



**Montana Fish,  
Wildlife & Parks**

# **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

## **For LWCF Grant Applications**

**MISSION.** Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, through its employees and citizen commission, provides for the stewardship of the fish, wildlife, parks and recreational resources of Montana, while contributing to the quality of life for present and future generations

All Montanans have the right to live in a clean and healthful environment. This environmental analysis is intended to provide an evaluation of the likely impacts to the human environment from proposed actions of the project cited below. This analysis will help Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks to fulfill its oversight obligations and satisfy rules and regulations of both the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Please provide a discussion for each section. If no impacts are likely, be sure to discuss the reasoning that led to your determination.

### **PART I. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION**

1. Type of proposed action.

- |                       |       |
|-----------------------|-------|
|                       | X     |
| Development           | _____ |
| Renovation            | _____ |
| Maintenance           | _____ |
| Land Acquisition      | _____ |
| Equipment Acquisition | _____ |
| Other (Describe)      |       |

2. If appropriate, agency responsible for the proposed action.

#### **Gallatin County Conservation and Parks**

3. Name, address phone number and E-mail address of project sponsor.

Gallatin County Conservation and Parks  
311 West Main, Room 304  
Bozeman, MT 59715  
406 582 3178  
Mike.harris@gallatin.mt.gov

4. Name of project.

**Regional Park Phase 4**

5. If applicable:

Estimated construction/commencement date

**JUNE 2018**

Estimated completion date

**JUNE 2019**

Current status of project design (% complete)

**85%**

6. Location affected by proposed action (county, range and township).

**Tract 3A of COS 2202B, located in Section 34, Township 1 South, Range 5 East, and Section 3, Township 2 South, Range 5 east, P.M.M., Gallatin County, Montana**

7. Project size: estimate the numbers of acres that would be directly affected that are currently:

(a) Developed:  
residential..... 0 acres  
industrial ..... 0 acres

(b) Open Space/Woodlands/  
Recreation..... 10 acres

(c) Wetlands/Riparian  
Areas ..... 0 acres

(d) Floodplain ..... 0 acres

(e) Productive:  
irrigated cropland ..... 0 acres  
dry cropland ..... 0 acres  
forestry ..... 0 acres  
rangeland ..... 0 acres  
other..... 0 acres

8. Map/site plan: attach an original 8 1/2" x 11" or larger section of the most recent USGS 7.5' series topographic map showing the location and boundaries of the area that would be affected by the proposed action. A different map scale may be substituted if more appropriate or if required by agency rule. If available, a site plan should also be attached.

9. Narrative summary of the proposed action or project including the benefits and purpose of the proposed action.

Project is a continuation of LWCF Project 30-00684 & LWCF PROJECT 30-00728  
GALLATIN COUNTY REGIONAL PARK

Construction of a maintenance building with attached public restrooms to be accessible from the dog park, install the first phase of irrigation systems into the enclosed dog park to irrigate revegetated meadows, newly planted trees and wetlands; and construct a third parking lot on the Regional Park for use primarily by the visitors to the new enclosed Dog Park.

The maintenance building is important to the overall environmental enhancement of the entire park. It will give us a central facility to store and maintain equipment and materials, keeping them out of the view and access to the general public and preventing the possibility of spills and contamination in the park areas from fuels, oils, paints, cleaning products and other maintenance materials.

Additionally without property maintenance the existing and new facilities will begin to suffer and have a potential for increased noxious weed invasion, sedimentation runoff into streams, loss of vegetation cover such as shrubs and trees, and increased stormwater runoff from improper parking facilities.

The addition of the Thrd Parking Lot and the Irrigation System in the Dog Park are critical to the long term protection of the resources on the Regional Park. With the construction of what is now Ferguson Ave. this summer we lost the temporary parking area utilized for access into the Dog Park. Curnelty people have been driving over the curbs off of Ferguson to park illegally on the grass in order to access the Dog Park. During the Winter whild the ground is frozaen it hasnt been a tremendous problme, however as the Spring Thaw comes the area being used for parking will become a muddy mess that will potentiall cause increased sedimentation into the adjacent streams or into the stormwater system.

The additional of the third parking lot will be one of the highest utilized access points for users of the park.

10. Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives (including the MEPA-required no action alternative) to the proposed action.
  - a). Preferred Alternative: **Complete improvements outlined in Phase 4 to reduce natural resource impacts, increase safety and security, and increase capacity for recreational users.**
  - b). No-action Alternative: **Restrict users and close large recreational areas to mitigate resource damage and user conflicts; decrease in safe access to highly utilized recreational facilities by pedestrians from public arterial streets; reduction of maintenance capabilities during winter seasons due to equipment failures causing loss of recreational opportunities; increased need for transportation of fuels, maintenance materials, cleaning chemicals, paints and other maintenance supplies in areas of the park utilized by the general public creating a potential safety situation as well as potential environmental pollution scenario.**

c). Additional Alternatives: **Fund a minimal number of improvements with the limited capital resources we currently have. Mitigate user conflicts and resource damage with fencing and closures.**

11. Listing of each local, state or federal agency that has overlapping or additional jurisdiction.

(a) Permits		
Agency Name: City of Bozeman	Permit: Building Permit	Date Filed: Design Review Process

(b) Funding	
Agency Name: None	Funding Amount:

(c) Other Overlapping or Additional Jurisdictional Responsibilities	
Agency Name: None	Type of Responsibility:

12. List of agencies consulted during preparation of this Environmental Checklist:

***None as none of the proposed improvements fall under the jurisdiction of permitting agencies.***

***MT FWP, Army Corps and Montana Department of Natural Resource and Conservation signed off on previous project that were impacting ponds and wetlands. This project finishes work that was proposed and approved under the MEPA and NEPA process in 2004. Additionally, MEPA and NEPA reviews have been completed for several other federally funded projects on this park.***

***The previous project required a SWPPP permit which was completed in 2016. The footprint of the disturbed area on this project is not anticipated to require a SWPPP, however all applicable best management practices for storm water protection will be followed.***

13. Name of Preparer(s) of this Environmental Checklist:

**Michael Harris, Director of Conservation and Parks**

14. Date submitted.

**February 22, 2018**

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Land Resources” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on land resources. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects of the action as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

1. LAND RESOURCES Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
a. Soil instability or changes in geologic substructure?		X				
b. Disruption, displacement, erosion, compaction, moisture loss, or over-covering of soil which would reduce productivity or fertility?			X		yes	
c. Destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?		X				
d. Changes in siltation, deposition or erosion patterns that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed or shore of a lake?		X				
e. Exposure of people or property to earthquakes, landslides, ground failure, or other natural hazard?		X				
f. Other						

The Regional Park was purchased in 2003 as raw agricultural lands with the intention of converting it to recreational facilities. The addition of the Maintenance Building and the Parking Areas are needed improvements for the recreational facilities.

Designs for the parking lot and building are being located near existing streets and infrastructure in a way as to minimize the need for additional utility infrastructure and long paved service drives. The location of the parking lot is consistent with the other parking areas to make them central to other recreational features that allows for large areas of undisturbed land and recreational facilities and minimizes the need for connecting service drives, pedestrian paths, bridges, and other typical improvements.

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Air” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on air resources. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects of the action as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

2. AIR Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
a. Emission of air pollutants or deterioration of ambient air quality? (also see 13 (c))		X				
b. Creation of objectionable odors?		X				
c. Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature patterns or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?		X				

d. Adverse effects on vegetation, including crops, due to increased emissions of pollutants?		X				
e. Any discharge that will conflict with federal or state air quality regs?		X				
f. Other						

***Air quality would only be impacted at the time of construction with minor dust and exhaust from equipment.***

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Water” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on water resources. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

3. WATER	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Will the proposed action result in:	Unknown	None	Minor		
a. Discharge into surface water or any alteration of surface water quality including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?		X				
b. Changes in drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		X				
c. Alteration of the course or magnitude of floodwater or other flows?		X				
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body or creation of a new water body?		X				
e. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?		X				
f. Changes in the quality of groundwater?		X				
g. Changes in the quantity of groundwater?		X				
h. Increase in risk of contamination of surface or groundwater?		X				
i. Effects on any existing water right or reservation?		X				
j. Effects on other water users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quality?		X				
k. Effects on other users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quantity?		X				
l. Effects to a designated floodplain?		X				
m. Any discharge that will affect federal or state water quality regulations?		X				
n. Other:						

