City of Bellevue

Meydenbauer Bay: Park and Land Use Plan

Steering Committee Meeting #13

MEETING SUMMARY

Agenda Item #2
Sept 18, 2008 Draft Meeting Summary

DATE: September 19, 2008

TIME: 5:00 PM

LOCATION: Bellevue City Hall

ATTENDEES:

Steering Committee
Doug Leigh
Iris Tocher
Stu Vander Hoek
Bob MacMillan
Hal Ferris
Kevin Paulich
Tom Tanaka
Rich Wagner
David Schooler
Marcelle Lynde
Stefanie Beighle

City Staff and Consultants
Robin Cole, City of Bellevue
Mike Bergstrom, City of Bellevue
Patrick Foran, City of Bellevue
Shelley Marelli, City of Bellevue
Matt Terry, City of Bellevue
Dan Stroh, City of Bellevue
Glenn Kost, City of Bellevue
David Blau, EDAW
Marilee Stander, EDAW
Brian Scott, EDAW
Sandy Fishcher, EDAW

DRAFT

SUMMARY:

1. Welcome and review of the agenda/ meeting overview
Dough Leigh, Steering Committee co-chair, opened the thirteenth meeting of the Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan Steering Committee and thanked everyone for attending. Robin Cole, Parks and Community Services Project Manager, gave a brief meeting overview. There are two purposes of the meeting. The main focus of the meeting is to review and continue to refine the revised park master plan alternatives. The goal is to move from three alternatives to one or two. Once the alternatives are narrowed, the consultant team will study the alternatives with a road open and a road closed variation. The second purpose of the meeting is to look at the parameters of the traffic study and to understand how the modeling will be done. The meeting will start today with a discussion from the Steering Committee about pros and cons of each alternative and then continue with a discussion of pros and cons from the public. Finally, the Steering Committee will provide direction to the City and consultant team on how to proceed.

2. Review and approval of:
a. July 31st 2008 Meeting Summary
Doug asked if members had any comments or revisions. The Steering Committee had no changes and approved the minutes.

b. Revised Steering Committee "Vision Statement"
Doug noted that the proposed revisions that had been passed out were submitted by Stu and Betina and consisted of minor language amendments. The Committee agreed to incorporate the modifications.

3. Presentation of refined park master plan alternatives
Brian Scott, EDAW's community outreach specialist, reviewed the agenda and gave a recap of recent schedule and work completed in the last six weeks. In the six weeks since the last Steering Committee meeting, the consultant team has been working on refining alternatives based on additional environmental findings and feedback that was given during previous meetings. One of the purposes of this meeting is to talk about the refinements that were made to the alternatives and get feedback from Steering Committee and public. At the end of the meeting, the consultant team will look for Committee feedback on specific issues to work toward a more refined or preferred alternative.

Brian noted that David's presentation will begin with a discussion of the refinements that have happened over the last few weeks but first he reviewed the process completed to date. Brian reviewed several key planning principles and noted that the Steering Committee's charge is to create a regionally significant park, a waterfront destination, a graceful pedestrian connection, a unique environmentally sensitive setting, and engage the community in the process.

Brian mentioned a schedule change. The City and consultant team had originally planned to have a public workshop this Wednesday night but given the amount of analysis required to hold a productive meeting, it was determined that the public workshop should be postponed until October 29th, 2008 which is the night before the next Steering Committee meeting.

Brian went on to explain that the three alternatives presented tonight have been both refined and renamed.. All three refined alternatives are environmentally responsible. The first alternative has an emphasis on education, the second on shoreline use and enhancements, and the third on civic enhancements. Brian noted that there are several elements in common between the schemes as a result of the feedback that was given during the previous meetings including the following: additional environmental restoration, a swim beach with associated lawn, restrooms and playgrounds, more softened shoreline, more upland habitat restoration, and less overwater coverage. What you will see tonight is more variation in parking and circulation. There was a lot of discussion on the marina program but due to the fact that there was greater divergence in those comments, you will also see greater variation in the marina.

