City of Bellevue

Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan

Steering Committee Meeting #14

MEETING SUMMARY

DATE: October 30, 2008

TIME: 5:00 PM

LOCATION: Bellevue City Hall

ATTENDEES:

Steering Committee
Doug Leigh
Iris Tocher
Stu Vander Hoek
Bob MacMillan
Stefanie Beighle
Betina Finley
Kevin Paulich
Tom Tanaka
David Schooler

City Staff and Consultants
Robin Cole, City of Bellevue
Mike Bergstrom, City of Bellevue
Patrick Foran, City of Bellevue
Kris Liljeblad, Perteet
Steve Sindiong, Perteet
David Blau, EDAW
Marilee Stander, EDAW
Brian Scott, EDAW
Sandy Fischer, EDAW
Newton Breiter, EDAW
Shelley Marelli, City of Bellevue
Glenn Kost, City of Bellevue
Dan Stroh, City of Bellevue
Nancy Lacombe, City of Bellevue
Matt Terry, City of Bellevue
Shelley Brittingham, City of Bellevue

SUMMARY:

1. Pre-meeting statement to the Steering Committee
Connie Marshall, former City of Bellevue Councilwoman and Mayor, was invited by Co-chair Iris Tocher to address the Steering Committee and comment on the Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan. She appreciated being there and recognized that the committee had been working on the project a long time and implored them to make it a unique project, unlike any other experience in the city. She had been a part of the City Council at the initial stages of the project and took part in purchasing the last piece of property on her last night on the Council. This is a really expensive, unique opportunity to be shaping. She asked if anyone had been to the Mercer Slough / Environmental Education Center in Bellevue. The dream for the environmental education center was to have the Center on Bellevue Way yet it ended up on 118th. She mentioned that the city is going to win several awards for that project.

There are 315 environmental acres in the Mercer Slough and a brand new environmental education center. Connie asked if Meydenbauer Bay Park needed to be another environmental experience. The first property purchased by the city was a little marina, right next to the yacht club – she suggested emphasizing boating uses in the park. She believes that there should be a place to be in Bellevue with a boat. It is remarkable to have a unique urban experience near a boat and not everyone has a boat.

Connie went on to acknowledge that she was glad to see that all three alternatives had a working marina. She asked the Committee to consider the useful life left on the docks. In reference to transient boat slips, she offered that traveling to other areas is a great opportunity and that people should have the ability to travel to Bellevue – to come up to shop and dine on Main St.

Connie asked the Committee what they want to see in the design of the park. She challenged the Committee with a number of questions including: Do you really need more playground equipment? What about the water experience? There's a beach, why not another? She mentioned that you don't need to replicate everything in every park. As far as a conference center, there are several throughout the city. What about a boat experience? Does Bellevue have a whaling museum that references a part of history before Bellevue was established? In regards to the youth center, there is one on 100th just up the street. Do we really need another one?

Connie brought up a point that not everything needs to be newly constructed. She likes the idea of reusing an existing building. Addressing parking and access, she offered that infrastructure is expensive and that it is important to think of funding. She told the Committee to have a dream but to be reasonable. 100th Ave provides access to the park, which is a steep access point. There is existing parking in Meydenbauer Bay Park. Connie asked if you need to daylight a stream and remove working parking. The ravine space is also steep and the existing infrastructure provides access.

Connie asked the Committee what visionary thing they were going to do. She stressed that this park needs to have something very unique. She asked if there is any space in Bellevue that has a continuous boardwalk from one side of the park to the other and said that she though it would be nice for everyone to have a continuous water experience. She challenged the Committee to think of a water feature, piece of art, or viewing dock. Where are residents going to take visitors? Where is your space needle? Is it going to be graceful and of human scale? There has been a lot of discussion about this and many alternatives presented. Connie encouraged the Committee to mix and match the alternatives. She said that you need to decide what park you are going to put your signature on; your vision. Everyone in Bellevue and everyone around will be grateful for this experience. This is a centerpiece for Bellevue and a chance to offer more than just shopping.

2. Welcome and review of the agenda/meeting overview

After thanking Connie Marshall for her comments, Iris Tocher opened the fourteenth 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. The objectives of the meeting are to discuss changes to the process based on the inclusion of an Environmental Impact Statement, discuss the alternatives, and to talk about traffic and parking. The meeting will proceed in that order, with EDAW presenting EIS scheduling details and 2 refined alternatives, and Perteet presenting traffic and parking analysis. Afterword, the Steering Committee will provide comment.