**Improvements proposed in this project will actually mitigate growing problems related to water quality. Increasing dog waste near ponds and streams, erosion from overuse during dry periods of summer, reduced potential for water temperature and algae blooms, and protecting water quality for children swimming at the beach are all improved or protected by this project.**

**Design of the building and parking area are done to mitigate potential storm water runoff through the use of swales or catch basins.**

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Vegetation” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on vegetative resources. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

4. VEGETATION	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						
a. Changes in the diversity, productivity or abundance of plant species (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?		X				
b. Alteration of a plant community?		X				
c. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?		X				
d. Reduction in acreage or productivity of any agricultural land?		X				
e. Establishment or spread of noxious weeds?		X				
f. Effects to wetlands or prime and unique farmland?		X				
g. Other:						

**Again, the projects proposed actually benefit the proposed impacts identified in the environmental checklist. None of these were factors in the 2004 grant and environmental.**

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Fish/Wildlife” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on fish and wildlife resources. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

5. FISH/WILDLIFE	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						
a. Deterioration of critical fish or wildlife habitat?		X				
b. Changes in the diversity or abundance of game animals or bird species?		X				
c. Changes in the diversity or abundance of nongame species?		X				
d. Introduction of new species into an area?		X				
e. Creation of a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?		X				

f. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?		X				
g. Increase in conditions that stress wildlife populations or limit abundance (including harassment, legal or illegal harvest or other human activity)?		X				
h. Adverse effects to threatened/endangered species or their habitat?		X				
i. Introduction or exportation of any species not presently or historically occurring in the affected location?		X				
j. Other:						

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Noise/Electrical Effects” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects of noise and electrical activities. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

6. NOISE/ELECTRICAL EFFECTS	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						
a. Increases in existing noise levels?		X				
b. Exposure of people to severe or nuisance noise levels?		X				
c. Creation of electrostatic or electromagnetic effects that could be detrimental to human health or property?		X				
d. Interference with radio or television reception and operation?		X				
e. Other:						

**Noise levels would stay the same and the improvements would actually help dissipate increased noise from when more users come to the park. No overhead power lines are proposed and no Van de Graph generators are being installed as playground equipment. No interference with radio or television equipment. Noise and Electrical effects were addressed in an environmental review for the location of the 911 Emergency Communications Center located on the North East corner of the Park. No impacts were identified in this review to local communications or park users in that study either.**

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Land Use” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on land use. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long-term effects.

7. LAND USE	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						
a. Alteration of or interference with the productivity or profitability of the existing land use of an area?		X				
b. A conflict with a designated natural area or area of unusual scientific or educational importance?		X				



c. A conflict with any existing land use whose presence would constrain or potentially prohibit the proposed action?		X				
d. Adverse effects on, or relocation of, residences?		X				
e. Compliance with existing land policies for land use, transportation, and open space?		X				
f. Increased traffic hazards, traffic volume, or speed limits or effects on existing transportation facilities or patterns of movement of people and goods?		X				
g. Other:						

***The addition of the third parking lot is a critical improvement in order to mitigate traffic hazards. With the addition of what is now Ferguson Avenue by the City of Bozeman the temporary parking area used to access the Dog Park was lost. People have been driving out into the field and parking illegally. The access point for the temporary parking area is not consistent with proper transportation requirements for the level of traffic on Ferguson.***

***The new parking lot was located so that the entrance of the parking lot would be the proper minimum distance from other encroachments onto Ferguson Avenue from the adjacent development as well as sufficient distance from the intersections of Ferguson and Oak and Ferguson and Baxter Lane.***

***The addition of the new parking lot will correct a specific traffic and public safety concern.***

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Risk/Health Hazards” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects of risks and health hazards. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects of the action as well as the long-term effects. Attach

8. RISK/HEALTH HAZARDS	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						
a. Risk of an explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or other forms of disruption?		X				
b. Effects on existing emergency response or emergency evacuation plan or create need for a new plan?		X				
c. Creation of any human health hazard or potential hazard?		X				
d. Disturbance to any sites with known or potential deposits of hazardous materials?		X				
e. The use of any chemical toxicants?		X				
f. Other:						

additional pages of narrative if needed.