David Blau, EDAW's project principal, presented a slideshow of the revised alternatives noting that the consultant team has advanced the three schemes in terms of refinements, footprints, and dimensioning. An environmental scorecard that will be presented toward the end of the slideshow will help compared one to another. All of the work is grounded in a very strong environmental ethic and database. Several analysis boards are posted at the back of the room but this presentation will focus on two in particular. The environmental ecological analysis boards identify contiguous canopy, significant trees, and the near shore aquatic habitat which the agencies are going to be very actively involved and engaged in with us as we move further into the environmental analysis and permitting. A second analysis map shows the impervious cover. Any way we can reduce impervious cover, and allow more of the precipitation to enter into the site rather than flow off the land and into the bay, the better.

After this brief introduction, David presented the alternatives and highlighted numerous features proposed in each scheme including the following:

<u>Alternative 1: Educational Emphasis</u>
- Retain one of the residences – youth environmental education center with both indoor and outdoor activities.
- Small pull-off and parking area off Lake Washington Boulevard

- Terraced surface parking lot shown near 99th
- Limited parking and drop-off at the Whaling Building for Marina uses
- Bring the natural systems up into the city at both ends of the park
- Fully day-lighted stream
- Parking in ravine is removed
- Enhancement of upland habitat and removal of invasive species
- Create a wetlands area that is much more valuable than the one that we have mapped and delineated which is marginal in terms of it's habitat value
- Pier 2 and 3 are removed
- New arcing public dock frames the beach area
- Very limited public parking – this scheme suggests that people should walk or bike to the park not drive
- Trail system complimenting the day-lighted stream with educational and interpretive features along the path

Alternative 2: Shoreline Emphasis
- Partially day-lighted stream allows us to leave the existing parking in the upper ravine
- Exhibit space near Lake Washington Boulevard with parking tucked underneath
- Additional parking under the plaza on the kite parcel with up to 125 additional spaces
- Expanded on-street parking off Lake Washington Boulevard
- New iconic element that extends from the kite parcel out into Lake Washington with an elevated public viewing pier
- Enhancement of upland habitat and removal of invasive species
- Continuous boardwalk for half the length of the shoreline
- Vendor kiosks but no permanent retail along the waterfront
- Piers 2 and 3 removed but replaced moorage at Pier 1
- Elevators at kite parcel to allow for ADA access
- Space under the elevated pier for boat storage and artist studios
- Maximized use of overwater coverage by stacking public dock

Alternative 3: Civic Emphasis
- Existing beach stays in current location but is enlarged
- No creek day-lighting
- Enhancement of upland habitat and removal of invasive species
- A full boardwalk runs the length of the site
- A floating boardwalk gives people an interesting view out over the water and back to the beach
- About 68 total parking spaces
- Removes pier 3 and puts in a new one that extends down from the kite parcel
- Grand viewing plaza at upper terrace
- No change to the upper ravine beyond habitat enhancements
- Retreat center with restrooms near public promenade and Whaling Building

The team conducted an analysis of several environmental topics and found the following:
- Alternative 1 has the lowest number of on site parking stalls and Alternative 3 has the most.
- Alternative 1 has 500 lf of shoreline restoration while Alternative 2 has 300 lf, and Alternative 3 has 100 lf.
- An important factor in permitting is overwater coverage. Alternative 1 has a 60% reduction; Alternative 2 has a 40% and Alt. 3 has a 20% reduction.
- The first scheme reduces impervious cover by 25%, the second by 16%, and the 3rd actually increases it by 14%.