3. Review and approval of September 18, 2008 Meeting Summary

Iris Tocher and Doug Leigh both noted misspellings of their names. In addition, an errata sheet was presented by staff suggesting changes to the summary of a public comment. Stefanie mentioned that she didn't remember making one of the comments attributed to her in the summary, and requested that the comment either be verified or stricken. The Steering

Committee approved the meeting minutes with the spelling corrections, errata, and acceptance of Stefanie's request.

4. Environmental Review Process

Brian Scott, EDAW's community outreach specialist, reviewed the agenda and summarized changes to the schedule. Since the last Steering Committee meeting, there was a decision to complete an Environmental Impact Statement which has affected the project schedule.

Brian reviewed several key planning principles and noted that the Steering Committee's charge is to create a regionally significant park, a unique and environmentally sensitive setting, a remarkable and memorable destination, and graceful pedestrian connection, increase visual access, and to engage the community.

Brian pointed out that the EIS is an additional task that was recently added to the project scope. This addition affects the process graphic presented at previous steering committee meetings and public workshops which projected a final plan proposal by spring 2009. With the inclusion of the EIS, there is a 6-7 month extension added to the overall process. The final Master Plan is now scheduled for completion in January 2010.

David Blau, EDAW's project principal, presented an overview of the EIS process. In effect, it will take about 4 months, until late February 2009, to issue the draft EIS. The plan is to have equal treatment of the alternatives for the draft EIS before holding a public hearing which will be held during a 30 day review period of the draft. The public along with different agencies such as Fish and Wildlife and the Army Corps of Engineers will give feedback. There will then be close to a 3 month period before a final is published, addressing comments raised during the process. The consultants anticipate that the committee will want to agree on a preferred alternative concurrent with the Final EIS. By the time the Final EIS is completed, there will be a committee preferred alternative. The plan is to take comments from the Committee and integrate the best features into a preferred alternative.

- Bob MacMillan interjected with a comment. We have been presented with 2 alternatives. Each has key parts such as 100th open and closed and proposed elements that City doesn't have any control over such as the land use changes. Bob mentioned that the Meydenbauer Apartments currently has vehicle access from 100th Ave SE, and that he walked the property today to make sure he wasn't mistaken. He is concerned that the committee is making an assumption that will come back and bite them. He thinks we should factor in the possibility that the surrounding properties might not redevelop.

- David Blau responded. The essential action for the upland areas is the zoning change. The team will not design building footprints. We could develop performance specifications so that you would have requirements for proposed developments but we do not have direct control over how this development occurs.

- Bob MacMillan replied that we can't assume the timing of private redevelopment.

- Sandy Fischer, EDAW landscape architect, commented that there is a no action and a proposed density change that will be evaluated in the EIS.

- David Blau brought up that work presented by previous economic consultants showed that any density less than what has been proposed wouldn't work both economically or market wise.

- Iris Tocher commented that she believed that what was decided was that development dealt with the issue of access. It occurred to her that the issue of access could be used as a carrot for encouraging development of the two privately held properties so that it would benefit the owners and the park.

- Mike Bergstrom said that part of the issue is that the incentive driven approach for zoning and development would require a give back. Controlling private development is difficult but is not uncommon to study it in an EIS.

- David Schooler added that any change in the park could move forward before the development and suggested that the best you can do is to set performance specs.

- Doug Leigh directed a question to David Blau. Do you imagine that there would be investigation into what the incremental steps might be and what the conditions might be and what things would look like during the process?

- David Blau said that project phasing would be covered in the master plan document.

- Doug Leigh added that in past projects with a master plan in place there can be a supplemental EIS for future changes if a lot of time has passed between master planning and implementation. We don't have specific designs or proposals and the design is very programmatic.

- David Blau responded that the EIS will be at a programmatic level. For future development proposals, there would likely be additional environmental review specific to the project level.

5. Presentation of refined park master plan alternatives
David Blau presented a slideshow of the revised alternatives noting that there had previously been 3 alternatives that were now refined into 2 based on feedback from the public and the Steering Committee. He mentioned that it was the same presentation as the night before and that he would cover the subtle points in the refinement of the plans. The first alternative was refined and the 2nd and 3rd refined into one. There are now two alternatives.

