Tue, 15 Apr 2014 12:51:03 -0400 [04/15/2014 12:51:03 PM EDT]

From:

To: skateparkideas@brattleboro.org

Subject: [No Subject]

Hi Carol, Please use this copy to send along to committee instead of previous e-mail of the same which I hope you will delete as it contains private conversations afterward I accidently sent , if you could let me know you have done this I would appreciate it, thank you, Les

Hi , members

I think the present criteria list is, on the whole, very comprehensive and a great effort in my opinion for what it's worth, but my fear is it may tend to be way too padded and lopsided in favor of the skate park having to be located in a mixed use park in a populated neighborhood chocking up a disproportionate amount of points in common for this certain grouping of criteria that I had mentioned about in previous e-mail, save all the grammatical errors I made in the letter. I apologize for that and should have proofread more thoroughly, happened to be in a hurry at that time, and I hope the content is comprehendible over all for all of you, but offer this condensed version as well.

I'm really having a hard time interpreting the grey areas of what can be viewed as a positive or negative with criteria. That is mainly the reason why I came up with the format I submitted to avoid some of these that tend to overlap and are repetitious in nature, but at the same time use up valuable points, not so much conserve refine or distribute them equally.

1.) Size: b.) Meets design criteria, Isn't this really covered in a. under the same category

2.) Location: d.) Near neighborhoods / population density (this doesn't address being too close(distance or set back) to or on top of neighborhoods, yet gets a positive rating if it is.

3.) Location: f.) Proximate to other recreational attractions (Again this can be a negative issue if they are on top of one another with overlapping use or even forcing displacement, yet gets a positive rating)

4.) Location: k.) Liveliness-level of activity (This is an unfair question if the location in not a rec park, how can there be any activity in a parking lot and treat this as a negative, yet would be if there was a skate park there, again chock up another for mixed use park like Crowell Park)

5.) Safety: c.) Recreational diversity or potential (chock up another for mixed use) or should this already be covered under "room for expansion".

6.) Cost: d) How is the site being currently used? (not sure how you go about rating this question, is it a negative or a positive, is it being a

rec park that is viewed as positive again as opposed to a loss in revenue for a parking lot?)

7.) Topography: g.) Green to gray/gray to green (These are two entirely different concepts and should be rated separately to avoid cancelling each other to no avail or am I missing something I hope?)

If for example you are rating the Elm Street Lot you have already potentially 20 points against it from above criteria mentioned simply because it is not located in a Rec Park or mixed use park which I do not think this is entirely fair.

I still do not see why the three locations at LMP are not being rated individually as they are very different in relation thus having to be graded differently.

I understand because I was unable to make the final meeting dealing with criteria, thus missing that particular discussion, I may be missing the rationalization of what I see as a disproportionate way of grading sites favoring existing mixed use in a populated neighborhood which could be addressed once instead of multiple times throughout criteria. As it is the criteria check list allows a questionable degree of attention to be devoted to this designation covered in most all of the categories to promoting this preference above other criteria that is just as important, may have been overlooked or is in fact omitting important impacts not being considered I had mentioned in previous e-mail. >thanks< Les

| This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus

protection is active.

| http://www.avast.com

This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.
http://www.avast.com

Tue, 15 Apr 2014 10:26:04 -0400 [04/15/2014 10:26:04 AM EDT]
From: [redacted]
To: skateparkideas@brattleboro.org
Subject: Skate park suggestion from 2012

[Hide Quoted Text]