4. Discussion with steering committee on pros and cons of alternatives

DRAFT

- Doug Leigh asked a question about significant trees – how many are there in the ravine? *Although we don't have those numbers with us right now, that was addressed in Technical Memo #5.*
- Stu Vander Hoek asked a question about how many slips are in the existing marina and how many parking stalls are in the downtown park. *The marina slip numbers are listed in a summary table on each of the plans*. *There are 198 total parking spaces in Downtown Park although that number does include spaces that are not in the completed master plan.*
- Bob MacMillan said that the master plan includes spots in the SE corner that will be removed. He would like to see all of the facts and data for comparison.
- Rich Wagner said that he was feeling frustrated and would like to have had a chance to see all of the materials before coming to the meeting. He doesn't feel like there is enough time to get clarity on all of the issues.
- Kevin Paulich said that he likes all parts of alternative 1 better than the others
- David Schooler had the following comments:
  - The planning has to be done with the streets and we need to look at 100th and determine if they are two-way or one-way.
  - Water quality is bad in the bay and thinks that aeration would work
  - Wants to know if there been any progress made with negotiation with the gas station owner and suggests that at this point we should just look at the ROW to the west and not that property.
  - Need to have low trees or shrubs only on the kite parcel – does not want to see any large trees even if they are significant trees. It is critical that there is a stunning view from 100th and Main
  - Likes the fully day-lighted stream and the relocated wetland
  - Not sure that we need the storm water features on 99th
  - Need to have parking that is accessible to the beach but beyond that it should be in the Downtown Park
  - Wants to have the waterfront pathway be continuous the whole length of the waterfront but does not want to see a concrete surface for the whole length although we must accommodate emergency vehicles
  - Likes additional restrooms
  - Is okay with having a few vendors
  - Believes that Alternative 2 has too much structure, too much building
  - Don't need a gallery/exhibition space since we have that in other places downtown
  - Likes the idea of a dock at the end of 100th and believe that could be really nice
  - No atrium café – believes that is unanimous
  - Would not like to have artist studios
  - Not sure how he feels about canoe and kayak rentals
  - Would like to see the pull out near 99th as show in Alternative 1
  - Does not think that we need a grand viewing terrace at 99th if it detracts from the view at 100th and Main
  - Not sure if we need the retreat center but believes that we do need cover from rain
- Rich Wagner had the following comments:
  - He is trying not to be partial based on living at Whalers Cove and having a boat at the Yacht Club
  - He likes the northwest part of Alt 1 and some of the Alt ?
  - He took two of the plans and pieced them together
  - The Committee did not get a tour of pier 2 or 3 which may be helpful
  - The elimination of pier 2 is not acceptable; it is extremely well built
  - Thinks that there is too much transient moorage – the public dock at the end of 100th could be shorter or smaller
  - Likes the dock on the park portion in Alt. 1 (suggests keeping transient moorage at this dock)
  - Alternative 2 – no to any commercial activity – no artist studio, no atrium café,
  - Not opposed to removing the cover of pier 2

DRAFT

- Stefanie Beighle had the following comments
  - Wanted to know how long do the piers last. Rich mentioned that Pier 3 was built in the 50s and is at the end of its life but Pier 2 is floating concrete and has at least 30 to 50 more years
  - She prefers Alternative 1
  - Would like to see the walk extending the whole length of the waterfront
  - Wants to see a link from Downtown Park to Meydenbauer Bay Park
  - Does think we need the parking near the beach but should put it underground
  - Does not want to see the usual type of play structures
  - Need to keep the water feature that extends from Downtown Park to the waterfront
  - Wants to have the vendor kiosks
  - Does not want the conference center
  - Way too many parking spaces in alt 2 because it is too far away from the pedestrian emphasis
  - No to a café
  - Likes the idea of having a boat storage area underground – likes the idea of tucking that into the slope and would like to view some boat houses.
  - Okay with keeping the pier 2 although she is not a boater
  - Likes the water feature on Alternative 3
  - Likes the full shoreline walkway but doesn't think we need a full boardwalk.
- Marcelle Lynde had the following comments
  - Likes the idea of using one of the existing structures for the education center
  - Would prefer to see parking in the ravine and only do a partial stream day-lighting
  - She is fine with keeping Pier 2 but remove pier 3
  - Hates the idea of an elevated boardwalk because it does not fit the scale or style of the place but does like having a single level dock at that location
  - Does not want the café
  - Not sure if she is in support of temporary vendors
  - Loves the pull out and grand view from Lake Washington
  - Supports the ideas of having a place to look out over the bay
- Stu Vander Hoek had the following comments
  - Likes the half stream day-lighting shown in Alternative 2
  - Keep the parking for educational center
  - Overlook terrace in Alternative 1 with parking
  - Keep pier 2
  - Likes the dock extension in Alternative 2
  - Thinks that the structure is intriguing not so much the café but the overlook and believes that seeing a better representation of that could really help scale it down
  - Need to look at that in combination with the street – is it one-way or two-way.
  - Total parking spaces – 125 to 150 seems to feel like a good number – put some on the east end under the overlook
- Tom Tanaka had the following comments
  - Thinks that we need to have adequate parking but in the bigger picture, if we are trying to make this a park for all people in Bellevue, we need to be available to people who do need to drive there. The public transportation in this area isn't very good.
  - Does not agree with the idea that we should eliminate the parking in the park and force people to walk or bike.
  - He likes the idea of a continuous path. It doesn't have to be a big swath but it should provide good connectivity between the two parts of the park.
  - Likes the iconic structure in alternative 2 and is intrigued with the idea of it; it is probably too large but would like to see it in the alternatives
- Iris Tocher had the following comments
  - She was very surprised and had originally been supportive of Alternative 1 with a lot of water coming down the kite parcel and didn't like the idea of the iconic structure in alt 2 but was really taken with it as shown in the section; she does like the idea of using elevators to help get people down