***The addition of the new maintenance facility is specifically designed to mitigate those concerns identified under the Risks and Health Hazards section. The maintenance building will allow us to property store and maintain equipment and maintenance supplies rather than having to transport them throughout the park.***

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Community Impact” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on the community. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

9. COMMUNITY IMPACT	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						
a. Alteration of the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?		X				
<b>10. PUBLIC SERVICES/TAXES/UTILITIES</b>						
c. Alteration of the level or distribution of employment or community or personal income?		X				
d. Changes in industrial or commercial activity?		X				
e. Increased traffic hazards or effects on existing transportation facilities or patterns of movement of people and goods?		X			X	
f. Other:						

*The location is a 100 acre park. The majority of it is currently unimproved. The boundary of the park is the City limits of Bozeman, and with the facilities existing and planned the presence of this park and the improvements from this project do make it a more desirable area to live in. So one could argue that improvements to a large park like this may impact the growth rate on the West end of Bozeman, however I would not describe that as a negative impact.*

*The City of Bozeman upgraded the arterial and collectors around the Regional Park the Summer of 2017 which added a 10' paved multiuse path along the south border of the park, a roundabout along with three pedestrian crossings on Oak Street and two pedestrian crossings on Ferguson and a new four way traffic light on Ferguson. The traffic impact to the area is caused by the growth in the west end of the city to a much greater extent than any of the park improvements would. Additionally many of the trips to the park are as a stop for travelers between destinations.*

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Public Services/Taxes/Utilities” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on public services, taxes and utilities. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

*If the improvements were not made the same if not more resources would be expended to mitigate overuse and resource damage. The improvements fit within the existing maintenance budget and long term plan and will actually serve to improve the leverage we currently have with our maintenance programs and equipment. The effect on tax base would potentially be an increase as houses closer to an area of open space, water, trails, and outdoor recreation will increase property values.*

*Additionally the improvements at the Regional Park are part of the public service we provide. With the addition of these improvements will increase the capacity available by users and increase the level of public service we can provide. Utility corridors were previously established prior to the LWCF restrictions so this project would not limit the ability of utility infrastructure to be added in the future as it has already been planned for.*

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Aesthetics/Recreation” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on aesthetics & recreation. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

11. AESTHETICS/RECREATION	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						
a. Alteration of any scenic vista or creation of an aesthetically offensive site or effect that is open to public view?			X		X	
b. Alteration of the aesthetic character of a community or neighborhood?		X				
c. Alteration of the quality or quantity of recreational/tourism opportunities and settings? (Attach Tourism Report)				X		
d. Adverse effects to any designated or proposed wild or scenic rivers, trails or wilderness areas?		X				
e. Other:						

***In order to minimize the need for ground disturbance, service drives, infrastructure, and to stay away from areas near streams or wetlands we chose to put the maintenance building close to Ferguson Avenue. This project would put a building up along the street where currently exists an open field. Some may find that offensive. This created a challenge since to put the building in a location that couldn't be seen from a public road would have required increased environmental impacts, impacts to recreation, and significant increased to financial resources needed for construction, operation and maintenance activities.***

***The design of the building has take into account aesthetics and how it would be viewed from the street. We have include plans for landscaping, light mitigation, fencing and parking that would minimize the aesthetic look of the building from the street and would look similar to the homes that are being constructed immediately adjacent to the property across Ferguson Avenue.***

***The addition of the third parking lot will add sufficient parking for larger community events and festivals like our Skijoring competition which is a positive impact to recreational/tourism. Additionally the new parking lot will add the capacity for parking during larger festivals and events to mitigate parking in adjacent business and neighborhoods.***

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Cultural/historical Resources” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects on cultural/historical resources. Even if you checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long-term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

12. CULTURAL/HISTORICAL RESOURCES	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						

a. Destruction or alteration of any site, structure or object of prehistoric historic, or paleontological importance?		X				
b. Physical changes that would affect unique cultural values?		X				
c. Effects on existing religious or sacred uses of a site or area?		X				
d. Adverse effects to historic or cultural resources?		X				
e. Other:						

**Montana State Historic Office has already reviewed the site and determined no impact.**

**HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.** At the bottom of this “Summary Evaluation of Significance” checklist, provide a narrative description and evaluation of the cumulative and secondary effects. Even if you have checked “none” in the above table, explain how you came to that conclusion. Consider the immediate, short-term effects as well as the long- term effects. Attach additional pages of narrative if needed.

