
• You are not showing the “leave as is” as an option.
• There shouldn’t be any [challenges] because we didn’t want it.
• Very passionate feeling about leaving the park natural “as is” seems to have been lost.
• No hard trail, more maintenance.
• This spring the wildflowers were spectacular. Most line the existing trail. Widening the trail to 6’ would wipe out a large number of them. A bridge doesn’t mean we want development.
• Widening the trail will impact on the natural terrain.
• May 26th meeting proposal is ok with the bridge. Leave the trails alone.
• Prefer hard trail if funding available as a caveat.
• Getting area residents on board this compromise proposal.
• To instill the good of the public use of the park.
• Selling it to the adjacent park homeowners. Deciding to do what is best for all others who also want to use the park.
• Silencing the nimbys. ADA access. Wildlife living in PWP is compatible with human existence.
• We are just hearing from a number of adjacent property owners who don’t want a trail. Unfortunately, most residents aren’t as organized and vocal as those adjacent property owners. The adjacent property owners are not representing the community.
• Doesn’t meet everyone’s needs but no plan will--keep the plan as natural as possible.
• This should only go forward as a complete project – not done in stages – except I’d prefer you just build the bridge and stop. Piecemeal development will only engage a greater level of hostility to this plan and process.
• The cost of the project.
• Funding.
• Maintenance.
• Maintenance and associated costs.
• No maintenance budget. Reclamation of construction damage. Destroying natural area within the city--this is not fit for development.
• Problems with trash. Kids are partying in the park now. Who’s going to stop it now. The police cannot make it out. Who will do the maintenance of the park.
• Increased traffic on narrow streets (Judicial, Quiet Water).
• Safety.
• Impact on wildlife.
• Impact to adjacent property owners.
• Grade elevations. Keeping the park in its natural state.
• Too much visibility and upkeep.
• Damage to the natural--not only during construction but permanently altering the natural hiking trails.

WHAT COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS DO WE HAVE FOR THE CITY IN MOVING THIS PROJECT FORWARD?
• I love it. Let’s get moving.
• Good plan. Please move ahead.
• Great plan. Move ahead.
• Get it done. Kids and bikes need a place to go. Not all the people impacted are represented at the meetings. This was my first meeting. There are a lot of others like me who want this. Hard trail is better.
• The “majority” of Billings’s residents are not represented at this meeting. The meeting is hijacked by adjacent property owners.
• Be courageous. Represent everyone not just the few adjacent property owners who have had exclusive use of the 54 acres for 35 years. It’s time for others to be able to use it too.
• Good luck. Stay the course. Stand tall. Identify all adjacent and A/Creek corridor residents who will support so that nimbys “alleged” majority does not control. Remember that PWP is a city park, not a park only for the adjacent landowners. Remember that area was compromised when area was subdivided and the first house was built.
• I think that the recommended plan is a reasonable direction for Pow Wow Park.
• At the 3rd meeting we basically heard from adjacent property owners who want their backyards left alone. Trails are an asset to a community. Heights and Billings residents should have access to this city park. Move forward with the plan.
• Seek an easement from the school to put a trail on the school side of the creek. It can connect to the bike trail along the Road (Alkali Creek Road) but can wind behind the school and playground and reconnect on the paved dirt road (Indian Trail) and then to Alkali Creek Road.
• Show where the support for these compromises come from.
• I’m not sure. I would like the City Council members to walk this trail before they make any decisions. I have participated in last year’s and all of this year’s meetings and have a greater appreciation of the process.
• Adjacent property owners (I am not one) will experience the greatest impact. Studies are available that document decreased property values created by adjacent trails for example. Therefore these property owners should have a weighted consideration.
• Would like to have had a plan for just the bridge.
• Stop--except for the bridge.
• We do not want it to move forward. We asked for a bridge and that is all. Then anybody can get on the bridge and then decide how far they want to walk. Stop. Look and Listen.
• Build a bridge-concentrate on extending the trail along Alkali Creek Road east out of the valley to connect with the other trails to the city. Stop. Look and Listen.
• Listen to the residents of the area involved.
• Stop, look and listen to us.
• Stop, look, and listen.
• Stop. Look. Listen.
• Stop. Look and Listen.
• Stop. Look and Listen.
• Listen to the people not the consultants.
• The city should drop this project and leave the park as it is. The majority at every meeting has said such.
• Stop. Look. Listen. Leave the park as is--no improvements.
• Stop, look, listen to what the majority of us want--leave as is. Town hall meetings have been a waste because we aren't being listened to.
• Either leave the park totally natural or build only the bridge. There is a bike path along Alkali Creek Road. This is a huge waste of tax $$$. Designate Pow Wow Park a natural park without changing the trails.
• Listen to the people--they want to leave the park natural. Every time a bit of nature is chipped away and “improved” we are taking away a natural state. Do we dare do that to our children? The park as it is now is a safe haven for dozens and dozens of children to romp and play everyday. “Improvements” bring more people and the safety of our children is then jeopardized. Please--leave it alone.
• Leave the park natural.
• Leave park natural. Do not implement trail off Black Pine. It goes no where. Wait until Airport Hill project is decided.
• Seeking public comment was a “hoop” the city provided to attempt to satisfy the community members that live in Alkali Creek. The decision was made 2 years ago or longer and this process was not appreciated. The city should pay for our time that we spent especially when the question was asked the first night if this process was really going to be open to public comments that would be listened to.
• Why do we have these meetings when you do what you design not what we want.
• Most people I invited to come to the meeting said why--they have the plans done and marked on maps. You took away hope that we had a say about a park we care about and take care of.
• Through the town hall meeting process it was very evident that the majority of the attendees are not in favor of significant development of the park. That is not being represented by the proposal put forth by Peaks to Plains.
• Let's put the $650,000 towards a pool in the Heights instead.
• Leave this park as a natural preserve. That is my choice of a plan. I will be there on June 27 and so will my neighbors.
• Keep in mind that another trail is being built along Alkali Creek. Let's not waste more taxpayers’ monies. Private property owners will take a big impact in this project. Don’t forget them.
• We strongly urge the council to not adopt the proposed master plan for Pow Wow Park.
• Don't move forward--leave as is.
• Listen to the adjoining homeowners and the participants of the town hall meetings. Leave it as natural as possible.
• They need to have the bridge but do not need 6’ hard trails by Judicial Avenue. It would be impossible to make the trail, in the first place.
• No one wants it. How hard is that to understand. Spend the money somewhere else.
• Do not proceed with this idea.

**SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS**

**WHAT WORKED WELL IN THIS MEETING?**
• More public opinion allowed.
• Public comment.
• The public being able to express their opinions.
• Good public comment.
• It was nice to be able to get our comments heard. Now please listen.
• Open forum. Questions and answers. Good comments.
• Many great comments.
• I appreciate people having a chance to say what they think.
• The people expressed their opinion which should be listened to.
• Better crowd control re: negative comments.
• The people had a chance to comment. Soliciting public comments is a difficult and emotional process. I believe that you’ve done a good job encouraging everyone to speak.
• Microphones. Time for public comments. Each person can do feedback.
• Public opinion is important. Like the comments from previous meetings.
• Open comments-excellent graphics-sharing of data from previous meetings.
• Individual comments vs. group comments from tables.
• Answering of questions from previous meetings.
• Formal presentation of preferred alternative. The experts you brought forward.
• Slide presentation is informative. Presentation of project good.
• Presenters were well-prepared and seemed open to comments.
• The presentation was well done. They did go more in the direction people want. But most of the trails should be natural. Low trails by the bridge would give handicap access and use but it should be contained. I feel that it was well represented.
• Well organized.
• It was well run. Glad council members showed up.
• Shorter time. Appreciate request for names and addresses. Better maps.
• Handouts.
• Only the bridge.
• You didn’t listen—you continue to push this project.
• I learned this process is a farce.

WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN DONE DIFFERENTLY?
• You did your best.
• I am not sure you could have done anything to satisfy the “do nothing” crowd.
• Participants in the audience could have been more respectful.
• Several questions directed to those in charge were not answered.
• Some questions were not answered completely.
• Could have used better explanation on some of the proposals.
• I would have liked to have heard how Jolene and staff determined how to reach the proposed compromise. How were the constituencies identified? How large were they? Did staff have a larger piece of the decision making than public comment?
• Not allow people to speak without microphone. Could only hear parts of their comments.
• Public comment needs to be noted during the whole meeting and documented.
• Wait till open public comment to let the people complain. Questions should be questions.
• No preconceived decisions. A real chance to change the basic concepts.
• Leave the soft trails out of the Master Plan. Leave it natural.
• Create a plan we want. Leave it natural.
• Stop. Look and Listen. It has not been done.
• Listen to what was said.
• Larger print on the slide show.
• Should be held at a location that is reflective of the Billings citizens, not just the local area. The 2nd town hall meeting should not have changed location.
• Diet Coke instead of Diet Pepsi—just kidding.
• Provide boxing gloves (kidding).