DRAFT

- Does not care if café is in or out
- Really likes the opening of the entire ravine gives us the most habitat benefits
- Likes the retention of the existing home
- Believes that in Alternative 3 the major experience of the park is the boats which she doesn't prefer
- Likes the human experience of having a stream that goes the full length of the ravine
- Like the retention of the house and the overlook pull-off
- Thinks that Alt. 3 has too much emphasis on the marina experience
- Likes the marina layout that are shown in Alt. 2

- Doug Leigh had the following comments
  - Prefers by far Alternative 1 the Educational Emphasis
  - Likes the idea of day-lighting – would like to see an analysis of the feasibility of this. Can we get some definition of how this will function? The experience could be great.
  - Maybe the upper half of the ravine is more about water quality
  - Loves the idea of the gesture of the walkway as it extends out into the bay
  - Likes the turn-out on Lake Washington Boulevard and thinks that it might be able to function as a transit stop later.
  - In the next phase the consultant team needs to give the Steering Committee a better understanding of how many people will use this park and what percentage of people will park, bike and walk to the park.
  - Be sure that all new surface parking lots if we have to have them are pervious and multi-use
  - Doesn't see the need for vendors shown in Alternative 2
  - Doesn't think that the large elevated structure fits with the idea of entering the park- it should be a quieter, on foot, approach from the Downtown.
  - Need to do more research on ppv – these have very different demands (look at shell houses) is this kayaks or canoes?
  - Could use more study of the marina drop-off and temporary parking
  - Is interested in the plaza shown in alt 3 – combine alt 1 and 3 and think about the urban context of that corner; what frames that view – art or entry focal point.
- Rich Wagner had the following comments
  - On alternative 1 he does like the rerouting of 99 pulling it away from Whaler's Cove.
  - In Alternative 2 he is opposed to seasonal vendors near the whaling building
  - In Alternative 3 he is having a difficult time understanding the floating boardwalk and is opposed to it.
  - Believes that piers 1 and 2 are an amenity for Whaler's Cove
- Marcelle Lynde had these additional comments:
  - Wants to see shells brought into the plans which are very different than canoes or kayaks
  - She doesn't want the café but would like to see a large covered structure to get out of the rain
  - Wants to know what the stormwater will look like in the restored stream
- Bob MacMillan had the following comments
  - Agrees with a lot of what has been said
  - Doesn't like the extension of the large stacked pier shown in Alternative 3
  - Likes the idea of both partial or full day-lighting of the stream
  - Would like to see more development of the plaza similar to Alternative 3
  - Wants to see 100th as a one-way street

5. Discussion with public on pros and cons of alternatives

Sherry Grindeland has lived in Bellevue for 20 years. She supports the creation of Meydenbauer Bay Park and wants to thank the Steering Committee for their work and she likes the City's process. She does not want to see a café in the park and doesn't believe that the parks department can do a good job of maintaining that kind of feature. She lives by Highland Park and wants to note that daily commerce affects traffic more than the traffic to the park. They just opened a wonderful skateboard park in her neighborhood. She believes that boating and beaches

will add a great new dimension to downtown Bellevue and that this park will feel to the neighbors like an extension of their backyard.

Aaron Dichter does like Alternative 1 and item 14 which is the curving public dock. He believes that we should keep piers 1 and 2 but remove the roof. He would like to know how many slips are in Piers 1 and 2. He wants to remind the group that there is a summer use sailing program at the end of the pier and we shouldn't put any structure close to the end of their pier. He wants to see 100th kept open whether it is one way or two way and would like to see serious options with 100th open.

Jane Morton is a resident of Bellevue but reading comments from Ron Sher. Ron is particularly interested in making places better to live. Ron is the founder of 3rd Place Books stores and is currently working with the Port and City to create the Port of Bremerton. He supports the creation of Meydenbauer Bay Park and has lived on the Bay for 25 years. He believes the Park will have few negative impacts and that this change will be a big improvement for the City of Bellevue. He believes that we need additional speed and noise restrictions for the Bay. His preference is for option 2 but could see some mix and matching.