After the brief introduction, David highlighted the main comments made about the 3 previous alternatives and how the refined 2 alternatives responded to them:

<u>Alternative 1:</u>
The previous version of Alternative 1 shown at the steering committee meeting invoked the following questions. Do we really need a water feature? Do we really need surface parking? Can we have a larger plaza? Could it be a continuous walk? This is how the team responded:

- There is a continuous walk that moves out to the curved pedestrian pier and overlook.
- There is an opportunity to expand the wetlands area
- The youth center is an environmental education center with an outdoor education area which is very much focused on eco-education
- On the kite parcel, there is a grander entry with both a stair and ADA access ramp to the waterfront
- Piers 1 and 2 are retained, Pier 3 removed, and an elegant arching pier added.
- About 10 parking spaces on top of the terrace and about 90 spaces in an underground parking garage below (you wouldn't see parking from the street and there would be a grand viewing terrace on top). The surface parking could become a transit stop.
- The hillside below the terrace would be an enhanced woodland
- Both schemes (alternatives) will be rooted in environmental, eco design including the removal of invasive species and roofs from overwater structures.

He went on to describe the section through the kite parcel in alternative one and referenced the existing Vue Condominiums in the background.

<u>Alternative 2:</u>

In Alternative 3 presented at the last steering committee meeting, people liked the plaza, the water feature connecting Downtown Park to the waterfront, grand water features, and the beach stayed at the same end of the park. In general, people felt that Alternative 3 was too bold a statement.

In Alternative 2 presented at the last steering committee meeting, people liked the partial daylighting, didn't like the café in the first plaza, and didn't care for the pier treatment.

The new Alternative 2 is a refinement of the previous 2nd and 3rd alternatives. It includes:

- A retreat center with a green roof
- A partial creek daylighting
- A pedestrian pier that has been scaled down somewhat
- A floating boardwalk that lets people get out on the water and look back at the city
- A water feature that would connect Downtown Park and increase its size
- In this scheme, 100th would be a grand staircase
- Elevators that would provide access to the waterfront
- A strong connection through the land use plan area to wildwood park

- Iris Tocher interjected. That is not existing right of way through the land use plan.

- David responded. No, but what we can do is put performance specs to ensure that it gets built in future.

David Blau went on to describe the section through the kite parcel in Alternative 2. David stated that the kite parcel has the potential to contribute to improvement of water quality. He displayed a section of the existing kite parcel to show the scale of 100th and the proposed treatment in the new alternative. There is a restored planting area, an enhanced building with green roofs, and a lower profile of structure and overlook. The elevated pier would be approximately 35' tall near the water's edge. The graphic showed the scale of the pier structure in relation to existing improvements. The water flowing through the kite parcel is envisioned as being stormwater.

<u>Presentation of 2 alternative master plan variants with 100th Ave open:</u>
David Blau introduced the 2 alternatives with variants that leave 100th Ave open. As we talk about 100th we should talk about the planning principles. They should drive the design solution. We are greatly increasing waterfront access and doing a good job at that. The pedestrian orientation, drawing pedestrians to the water, requires your decision to decide whether we are doing a good job of that. How does a pedestrian first message inform the park design? This is in reference to park integrity. Perteet will discuss traffic analysis.

<u>Alternative 1 with 100th Ave open:</u>
With 100th Ave closed in Alternative 1, there is a full use of the parcel, giving us a lot of room to work the ADA path to the waterfront. When 100th is left open, it forces us to figure out how to get pedestrians to the water on a very tight site.

- Doug Leigh asked if EDAW knew the existing grade of the road.
- Sandy said it was approximately 10 percent
- Doug mentioned that new roads couldn't be built at a 10 percent grade

David continued by presenting the advantages and disadvantages of closing 100th Ave in Alternative 1.

Advantages of Closing 100th included:
- Strong park presence on approach
- Strong pedestrian link to DT Park

- More space for ADA path with 60' change in elevation
- Fewer vehicle/ pedestrian conflicts
- Reduced street runoff and pollutants
- Pedestrian connection to Wildwood Park

Disadvantages of Closing 100th included:
- Lose existing road used by local residents
- City park parcel east of 100th Ave SE without vehicular access
- Increased traffic volume on surrounding streets

Alternative 2 with 100th Ave open:
In Alternative 2, the park visitor has a choice of using the stairway or using an elevator to get down to the shoreline. If the street is left open, it is more difficult for pedestrians, as they have to use the elevator to get to the shoreline. The road would provide access to the lake level. If there was a modest café or kayak storage, they would have better access.

