City of Bellevue

# Meydenbauer Bay: Park and Land Use Plan

**Steering Committee Meeting #12**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**Agenda Item #2.a**
**July 31, 2008 Draft Meeting Summary**

---

**DATE:** July 31, 2008

**TIME:** 5:00 PM

**LOCATION:** Bellevue City Hall

**ATTENDEES:**

**Steering Committee**
Doug Leigh
Iris Tocher
Stu Vander Hoek
Bob MacMillan
Hal Ferris
Merle Keeney
Betina Finley
Rich Wagner
David Schooler
Marcelle Lynde
Stefanie Beighle
Tom Tanaka

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

**SUMMARY:**

**1. Welcome and review of the agenda**
Iris Tocher, Steering Committee co-chair, opened the twelfth meeting of the Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan Steering Committee. She mentioned that most of the committee was at the public meeting the night before and that the primary purpose of the meeting was committee business. The public had a chance to voice their opinions the previous evening during the public meeting and were therefore asked to hold their comments unless they were not present at the public meeting or were not able to comment at that meeting. The steering committee was asked to discuss what they heard at the public meeting and to comment on the alternatives after hearing a brief overview from EDAW about the alternatives and the work completed since the Steering Committee meeting 11.

**2. Introduction of new committee member – Tom Tanaka**
Robin introduced the new committee member, Tom Tanaka. Tom is the vice-chair of the Transportation Commission and will be a great addition to the committee. Welcome Tom!

DRAFT

**3. Review and approval of May 29, 2008 Meeting Summary**

Iris noted that all members should have received copies of the May 29, 2008 meeting summary in their packets and asked if members had any comments or revisions. The Steering Committee had no changes and approved the summary.

**4. Review and discuss vision statement**

Brian Scott, EDAW's community outreach specialist, reviewed the agenda, noted where we are in the public process and introduced the first segment of EDAW's presentation. Brian gave an overview of the steering committee and stakeholder interviews that he conducted in June and July 2008 and that were summarized in a discussion matrix included in the packet. Brian noted that the interviews were focused on understanding people's vision for the park, their values, the character of the park and the types of uses that should occur in the park. In general, people agreed that Meydenbauer Bay Park should be a park for the whole city and that it should be used year-round. They agreed that their environmental values were strong for the park and that the park should improve water quality and enhance environmental awareness. They also agreed that it should be a busy park but envisioned that it would be quiet and passive, especially to the west. Those interviewed were in mild disagreement over the prior land use decisions especially redevelopment, parking and park access. They also strongly disagreed on traffic issues, the treatment of 100th, long-term moorage and parking.

Brian asked if there were any comments on the program statement draft included in the Steering Committee packet.

- David Schooler said he thought it was very good. He said the he would like to bring attention to the 3rd from the bottom paragraph; we are not sure where vendors would be, but felt they shouldn't be along the water. He was also uncomfortable with the statement "Not in ways that disrupt natural systems". He strongly believes that we should be able to pump water out of the bay as a method to clean the bay. He noted that this is not an existing natural system and that he is concerned that the wording of the statement in question may limit the group from doing other environmental improvements if they are not already part of the natural system.
- Rich Wagner mentioned that he would like to ask the group about the program question and said he was particularly interested in what Hal thought. The more specific program items are, the easier they are to move along. He wishes that the group had been more specific about the program questions. He asked if there is more program work that needs to be done.
- Iris Tocher agreed and said she thought that was a valid point.
- David Blau responded that the consultant team feels strongly that they need to work the program with the concept plan in tandem – EDAW would like to keep some flexibility in the program at this stage to understand what we can accomplish. EDAW would like to ask for some latitude as we continue to study the issues.
- Iris Tocher agreed with David Blau, and said that she thought the Vision/program statement was a good start. She would like to be clearer about the values from which we are operating.
- Marcelle Lynde suggested changing the word from "disrupt" to "degrade" in the sentence that David pointed out.
- Hal Ferris thought that EDAW developed a good program statement. He felt that it helped to evolve the program. He said that there are a lot of pieces that could go in the park but if we try to fit everything in, we might have too much. He believed that it was possible to continue to evolve the program as we work to make it more memorable. He stated that it would be good to have some reflective time at the end of the process.
- David Schooler asked to have a list of program items for the park that could be tracked in future discussions.
- Iris Tocher mentioned that she liked the matrices in the notes in the packet.

**5. July 30, 2008 public workshop/ Alternatives review, discussion, and direction**

**a. Overview**

David Blau, EDAW's project principal, presented a slideshow that was prepared for the public workshop held the previous evening. He emphasized that the evening's discussion was not meant to be an exercise to choose one of the three alternatives. The alternatives were developed to test what statements/values mean to different people. They are deliberately different to draw out different ideas. For example what does environmental stewardship mean to different people? David reviewed the timeline for development and refinement of the alternatives and finally the creation of one plan proposal. He expected that the plan proposal might have elements from each of the three plans.