Karen Klett wants to commend the task force on what they are doing and wants to thank you for the effort you are spending. She knows this is a difficult task. She was on the Park Board for eight years and has lived in Bellevue since the 1960's. She has enjoyed the waterfront for many years, had a nautical shop on Main Street and began to dream of a connection between the waterfront, Main Street and downtown Bellevue a long time ago. In the 1980s she worked with Bellevue historical society more recently she put together a task force to buy the Lagen property. She believes that the Steering Committee is now tasked with the hardest part – deciding how the vision will be implemented. She loves what she has seen so far and has asked some others to share their thoughts as well

Ross McIver has lived in Bellevue for 47 years. He believes that parks are important to this community and has seen them expanded greatly in the last several years. He believes that education and open spaces are important community elements and believes that the Bay has already been cleaned up significantly and wants to do more to improve it.

Carmen Aguillar has been living in Bellevue for 15 years and wants to support the work that is being done. She has served on the Parks and Community Services Committee Board. She likes that Bellevue has a strong process and that they respect the neighbors and take care of their parks. He wants to encourage the Steering Committee to keep up the outstanding work. When it is done, everyone will enjoy it.

Rod Bindon represents Meydenbauer Bay Yacht club with its 300 members and their families. They like Alternative 1 with some modification; keep 100th open and retain pier 2. They like the curved public pier by the swim beach as it does keep traffic away from the Youth Sailing facility. They are Pro Park.

Betty Schwind wants to keep 100th open and believes that we need to think ahead and do something about the mud and the slush that is at the south part of the Park. She believes that if you have restaurants in the park, debris will blow down the park and cause negative environmental impacts. Unless the water is cleaned up, there will be nothing to look at.

Bob Drexler is from Bayshore East. We on the east side of the Bay don't want to see the structures come out any further than the existing docks are because they would impede views along the waterline. The second comment is item #20 on alternative 1 – he would like to know what that means. *Meydenbauer Bay Park is shown as a future trail head for the Lake to Lake Trail. Parts of the trail are existing; other parts are only planned.*

David True is with Paccar Inc. They are a firm that has been in the current Bellevue location for many years. He is here to advocate for a robust marina. He is very pleased to see the changes in the current drawings and likes the mix in boat sizes. He wants to emphasize how important it is to them to keep their location at the marina. He also wants people to know how important these boats are visually. They welcome the idea of having the piers open to the public as they have full time security on site. He would also like to advocate for a moderate amount of parking.

Pamela Ebsworth is very pleased to see so much nice development on the plans. She leans toward alternative 1 but does want to see 100th retained. It is important to the people who live in the area and takes pressure off of Main Street. She would like to see pier 2 remain. She is totally against any kind of commercial uses or activity in the park. She does not like the iconic element in Alternative 2 and likened it to the Alaskan Way viaduct. Meydenbauer is small and the park is at the end of the cove. She believes that this element is out of scale and wants to keep the park natural.

Anita Neil wants to point out to people who are pro-park that this is a two part process – there is the park and the upland piece. The upland is still a huge concern. She liked a lot of what Rich Wagner said and thinks that partial day-lighting is enough. She wants to keep docks 1,2 and 3 but remove the roofs. She doesn't like the floating pier and it concerned about the length of the curving pier. She doesn't want any retail and is happy that they will finally get a plan that shows 100th open – at least one way. She thinks that the two story dock is a bad idea and doesn't like Alternative 3. She prefers transient moorage as shown in Alternative 1. She thinks that community buildings look okay in Alternative 1 but there is way too much in 2 and 3. She is pleased to see the direction that this project is going.

Donald O'Hara represents sunset community organization. When the property was acquired, they were assured that they would keep all existing moorage. He would like to see the existing piers stay. When people come to the park on boat, they will want something to drink, fresh supplies, and other things which means we are going to need some transient slips. The current slips aren't being used because they only accommodate small boats. We need to keep in mind that we have two separate environments in the Bay and we need to plan carefully for different uses.

Marv Peterson loves the boats and wants to thank you because tonight we finally see some unity. He also likes the large boats. He thinks we should leave the gas station site alone. He feels strongly that in Alt. 2 the economic loss to the Meydenbauer Bay condos if there is a 2-story dock will be significant.