Advantages of Closing 100th included:
- Strong park presence on approach
- Strong pedestrian link to DT Park
- Fewer vehicle/ pedestrian conflicts
- Reduced street runoff and pollutants
- Larger park and habitat area
- Pedestrian connection to Wildwood Park

Disadvantages of Closing 100th included:
- Lose existing road used by local residents
- City park parcel east of 100th Ave SE without vehicular access
- Increased traffic volume on surrounding streets
- Café and boathouse without street frontage

David completed his presentation of the two refined alternatives with a review of the environmental scorecard which was first presented at the Steering Committee Meeting on September 19, 2008.

6. Traffic and Parking Analysis
Kris Liljeblad of Perteet Engineering discussed the transportation analysis work on traffic and parking done on the 2 alternatives and summarized their scope of work. A verification and update on the previous transportation work was done. 2020 was used as a forecast year to look at planned growth and development of the downtown and changes to the facility plan of the city. Additional analysis of parking demand was done based on the proposed alternatives. The parking demand is estimated from similar demands of similar uses such as recreational or civic uses. Peak use is estimated. The effect on intersections was based on 2020 numbers with and without 100th open. The work done is preliminary and feedback is encouraged from the committee and city staff, and there will likely be changes.

Parking and trip generation numbers were presented first. Trip generation numbers are estimated in a similar manner as parking, with the amount of trip making based on a national guidebook comparing similar operations and uses. Alternative 1 meets the demand for parking spaces. Alternative 2 has about 30 excess spaces. There are obviously going to be times when the numbers are too high or too low. The afternoon peak hour generation estimates were:
- 57 trips for Alternative 1
- 115 trips for Alternative 2
- 106 parking spaces needed for Alternative 1
- 156 parking spaces needed for Alternative 2

Showing a map of the area around Meydenbauer Bay Park, Kris described the geometry of the area in terms of transportation analysis. He pointed out the evaluation of arterial streets such as Lake Washington Boulevard and 101st Ave. The area of 100th in question is not an arterial. The analysis gives grades to offer an early projection compared to 2020 conditions. In the first conclusion, with 100th left open, there is little change in transportation needs. The operational characteristics of the intersections are not changed. With 100th closed, evaluating the same comparisons, we look at important points where traffic might divert to. Similar to the first comparison, 100th and Main St, and 2nd and Bellevue Way are important intersections. The intersection of 101st and Main St. deteriorates a level of service. The amount of delay at the intersection would be doubled. There is potential to mitigate this to then offer an acceptable level of service with techniques such as a traffic signal, a left turn lane, or full stop control to create gaps.

<u>Steering Committee comments and questions about transportation analysis:</u>

- Bob MacMillan mentioned that he lived on the corner of 101st and Main St. He brought up that another traffic consideration is the 102nd and Main St. intersection. Any left turn movement there has the same effect combined with the fact that there is an access point that affects traffic. Any westbound traffic is increased.
- Kris added that any left turning vehicle causes problems.
- David Schooler asked Kris if he had also taken into consideration the proposed density changes in the land use plan, the changes in the upland piece and the changes to sites east of 100th.
- Kris responded by saying that the land use used in the analysis was a worst case condition.
- David Schooler asked Kris whether they took into account a denser upland piece for traffic and parking
- Kris offered that both alternatives have no significant impacts. With 100th closed, 101st and Main St. drops in a level of service. A city decision such as signalizing the intersection could mitigate this and bring it back to an acceptable level of service.
- Doug Leigh asked about stop signs and if they could be used at the intersections in question.
- Kris responded that they didn't look at that but could with more time.
- Tom Tanaka inquired if Kris was planning to talk to city staff as there are changes occurring to Main St.
- Kris said that he was planning on reviewing the findings with the City.
- Betina Finley asked Kris if they had looked at a one-way loop.
- Kris stated that they analyzed a worst case scenario that looked at 100th as a two-way street.
- Stu Vander Hoek asked if the team could evaluate a round about at 101st and Main St.

7. Discussion with Steering Committee on alternatives, traffic, and parking

- David Blau told the committee that it would be most helpful to the consultants if the committee could comment on any tweaks to either alternative before proceeding into the EIS.

