**ITEM 1: Review of last meeting (Management Strategies)**

The meeting began with a review of management strategies generated from last meeting. The following components were discussed:

* Establishment of an organization that can represent disc golf users
  + This would allow the Muni to enter into an agreement with a user group
  + Such a use agreement would be similar to the agreements already in place for soccer and baseball in Municipal parks. It would address key concerns and spell out responsibilities of disc golf players and the Municipality for the municipal share of maintenance and upkeep for the course. The agreement would offer a means of resolving disputes and establish the repercussions (to include possible closure) if the requirements of the agreement are not met. A new disc golf course should not open until such an agreement is in place.
* Several concerns arose regarding the establishment of a group
  + Achieving/maintaining non-profit status is costly
  + Can one user group cover all disc golf courses, or would a neighborhood group approach be more effective in managing courses?
* Possible solutions
  + A user group could receive support from local businesses in the form of sponsorships
  + A user group lacking the funding for non-profit status could become part of an umbrella group or foundation (like Anchorage Parks Foundation)

Both the site selection criteria and management strategy documents will be sent out to the advisory group for review/comments prior to the next advisory group meeting.

Several elements of existing user group agreements were vetted with the group:

* Clean up and trash removal
* Increase toilet maintenance if overused
* Responsibility for graffiti removal, or preventative measures
* Monitoring level of use to minimize impacts?
  + Adaptive use strategies:
    - Alternate holes
    - Limited use
* A management strategy and identified user group may need to be in place prior to the opening of a new course
* Tree/shrub modification upon MOA proposal
* Illegal activity – user group can help deter illegal activity
* Notification/dispute resolution
  + Established approach for negotiation/mediation
* Insurance
* Is there liability for course users?
* Special Permits for tournaments should be part of agreement
* Clause that notifies Disc Golf group prior to any disc golf course is closed

**ITEM 2: Site Criteria Analysis Exercise – Test untested Criteria**

Site criteria to guide the selection of potential disc golf courses in Municipal park land were developed in the first 2 advisory group meetings. The criteria were mostly derived from the group’s experience with Westchester Disc Golf Course and a case study from Boulder, Colorado. The objective of this exercise was to apply the site selection criteria to actual parks in Anchorage to determine if any criteria elements need to be modified or if additional criteria needs to be added. The exercise also provided the group’s first opportunity to evaluate existing parks for disc golf course feasibility. The criteria proved to be a successful tool in evaluating parks for potential disc golf course sites. Although no criteria was specifically modified or added based on the exercise, a few other considerations were brought to the group’s attention:

* Receptiveness of local community councils
* Park uses (master plan, site plan)
* Proximity to or existence of wetlands
* Availability of a volunteer group or stakeholders within proximity of park

The following is a summary of the site selection exercise. Parks were given a positive (+) or negative (-) rating based on each criteria.

* *Size - Acreage (1 acre/hole)*
* *Conflicts:* 
  + *Neighboring Residences*
  + *Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation*
  + *Other Park Uses (dog parks, ball-fields, playgrounds, etc.)*
  + *Environmentally Sensitive Areas*
* *Parking (3-5 spaces/hole)*
* *Level of Play (Recreational players vs. Competitive Players)*
* *Course Character (wooded, open areas, etc.)*
* *Restrooms*
* *Access*
* *Existing Infrastructure (existing parking, trail systems, restrooms, etc.)*

**Russian Jack Springs Park**

The group responded positively to Russian Jack for its existing infrastructure, parking and potential to add on to the existing 9-hole course.

(+) Size (300 acres)

(+) Parking

(+) Existing infrastructure (old campground and hardened trails)

(+) Course character – nice mix of topography, open, forested areas

(+) Other uses

(+) Restrooms

(-) Sensitive habitat (forested areas)

(-) Political will (local CC may not be receptive to tree removal or improvements in forested areas)

(-) Conflicts on bike/skiing trails

**Charles Smith Park**

The group responded positively to Charles Smith Park along the Chester Creek Greenbelt due to its access and proximity to downtown. There was also sentiment that neighbors and other stakeholders would respond positively to the change of use in the northern woods which experiences a consistent population of homeless camps.

(+) Size

(+) Parking (at nearby Mulcahy)

(+) Close to neighborhoods

(+) Access

(-) Wet areas

(+) Existing infrastructure

(-) Course character (primarily wooded and flat)

**Davis Park**

The group valued the lack of conflicting trails and ample parking but were concerned with the site’s course character and location. The forested area may require extensive pruning where social trails do not exist.

(+) Size

(+) Parking

(-) Convenient location

(-) Infrastructure (dense forest)

(+) Vehicle/pedestrian circulation

**Eastchester/Sitka Park along the Greenbelt**

The group valued the park’s proximity to downtown and accessibility from local neighborhoods but parking, potential wetland issues, and shared-use trail conflicts were a concern.

(-) Parking

(+) Size

(-) Level of play

(-) Environmental sensitive areas

(-) Trail conflicts

(+) Accessibility

**Earthquake Park**

The size and natural beauty of this park sparked comments that this area could accommodate a professional-level destination course. Concerns included lack of parking, and potential conflicts with wildlife habitat and the Coastal trail.

(-) Parking

(+) Accessibility

(+) Location

(+) Level of play

(+) Course Character

(-) Existing Infrastructure

**Centennial Park**

The group viewed the park’s location and access as concerns, but its size and hilly terrain were considered opportunities.

(+) Parking

(+) Course character

(-) Conflicts with ski trails

(-) Location (although potential appeal to military)

(-) Existing infrastructure

Other potential sites to apply criteria to:

* Ruth Arcand Park

The meeting closed with a notification that the baseline document with site selection criteria and management strategy recommendations will be sent to the group within the next 2 weeks for review/comments. The next meeting will focus on reviewing the baseline document and will be held on **Tuesday, October 30th at 5:30pm.**