Madelaine Georgette would like to ask the Steering Committee and Consultants to take a tour of Luther Burbank Park on Mercer Island. Take a look at the ratio of parking spaces to the land and the population that this is meant to serve. This would be a good guide for the number of parking spaces. She feels that this is an excellent example of what the park should be like – it is virtually all about nature. There are a few tennis courts but there aren't any vendors. That park is a good example of how people enjoy nature. It is a regional park that serves 3 Million people.

Scott Boulware has not been here since the first few meetings. He is a neighbor and can't wait to see this park across from the house. A lot of people might be terrified but his family can't wait. He likes Alternative 1 and loves the big arcing pier. He would like to advocate for the Boys and Girls clubs and wants to have life guards and swimming lanes. He doesn't like the new structure in alternative 2 and does not want retail in the park. He wants to see many boats and would support more boats than there are now. He has been on a waiting list for 3 years and is subletting a spot on Pier 3 right now.

Birney Dempsie likes the idea of the public park but wants the marina. He thinks that 14 is too many transient moorages. He does not want a restaurant.

Stewart Koladnar likes Alternative 1, day-lighting the stream, and the plaza in Alt 3 on 100th Ave. It would be nice to be able to walk out onto the docks. He believes that the goal should be people walking into the park, not driving by slowly as the overlook might support.

Bill Smith has a boat on pier 1. He feels that if you have piers 1 and 2 that is still a 60% reduction of slips. A waterfront experience includes boats. Boats are part of the waterfront.

Linda Ellison has a boat on Pier 1 and is right next to the Alliance. She feels that we must have parking for the people who have boats there. Please consider a place for boaters to park for both loading and when boaters are out on long trips.

6. Steering Committee direction to City staff and consultants

a. Narrowing of alternatives

Brian summarized some of what was heard in the public comments and Steering Committee comments. He said that he heard a lot of support for day-lighting the creek, keeping pier 2, a lot of concern for a restaurant, support for keeping a continuous walkway the full length of the park, and some mixed comments about the Pier at the foot of 100th. Those seem to be the big themes. The purpose tonight is not to pick one scheme but to identify elements that people like or don't like from each. The Steering Committee was asked to discuss more specifically different elements in the park.

Structures:

- Tom Tanaka believes that views are a big part of this. Be careful about obstructing views.
- David Schooler thinks that restrooms and rain cover should be provided in more than one location, and that we should use the existing home as an education center. He thinks that the boat storage tucked into the hillside is interesting.
- Stefanie Beighle wants to have an education center as shown in Alternative 1 and a boat house in the hillside.
- Kevin Paulich is still favoring #1 but wants to keep pier 2 and add a view plaza at the top of the park.
- Rich Wagner agrees with Kevin's comments.
- Marcelle Lynde agree with Kevin's comments but would like to add that she wants a meeting place, probably single level with a green roof.
- Stu Vander Hoek– wants to see a community meeting space, an interpretive center, and a refined urban edge at 100th SE. He would like to see ideas that aren't so iconic but give a nice transition to the Bay.
- Iris Tocher echoes what Stu said about meeting places. She would like to see an overlook plaza at 100th and Main and some exploration of structures that are tucked into the side of the hill.
- Stu Vander Hoek mentioned that we have a lot of historic structures in the City that people don't know about, open our minds and see if we can use the ravine to relocate some historic structures in Bellevue.
- David Blau asked the committee if the consultant team should we continue to explore the conference center idea the northern part of the park and the committee agreed that they should as long as it was of the appropriate scale.

Parking:

- Iris Tocher thinks that 68 is about right
- Stu Vander Hoek originally said that 150 spaces was about right but believes we need to know more about the program before you can determine the amount of parking. We need to know if this park will impact Main Street.
- Marcell Lynde Likes the parking garage and thinks that about 60-70 spaces sounds right. Don't need to provide parking for every single person who comes to the park.