- Iris Tocher had the following comments:
  - Start with Rich Wagner's comments
  - Could the Kite Parcel in Alternative 2 be ADA accessible? (Sandy responded that the elevator could be moved)
  - Lots of folks didn't want commercial uses in the park – a marina is a commercial use.
  - Wants only Pier 1 kept and the additional curved pier from Alternative 1
  - Doesn't see why there can't be 2 beaches
  - Could have transient moorage on the west side
  - On moorage – lots of people own rvs, but we don't provide them parking spots.
  - Doesn't know that we are obligated to provide it
  - From a non-boater, Piers 1 and 2 could be removed (better for water quality)
  - Only Pier 1 is important for ambiance

- We're talking about something different. Downtown Park was established 20 years ago and is still not finished. We are talking about long-term and not about what's done today.
- Wants something visionary and really iconic
- Advocates day-lighting the entire stream
- Interested in human habitat/experience – Downtown is intensifying, eliminating people's experience with nature
- Thinks reuse of heritage center in a beautiful old home doesn't function that well. Wonderful to preserve history, but possible to give kids the experience of a new facility.
- Like Alternative 1 until you get to the whaling building – likes the kiosks there
- In terms of closing 100th – thinks that if we don't get the entrance to the park right, could impact entire project. Wants a magnificent, grand thing

- Stu Vander Hoek
  - Wants roundabout in the EIS

- Bob MacMillan had the following comments:
  - Looking at the profile of Alternative 2, while it is a vast improvement, it would seem that it could be articulated one level down, which would preserve the view of the 10,000 Meydenbauer Condominiums.
  - Thinks the committee should walk the site together again

- Robin Cole offered to schedule a site walk and the committee approved. She will schedule via email

- Kevin Paulich had the following comments:
  - Is there any support for Alternative 2 on the committee? (Part of the committee replied 'yes')
  - Transient and permanent moorage – in the winter months, transient could be used for winter moorage – a lot of docks keep boats for summer and elsewhere in the winter
  - What is most important is to have a visual link between the two parks (Downtown and Meydenbauer)

- Tom Tanaka had the following comments:
  - Highlighted the removal of docks and the sailing school at the yacht club
  - From a business perspective, what is the city's perspective on existing moorage? Is it better to have long-term moorage? Pier 66 in Seattle has transient and they wish they didn't have it. It's empty except during summer months and special events. What does the city need?
  - In reference to the sailing club, understands the concern, but there is a tail and a dog. The inappropriate one is wagging the other. If there is a way of working with the yacht club to accommodate the sailing school, then that is good, but not a constraint.

- Patrick Foran from the City of Bellevue responded:
  - Number of transient slips is based on a grant
  - Fiscally, there is a bond which is being paid off by the leases. Once it is paid off, there is no obligation for fiscal cost recovery.
  - City wants a balance between public access and other principles in terms of the marina design
  - Doesn't envision any plan without permanent moorage
  - Goal is public access for the community.
  - Not constrained by a fiscal recovery goal

- David Schooler had the following comments:

DRAFT

- Suggested the entire group should take a walking tour now that the committee has some ideas and are wrestling with the details and concepts. Example: how does it feel to have something 35 feet in the air?
- Glad to be showing alternatives with 100th open
- Maybe have one-way – could solve the ADA issue
- Important to see how ADA applies to the kite parcel
- Whaling building – do we have enough stuff to fill a whaling museum?
- Restaurant – what type of restaurant – Ivar's or Canlis?
- Strong believer in cascading water – what ties this together?
- What is the environmental value of opening up the upper portion of the stream? Is it of high value? parking can go. If not – parking can be promoted

- Betina Finley had the following comments:
  - Cost is the issue with day-lighting
  - Prefers Alternative 1
  - Instead of building something, look at preserving a structure that is already there – something a little historical and less sterile - Bellevue Botanical Garden does this
  - Would be nice to have a facility to be able to rent out – multiple uses for a facility
  - Like a full boardwalk
  - Likes closed or one-way access (which direction is better for one-way)
  - Example of city overlook – Parque Guell, Barcelona, Spain
  - Opposed to café and any commercial uses (except marina)
  - Wants to pursue park implementation quickly
  - Torn about long-term moorage. Wants people to be able to access the city from the marina.
  - Prefers Alternative 1 (mostly)
  - Doesn't like kiosks in Alternative 2

- Stefanie Beighle had the following comments:
  - Likes both plans – a combo would be best
  - Likes both transient and long-term moorage (not sure how much)
  - Curious to see who is actually mooring there (where from)
  - EIS – have problem with short-term parking on pier because of runoff.
  - Maybe use carts at marina to transport goods
  - Alt 2 – kiosks, could be a bathroom with one seasonal kiosk that sells snacks in the summer
  - What about providing access to the Vue from the kite parcel (in the northwest corner)
  - Would like to see 100th closed if she had a preference – because of pedestrian priority and the remarkable and memorable experience.
  - Thinks we need more info on traffic before making a decision.