ANY OTHER COMMENTS?
• I enjoyed the shorter meeting. 6:30 P.M. – 9:00 P.M. was too long. Thank you Jolene and Ann. You conducted yourselves very well under difficult circumstances.
• These people are not the majority, but they are well organized.
• Thanks for shorter meeting. Thanks for your gracious handling of meeting.
• The organization and attention to detail. Amount of work that went into this process is amazing. You all have a tough job. Thanks for encouraging openness of comment period.
• I just listened but am considering to get more involved to help support the development. Often those who are the loudest are not always the majority.
• Presented a plan that matched our input.
• I will support the proposal even though it does not involve everything I want.
• I would have liked to have seen the speakers identify themselves.
• Dave Brown needs to recuse himself from future votes on this issue since he is an adjacent property owner to Pow Wow Park.
• I found it very strange that not one Bike Net person was not here. They have been at all the other meetings—so why not now. I was glad not to see them—but wonder what they are up to.
• Too long. This is the 3rd time I’m paying for a babysitter. $20 \times 3 = $60. More meetings to come with no positive outcome which cost me-in all ways.
• There is no reason for the Master Plan to include the trails. The bridge-yes. Trails-no.
• Please listen. Leave the park natural.
• I think we have been patient and are considering our stewardship of this land. Do not develop this park.
• In 1997 when the old bridge was flooded out I called to see how it could be replaced. I was told that Pow Wow Park is not a concern and there wasn’t money for maintenance. So people in the area have always taken care of it. Listen to us.
• We want this Pow Wow Park to stay as a natural park to enjoy the plants, animals, etc.
• The majority spoke. Leave the park alone.
• Nothing was implemented from the previous meetings.
• The commentator was a little defensive. Respect the people. Respect the land. Do not let the organized Bike Net organization run the decision. This is a local matter.
• I hope that the interest we have shown will be listened to.
**Key:**
- $x$ = Breakdown of Cost Estimate

**Pow Wow Park/ Alkali Creek Corridor**
**Recommended Master Plan Alternative**
**June 2005 - Exhibit E**
Trailhead Perspective
The trailhead will be comprised of three sign panels that will contain overall park information, including maps, rules and interpretation of physical and cultural features. Site furniture such as benches, bike racks and trash receptacles may also be placed in this area.

Boundary Signage
Simple signage, as suggested above, should be placed regularly along the property lines to clearly mark the public park boundaries.

Bridge Access
Access into the main park from the west is considered a high priority for the neighborhood and community. Shown is an example of a bridge design appropriate for this area. Bridge abutments must be located outside of the floodplain for permitting and maintenance purposes. Any improvements will need to comply with current ADA regulations at the time of implementation. The east end of the bridge will rest on the island within the oxbow.

Retain the Natural Character
The cliff face, natural vegetation and riparian ecosystem should be retained through effective management strategies and neighborhood partnerships.

*Remaining park lands not shown on graphic to remain in “as-is” condition.
BUDGETARY COST ESTIMATE

Project:  
Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor Master Plan

Phase:  
Recommended Master Plan Alternative

Date:  
June 1, 2005

Prepared By:  
Peaks to Plains Design, P.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONNECTION FROM SCHOOL AREA TO JUDICIAL AVENUE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL ACCESS AREA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONNECTION FROM SCHOOL TO QUIET WATER AVENUE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BBWA CANAL CONNECTION FROM BLACK PINE STREET</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
$ 655,325

Recommended Alternative
### BUDGETARY COST ESTIMATE

**Project:** Pow Wow Park/Alkali Creek Corridor Master Plan

**Phase:** Adopted Master Plan

**Date:** July 15, 2005

**Prepared By:** Peaks to Plains Design, P.C

#### SCHOOL ACCESS AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Sidewalk - Design Standard</td>
<td>10' Width - School</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$23.87</td>
<td>$18,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb &amp; Gutter - City of Billings Std</td>
<td>Along School Property</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Ramps - ADA</td>
<td>with colored concrete - School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$195.00</td>
<td>$585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Specalities - Pavement Markings</td>
<td>Handicap Symbol &amp; Stall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$57.55</td>
<td>$58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving Specalities - Pavement Markings</td>
<td>Crosswalk Striping 12&quot;x5&quot; Inlaid Thermoplastic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>$660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Reclamation - Turf Type</td>
<td>Drill or Hydroseeded - School</td>
<td>21780</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$2,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>2&quot; Caliper B&amp;B - School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td>$2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Sidewalk - Design Standard</td>
<td>10' Width - Park</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$23.87</td>
<td>$7,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Surfacing</td>
<td>Trailhead 5&quot;/6&quot; section</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>2&quot; Caliper B&amp;B - Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Rack</td>
<td>6&quot; Length</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter Recepticle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretative Boards</td>
<td>Trailhead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Signage</td>
<td>Carsonite Boundary Signs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge - 10' Width x 150' Length</td>
<td>Ambulance Load</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$175,000.00</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Trail</td>
<td>6' Width - Minimal length as per ADA Regulations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$9.78</td>
<td>$9.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Species Reclamation</td>
<td>Scarify &amp; Plant Grasses &amp; Forbes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL** | | | | | **$217,878**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZATION &amp; INSURANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$21,788</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$35,950</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL FEES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$41,342</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | | | | | **$316,957**

*Items marked “School” are improvements located on School District 2 Properties, not on public park land, but may be eligible for grant assistance to complete access from the roadway and sidewalks to an access point connecting to the north side of the park.*