> Brattleboro Reformer (VT)
>
> January 28, 2012
> Section: Opinion
> Article ID: 01281204_art_7.xml
> Page: 04
>
> Alternative Skate
> Park location
> Editor of the Reformer:
>
> Why not consider the under used parking lot on the corner of Flat and Elm streets as a new location for the skate board park?
>
> 1. No trees would be affected.
>
> 2. No run off problem.
>
> 3. No small children around.
>
> 4. Close to the girls and boys club.
>
> 5. Only one neighbor across Flat Street.
>
> 6. There is parking.
>
> 7. There could be a bathroom.
>
> 8. It is very open; no hiding places.
>
> 9. It is in town easy to get to.
>
> As for the current Police and Fire Station location: There is indeed a value to the town, the Elliot Street area in particular, to have the fire station as a presence at its present location. With the laundry closing why not consider the possibility of acquiring the laundry, and also incorporating the under used parking lot behind the laundry? This would be a lot of square footage for both departments, they would remain in the town, and not have to deal with the traffic problems at exit 2 which I understand is a proposed location.
>
> Stewart McDermet,
>
> Brattleboro, Jan. 24
> Bob Audette
> Brattleboro Reformer

Mon, 14 Apr 2014 17:20:28 -0400 [04/14/2014 05:20:28 PM EDT]

From: [redacted]

To: skateparkideas@brattleboro.org

Subject: Elliot St. Park

I understand that the Elliot St. park is being considered as the location for the new skatepark to be built. I'm glad the committee is searching for new locations, as I think the beauty and current utility of the Crowell Lot would have been too compromised. The Elliot St park lacks such problems. It's not used much currently, that I know of, and has a reputation for drug dealing at night. It would be nice to see it used more and in a positive way. However, I have one significant concern, which is noise. My home is located on Elliot St, and I'm always amazed at how much noise skateboard wheels make when a skateboarder goes by on the road. It's quite remarkable. I think the lot on Frost/Flat St. might be better as noise would be less of an issue, and it would be nice for the town to create something attractive in that part of town. The development of a skatepark there would be an aesthetic improvement over what's there now, in contrast to using the Crowell Lot, which would mean destroying current beauty.

Thanks for taking the time to consider my opinion.

Regards,
Paul Rodrigue.

Sat, 12 Apr 2014 12:28:42 -0400 [04/12/2014 12:28:42 PM EDT]

From:

To: skateparkideas@brattleboro.org

Subject: Star date 4/12/14

Hi,

I would like to know if for future site visits it would be possible if there could be a 15 min Q/A period for those not on the committee wanting to ask questions about features that our more adequately referred to firsthand at the potential site location, otherwise I personally do not see the sense in attending these gatherings since the committee members are busy concentrating on their own time to rate criteria unless it is just to get a visual.

Also I would like to comment on the final criteria being used, I believe there too much emphasis and weight placed or relating to the skate park having to be located amongst other sport activities favoring and rating as an absolute positive, such as on Location: f.) "Proximate to other recreational attractions", Safety: d.) "Recreation Diversity or Potential" (how does this pertain to safety if there is overcrowded and cramped confines of different age groups ie. Playground right next to skate park) or should this be already covered under " Room for expansion", Cost: d.) "How is the site being currently used" (this is a cost issue, not really giving any consideration "specifically" to other existing park uses possibly being displaced or reduced and the consequence/impact to

There is nothing mentioned in the criteria that addresses

There is nothing mentioned about being close to steep hilled roadways under Topography.

These are all major issues that have been discussed a previous select board meetings concern with the skate park planning.

How is "Liveliness - Level of Activity" k.) Location graded? Is it the existing use of the park or proximity to other youth attractions in surrounding area such as Youth Theater, B& G's Club and COOP? Hasn't this been covered already to a degree under above mentioned criteria basically covering level of activity rec. or otherwise, Population Density?

As far as the Impacts I submitted addressing sites< Historic Significance , Tree Removal, Construction Impacts and Access, Set Back for Safety, Overcrowding, Loss of Parking, Fences and Barriers, Respect to Neighborhood in close to Proximity ect. I think most of which was lumped together and reduced to one category "Other Physical and Environment concerns" which I'm not sure how you would rate as they are so different

begin with. Nothing on th threat to existing Park Trees after all we've been through.