- Kevin Paulich had additional comments:
  - He is happy to hear there are ways to mitigate the impacts of closing 100th.
  - A visual link from Downtown Park is needed; 100th ruins that but other impacts of leaving it open should be addressed as well.

- Doug Leigh had the following comments:
  - Need more information to decide on the marina operations; thinks people should be able to get close to boats,
  - Runoff can be dealt with
  - For kayaks and boats, we need to provide places to store boats and access to launch that will not impact restored shoreline
  - Not thrilled with a conference center
  - Like the idea of a flexible space that can serve multiple purposes.
  - Accessible access has only been shown using 100th; do other options exist (e.g., 99th, 101st)?

DRAFT

- Doesn't like to see elevators – unsupervised, maintenance, safety
- EIS – how to minimize the carbon footprint of the park (wants that considered)
- Traffic – 100th is the peak issue – thinks we should evaluate a one-way option and a woonerf
- Prefers stop signs over signals
- Like the floating walkway
- Has concern with green roofs – thinks they would eliminate views.
- Believes boys and girls club is moving to Surrey Downs
- We want everyone included in the park – it is a lake experience not a slough experience
- Has concern with existing parking in the park and with parking in the surrounding area
- Most people favor a full restoration of the ravine from a park, restoration, and experience benefit
- Thinks committee should get together for walk and Christmas Ship time

- Iris Tocher had the following comments:
  - Downtown is intensifying; people need nature experience close at hand and urban residents don't have back yards
  - Like Alternative 1
  - Older buildings are not very functional
  - Don't like enlarging parking at the whaling building
  - Like some vendor carts
  - Like floating walkway
  - Biggest concern with 100th Ave SE is that the park entrance is important; even a one-way route could adversely impact the entry.

- Bob MacMillan suggested that the committee visit the site together.

8. Public comment

- Don O'Hara, Sunset Community Association
  - Don't move beach
  - Don't surface stream
  - Run boardwalk full length
  - Move transient moorage to the west
  - Leave the three docks
  - Small boat rentals at the whaling building
  - Buried parking is a great idea
  - Boats moored are residents
- Lee Thacker
  - Doesn't live in Bellevue, has a boat in the marina
  - RV comment – can park anywhere
  - Tough to moor boats elsewhere and allows people who can't afford to live on the lake to enjoy the lake experience
- David Bricklin, Meydenbauer Neighbors Association
  - EIS should look at both land use and park and how they integrate
  - Traffic, thinks we should look at longer than the 2020 year horizon
  - The impact analysis should consider travel times, not just intersection operations
  - Impact analysis should include the South of Main redevelopment
  - Appreciative of time and energy involved
- Scott Hannah, Meydenbauer Bay Yacht Club
  - There is an aesthetic purpose for boats
  - Once moorage is removed, it's gone and can't be recaptured
- Anita Skoog
  - Wants 100th open, it really impacts residents life (additional delays)
  - Affected drivers would have to go clear out to Bellevue Way.

DRAFT

- Likes retention of Piers 1 and 2; removal of the roof is okay
- Compromise on curved pier – shorten it or curve it more to not extend past the dock
- Likes partial daylighting
- Parking – thinks we should split parking 40 and 40 in two locations underground
- Omit the retreat center and youth center
- Likes retaining whaling building, but doesn't want commercial use
- Thinks vehicular pulloff is a potential problem for traffic and late night behavior
- Doesn't like café and seasonal kiosks
- Wants to keep significant trees and shrubs
- Doesn't like elevated viewpoints if they block residential views
- Green roofs are acceptable
- Boardwalk, restrooms, play area, swim lanes, and short term moorage are okay
- Elevators are okay if tucked into hillside
- Submitted a copy of her speaking notes (on file)

9. Meeting adjourned
Iris adjourned the meeting and noted that the next Steering Committee meeting times were not yet determined. The format and content of the meetings requires further discussion which will be coordinated through the City.

PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS (who signed in):

- Dave Keyser
- Daryl William
- D.R. O'Hara
- Betty Mastropaulo
- Don Mastropaulo
- Jean R. Manning
- Eric Urbasich
- Lee Thacker
- Ray and Mary Waldmann
- Joanne Roddis
- Dennis O'Neill
- David Bricklin
- Crystal Madison
- Mildred Barker
- Mark Williams
- Bob Buckley
- Scott Hannah
- John Evans
- Sandra Boyd
- Anita Neil
- Susan Blethen
- Marv Petersen
- Deborah Jerome
- Kathleen Cole

DRAFT