- Rich Wagner said that we must have adequate marina parking, and he likes the idea of underground parking. It should be well lit with green on top. He was interested in some of the studies shown where there was a parking structure underground with elevator to help bring people down to the water near the tail of the kite parcel.
- Bob MacMillan said that although it sounds a bit random, he thinks that 150 spaces sound about right. He believes that we need a safe secure underground area.
- Kevin Paulich thinks that parking in alternative 1 is fine as it is. Parking should be at SW corner of Downtown Park and 68 spaces sound appropriate. There should be a short term parking area for the marina.
- Stefanie Beighle also thinks that the 68 number looks good and she agrees with that Kevin said.
- David Schooler doesn't think it is useful to give numbers until we have more information.
- Tom Tanaka thinks that we need to have more parking in the park closer to the Marina and the beach. The problem with some of the parking in the ravine is that is too far for people to walk.

Marina
Since there seems to be some consensus on the ideas about the Marina Brian Scott summarized what he had already heard from the Steering Committee:

- Pier 1 should stay
- Pier 2 could stay
- Pier 3 – okay if that goes and replaced
- Mix of ideas about the Pier at the end of 100th. Must consider what it means for the sailing club. What ever we do their has to take that into consideration- it may be smaller or not there at all.
- Iris: We are talking a long range plan – think long range – 20, 30, 50 years out.

b. Key assumptions for traffic analysis

David Blau reviewed the work that the consultant team has started. There will be some discussion/presentation on two topics – He will report on where the consultant team is on transportation, traffic and parking analysis and how they will embrace the decision on 100th Ave. and then he will touch on the environmental review process.

The consultant team has begun to look at the City traffic model – built out to 2020. They will use that model to analyze the alternatives with and without 100th open. They will be doing an analysis of parking demand that will suggest a certain number of parking stalls available in the area; a parking strategy will be based on those finding. They will look at the refined alternatives in terms of what traffic impacts there are and what mitigation measures may be required. Perteet is the lead on the transportation and parking work for the project and are present this evening to answer questions. In the original parking survey, two days were studied – a Thursday and a Saturday from 1-3pm. Perteet conducted a spot check of the traffic studies.

Some of the findings were:

- There are 286 on-street parking spaces and 1,264 off-street spaces within the 20 zones around the project area.
- Occupancy for on-street parking was 45 % on week days and 62% on weekend
- No significant deviation from the data that was collected one year ago

Marcelle Lynde: Did you document the weather on the day of the study? *Yes, it was sunny and clear that day.*
Q: Did the study include an inventory of parking on private property such as business parking lots?

Steve Sindiong, Manager of General Transportation Planning with Perteet Inc. noted that the City may want to explore parking sharing options. David Blau noted that they are also looking to see what is happening where. They are looking at relative occupancy on different street locations and will have more information in a month. They did a quick look at the demand generated for parking from each alternative and it looks like the number that several committee members suggested, 150 spaces, will meet the demand. Again, there will be more work completed on this subject over the next month.

Discussion:

- Kevin asked if the methodology they are using assumes that patterns don't change in terms of transportation. In other words, the analysis is all based on the way people currently travel.
- Kris Liljeblad, Project Principal with Perteet Inc. noted that trip generation and parking demand is based on historic uses. Steve Sindiong said that demand is based on parking study manuals – they do tend to look at suburban types of uses. When we explore parking management, we will include information about other ways to get to the park – bike parking, transit, sidewalks, etc. As part of the parking strategy, we will look at non-motorized transit option. Transit is currently very poor in serving this site.
- Rich Wagner asked if the work would look at alternatives with the road open as a one way or two-way*? Until we know more about the program, we can't get a full analysis*. David Blau: We chose not to study the traffic in detail at this stage because we felt that after this meeting, we would have a better understanding of what the steering committee and community would want in the park and be able to narrow the alternatives to one or two. Based on the comments we heard today, that seems possible. In the next month, Perteet will study an option for each of the alternatives with and without the road open.
- David Schooler asked if we are still working with out a real traffic study. And wanted to know if we can test it in the real world? He doesn't feel comfortable with a computer model. Will you go out there and test it with one lane open, both lanes closed? *What we are going to do is look at trip generation for the refined alternatives and run it through the model.*
- Iris Toucher mentioned that the city is going through a tremendous change and wanted to know if this strategy for this park be fully integrated with the strategies of downtown.
- Steve Sindiong mentioned that the model that they will use does assume the future development that will be built out to 2020 and it will assume build out based on current zoning.
- Stu Vander Hoek wanted to know how the recommended parking management strategy will treat zones to the west of 100th. Will you assume that parking stalls are available for park use? Is your study going to allow park users to park in all areas? Yes, *the plan will recommend that you allow for some on-street parking for this park use.*
- David Schooler suggested that the team go to Amore (a chocolate shop) that is very close to 100th and Main next Thursday at 1pm to see how many parking spaces there are. *There are some locations that are currently maxed out.*
- Stu Vander Hoek said that we can't assume that we can use private parking.
- Iris Tocher said that it is wrong both morally and ethically to assume that you can use private parking for the park.
- Stu Vander Hoek said that he doesn't agree with the two studies that have been completed.
- Tom Tanaka said that in terms of Main Street parking he suggests that the consultant team look into traffic mitigation options along with parking issues.
- Brian Scott suggested that a smaller group convene to talk about this issue and ask Perteet more questions about parking.