13. SUMMARY EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action, considered as a whole:						
a. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project or program may result in impacts on two or more separate resources which create a significant effect when considered together or in total.)		X				
b. Involve potential risks or adverse effects which are uncertain but extremely hazardous if they were to occur?		X				
c. Potentially conflict with the substantive requirements of any local, state, or federal law, regulation, standard or formal plan?		X				
d. Establish a precedent or likelihood that future actions with significant environmental impacts will be proposed?		X				
e. Generate substantial debate or controversy about the nature of the impacts that would be created?		X				
f. Have organized opposition or generate substantial public controversy?		X				
Additional information requested:						
g. List any federal or state permits required.	The parking lot may require a Storm Water Plan (SWPPP) from MT DEQ					

**Again, these are improvements that are an extension of the work done in our 2004 2011 LWCF Grant. The improvements will actually increase benefits and decrease impacts. In the future as more users come to this park the additional facilities and infrastructure from this grant will help to keep park resources from being overused.**

### PART III. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST CONCLUSION SECTION

1. Discuss the cumulative and secondary effects of this project as a whole (see glossary for definition of cumulative effects).

The cumulative effects of this project as a whole will be positive for the community. The improvements identified in this project will enhance and protect the investment of previous LWCF Funds. The project timing is right as the number of users is beginning to reach a point where if additional improvements are not added then increasing resource damage and user conflict will continue.

2. Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this Environmental Checklist (Part II), is an EIS required?

YES \_\_\_\_\_

NO   x  

If an EIS is not required, explain why the current checklist level of review is appropriate.

3. **Public Input.**

Public involvement for this project began with the “Citizens to Save Open Space” campaign that began in 1994 and evolved into the “Friends of Regional Parks” by 1999. Public support for this project was in part expressed by passage of the first \$10 million Open Space bond in 2000. The purchase and development plans for the park went through extensive public meetings at the Open Lands Board and then through the Gallatin County Commission. The projects were additionally reviewed and identified with full public comment at two community Charrettes in 2007 and the adoption by the Board of Park Commissioners and Board of County Commissioners in 2008. The previous LWCF grant ended in 2009 and we are now adding to those projects that were approved in 2009. In addition, in an update to the Regional Park Master Plan we began taking public input on these improvements in August 2013 to December 2013. Surveys were conducted in person and web and were widely publicized at public hearings, social media, newspaper, radio and tv.

4. **Public Input Summary.**

Out of our two main surveys on these improvements there were positives and negatives, primarily in one area, that of the designated off leash area. The current situation is that the Regional Park has become an off leash dog park, even though it was not formally designated as such by the county. In trying to address the issues that have arisen with resource damage from dogs in the way of increased sediment into lakes, loss of vegetation, high rates of compaction and user conflicts the County began to analyze methods to mitigate these concerns. The Master Plans called for an enclosed dog park; however current users would prefer that we leave the park open dogs off leash everywhere.

We conducted two surveys, one being specific to use at the Regional Park by dog users which had over 700 respondents, and one survey done by the public as a whole which had 676 respondents. The primary conclusion from both surveys was that an area for dogs off leash and amphitheater for recreation and for its vista was important to the community. The surveys also concluded that dog users do understand the need for increasing infrastructure, mitigating resource damage and avoiding user conflicts, they want to keep as much of the

park open to dogs as possible with areas where dog and owner can walk or run a significant distance rather than a small enclosure.

By improving one are of the park with additional trails and creating additional parking access and securing the beach we can create an area for dogs to run off leash that isn't as sensitive as the two ponds and that doesn't have a high level of fishing, or children based recreation.

5. **Wildlife & Fisheries Review Forms.** Most LWCF projects take place in urban areas where negative effects on wildlife are negligible. However, if your proposed project is situated on undeveloped, wild land, both Wildlife & Fisheries Review Forms must be included in this grant application. Consult FWP's Recreational Trails Program website for details on this requirement.

***Not applicable.***