

Monica Cooper, chair-"Friends of NE Park" (aprox. 400 members)  
Member, NE Park Task Force  
Family has lived adjacent to NE park since 1964

I would like to thank the City Commission for setting up a very professionally run task force for NE Park. Questions, however, about events leading up to the present task force need to be addressed.

In looking at the chronology list provided by Public works at our last task force meeting (see attached) from the inception of the stormwater proposal on Nov. 16, 1999 to the present, no mention is made of the commission's role in this progression. I was recently told by Teresa Scott that this project had been ~~had been~~ referred to Public Works by the city commission. And I was told by Ms. Scott on Jan. 5<sup>th</sup> that after going through the Development Review Board they could go ahead with the project, and also that a major reason for placing it in the park was the fact that this was free land.

The neighbors on the periphery of the park who were notified of the Development Review Board meeting to be held on Jan. 11<sup>th</sup> received a letter on January 2<sup>nd</sup>. One weeks notice was given! As I understand it, only the Capstone development but not the skateboard facility or the retention facility would have had to go back to the Planning Department for review.

My questions and concerns are as follows:

- 1) Did the City Commission give Public Works the authority to go ahead with investigating and planning a stormwater facility in NE Park?
- 2) Is it city policy that changes in parkland can be made without any review by citizens or the commission once the Parks Department or Public Works Department deems it to be good use of the land?

3) I, and many others, find it highly objectionable that the idea of shared stormwater retention being encouraged by the city would be carried over to the use of a public park to benefit the needs of an adjacent developer.

I would like answers to each of these concerns and would like to see where this is written as city policy.

I would like to submit that it be written in legal terms that a public park cannot be altered without extensive review by the public and the city commission over an extended ( and well advertised) period of time. Countless hours have been sacrificed by many outraged citizens who were forced to respond in an emergency state to rectify bad or non-existent city policy concerning property belonging to the public. We would like to be certain that decades from now this situation does not reappear.