I also attended the public meeting, unfortunately held at the same time as the last SSSC meeting and why I did not attend, addressing the intersection of Western and Union Hill and there are no guarantees this will under the current grant available to draw from that will insure all hazards with criss- crossing traffic flow hesitation and speeds concerned can be adequately delt with by creating bump outs. Thank you for your work, Les

---
This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.
http://www.avast.com

Tue, 15 Apr 2014 12:53:20 -0400 [04/15/2014 12:53:20 PM EDT]

From: [redacted]
To: skateparkideas@brattleboro.org
Cc: Frederic NoYes <furtling@gmail.com>
Subject: Elm/Frost/Flat location possibility - local support

There's been some buzz that the corner of Elm and Frost has been considered for the skatepark, and I just wanted to chime in that I have been thinking for years that this would be an excellent location.
It's level, across from Youth Theater, near B&G club, accessible to whole town, easy to patrol and monitor, and should be easier parking than in other spots.
I own or co-own houses at 87, 121 and 123/125 Frost, and that site has my support!

Thanks for your work.

Tim Wessel

--
Vermont Films
87 Frost Street
Brattleboro, VT 05301
www.vermontfilms.com
Office - (802) 254-2800

Sun, 13 Apr 2014 12:36:08 GMT [04/13/2014 08:36:08 AM EDT]

From: [redacted]

To: skateparkideas@brattleboro.org

Subject: site selection concerns

I would like to commend the Skatepark Site Selection Committee for an exceptional job thus far. However, I would like to bring two of my concerns to your attention. At the beginning of this process, your committee took all ideas for possible locations from the public, which exceeded 50 sites. Everyone had the ability to voice their opinion and then these sites were studied and removed for various reasons until they were narrowed down to the final eight. The group also took in everyone’s input as to what criteria should be used to evaluate these sites. After everyone had the ability to voice their opinions, the group weighed each suggestion and came up with a set of criteria that your group agreed upon. You have done an excellent job to be sure no rock is left unturned. Unfortunately, I feel your process has suddenly gone astray. The public has had the opportunity to voice their opinions throughout this entire process until now. I suddenly feel like the door has been closed. The site visits have been scheduled and publicly warned so the public can participate. Yet no one was allowed to offer opinions or insight at these visits. Making the public wait until after the visits to voice their opinions is pointless since those sites have already been rated at that point. At the April 3rd meeting, it was asked by one of your committee members what was the best way to get input from the skateboarders. There were two skateboarders and one BMX biker present at the April 10th meeting. But when they tried to voice their opinions regarding the sites that were just visited, the meeting was shut down because individuals “didn’t like where the conversation was going”. If this skatepark is ultimately for the skateboarders, shouldn’t their opinion mean anything? I feel that having all factual information about a site as well as allowing all opinions to be heard is the most productive way to accurately rate a site. Opinions can be quite valid or can seem far-fetched. But either way, everyone should have the ability to make those comments. It’s then up to the individual committee members to evaluate whether they feel that information is helpful or something they disagree with and wish to discard before casting their votes for that site. My second concern that I feel is much more important than the first is the process that has been suddenly dictated without discussion as to how the votes will be added up and turned in. It has been stated that the scores will not be turned in until all the sites have been visited and evaluated so members can potentially go back and alter a score for a site at a later date. How can allowing score manipulation be an acceptable practice with such a thorough and critical committee? If members are completely informed of all pertinent information regarding each site and they truly evaluate each site for it’s true potential, why would one need to have the ability to alter a score? When the final site is presented to the Selectboard, how can people feel confident that this is truly the best site with the highest score and not just a site that’s had it’s scores adjusted to ensure that the desired site implied by town officials is the proper one being presented? I feel taking the extra time to accurately rate each site for it’s true potential and immediately turning in your scores to a neutral party is the only way to ensure a fair process. Again, the Skatepark Site Selection Committee has done a commendable job to be sure every rock is left unturned. It’s concerning to see all your hard work suddenly swept

The #1 Worst Carb Ever?
Click to Learn #1 Carb that Kills Your Blood Sugar (Don't Eat This!)
http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3241/534a84ff4d7934fe5013st04vuc