DRAFT

- Stu Vander Hoek doesn't believe that the one-on-one conversation would be effective.
- Kris Liljeblad wanted the Committee to know that the Saturday he and Steve did the spot check was a very busy day. There was activity in the Downtown that day and it was the day of the 24hr Relay. Despite that there were significant numbers of on-street parking spaces available in the vicinity of Downtown Park. The numbers aren't going to change. What we need to do is determine what to do with these numbers.
- Stu Vander Hoek stressed that this is the tip of the iceberg. The conversation needs to happen in public.
- Patrick Foran added that Perteet's work was only a spot check of the previous study. It was not a new full study. Patrick said that he would like to see a significantly more robust parking study in the park area and understood that this study was only a validation of the parking study that was done last year.
- Sandy Fischer, Landscape Architect with EDAW said that there is a fundamental decision to be made here. Will the park meet its own parking demand or will we be pushing the parking for the park into the neighborhoods.
- Kris Liljeblad mentioned that in reviewing the parking, it is important to study off-street as well as on-street parking because if off-street is full, the people who live in the area and have visitors will begin to occupy the on-street spaces. Kris agrees that it is not fair for the park to compete with parking for Downtown businesses. It sounds like we need to plan parking in the park for the park.

  David Blau concluded his presentation with a discussion of the environmental analysis. He wanted to touch on a very important decision that the City staff is facing over the next few weeks. There are basically two choices. The first is an expanded checklist; the second is a full programmatic EIS. You don't have to have multiple alternatives for the first option. For option two you would have alternatives that preserve a range of environmental outcomes. To date, the consultant team has not found any significant unmitigatable environmental impacts. The only issues that were identified as potentially significant are aquatic habitat and salmon related impacts. If the City chooses to go the full EIS route, it is in the spirit of full disclosure and solid open public process. It would be for reasons other than potential environmental impacts. If we go the second route, we will be talking about a scoping meeting in the near future. That will also likely affect the project schedule.

- David Schooler asked if we draw the water out of the bay will that be identified as a significant impact that will trigger a Full EIS? He mentioned that he hasn't seen any in-depth discussion about the re-circulation of water from the Bay.
- Stefanie Beighle said that in her opinion that is an issue that is separate from the Master Plan of the park, that is an issue of Bay cleanup.

7. Adjourn

Iris adjourned the meeting and noted that the next Steering Committee meeting would be held on October 30, 2008. David Blau noted that information at that meeting would include narrowed alternatives and the traffic analysis of those alternatives with 100th open to vehicle traffic as well as closed. City staff reminded committee members and the public that a public workshop would be held October 29, 2008, one day prior to the Steering Committee meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS (who signed in):

- Sherry Grindeland
- Jane Morton
- Karen Klett
- Pat Sandbo
- Ross McIver

DRAFT

- Carmen Aguillar
- Rod Bindon
- Betty Schwind
- Bob Drexler
- David True
- Daryl Williams
- Pamela Ebsworth
- Bill Reams
- Bob Buckley
- Mary and Ray Waldmann
- George and Paula Cruickshank
- Linda Ellison
- Ben Ellison
- Firman Smith
- Stuart Kolodner
- Anita Skoog Neil
- Mark Williams
- Robin and Blue Savage
- Birney and Marie Dempsey
- Aaron Dichter
- Crystal R. Madison
- Mildred Barker
- Louise Brewer
- Chris Challis
- Matt Palmer
- Marv Peterson
- William W. Smith
- Scott and Susan Gilson
- D.R. O'Hara
- Mardeen Jorgensen
- Negar Partovi
- Joy Stewart
- Al Vaskas
- R. Sandbo
- K. Surace-Smith

DRAFT