David introduced the design concept big ideas and the framework that was developed for the alternatives; two streams, one natural and one urban. In general, the movement along the northern edge, connecting the upland to the lowland is a natural one; it is a process of water flow and species movement along the natural corridor. The corridor along the south also connecting uplands to lowlands and the water's edge is about human movement both motorized and non-motorized. The following are a few highlights presented from each of the alternatives:

<u>Environment and Education</u>

- Daylight stream (some of the flow without removing the existing pipes)
- Stormwater gardens on triangle park
- Shoreline restoration (restore with grasses and sedges)
- Remove or take the beach out all together
- Replace some long-term moorage with a new transient moorage pier
- Opportunity for paths and gardens in the park
- Retain the home near the bridge at the northwest corner of city property)
- Interpretive stations
- Kayak

<u>Urban Edges</u>

- 100 feet wide promenade
- Overlook plaza at main street

<u>Shoreline Destination</u>

- Partial stream daylight
- Relocate and enlarge the beach
- Create a promenade that is framed by two piers

Iris Tocher responded to David's presentation and question "Why do you like it?" She mentioned that many of the public identify the Environmental & Education scheme as memorable. She said that the design needs a bold move to make it highly memorable. She would like to see the following:

- Parking under terraces
- Terraced gardens
- ADA accessible trails
- Small built areas along the boardwalk (light retail is a question that needs to be explored)

**b. Public Workshop Comment Review**

Marilee Stander, Sandy Fischer and David Blau reviewed public comments that were recorded at small tables during the public workshop. Brian Scott reviewed the comments that were recorded in the large group discussion during the public workshop.

**c. Discussion**

- Bob MacMillan thinks it is a good idea to go back to a point that we were at in January with the Land Use Plan to address the issue of consensus on the preferred preliminary land use plan. He believes that consensus was met but only with the provision that we must study the traffic impacts. He also noted that there is not enough room for 2-way traffic to pass if we expect to have a lot of parking on Meydenbauer Way. He believes that we need to address this issue today.
- Iris Tocher agreed that the SC had consensus but with the proviso that we would have a traffic management plan in place.
- Doug Leigh said that he sees the fusion zone being the park and the land use master plan. The big question for the park is how it feels. What is the user experience and what does it feel like to be in this place?
- Hal Ferris agreed with what he heard. He liked the idea of having water at both ends, and especially on the east side. He also liked the idea of day-lighting the stream, removing the road and the parking. He believes that we do need to move the beach but that it should be equal too or greater in size than it is today. He also noted that there needs to be a separation of the boats and swimmers. He likes the curving pier and the viewing area at the end of the pier. Don't want to have the park dominated by the restored landscape rather he wants the park to have usable space for people to enjoy. He likes the history emphasis and wants to see that in the park, and believes the whaling building would be good for that purpose. He prefers light boat rental and feels that private moorage should not restrict the public access.
- Stefanie Beighle agreed with most of what Hal said, and said that she prefers the Environment and Education scheme. She would like to see a view point developed on the east side in addition to what is shown in the shoreline scheme. She would like to see water coming from above. She is willing to see concessions in the park but only if they are run by non-profits. She believes that the beach is necessary and likes the promenade but doesn't believe that it is necessary.
- David Schooler did not want to repeat what others already said. He was intrigued by the environmental emphasis scheme. He would like to see more information on the details of this scheme. For example, if we did "x" in environmental restoration you would get "y" in environmental improvements. He wondered what the environmental costs of the beach are.
- Brian Scott mentioned that the designers had a discussion about this. We need to understand what environmental restoration means to SC members– no human use or some?
- David Blau responded saying that that by daylighting the creek, we have different benefits –there are some water quality benefits but in many ways it is more of a education component. Your main benefit for the shoreline restoration will be for birds. We can do qualitative statement but will not do a quantitative analysis at this point. This would be part of an EIS. What about the beach? How big should it be?
- David Schooler agreed with the previous street comments. The team needs to revisit the technical aspects of the closure. He likes the idea of parking off of 99th and he likes the idea of terraced gardens. He does not want to see any more fir trees planted – they consume too much water.
- Tom Tanaka commented that this discussion has raised an important question. Is there a common understanding of what environmental stewardship is? There are many components of the other plans that may not preclude environmental stewardship.
- Marcelle Lynde noted that most of the elements in the schemes are an improvement on what we have. Environmental regulations won't allow us to build something that isn't low impact.
- Doug Leigh noted that one common element that can be evaluated is carbon. We need to look at carbon as one of the components. How much is emitted as we construct. The park should be carbon neutral or net zero. What was the historic condition? We should

explore improved infiltration. The park design can be used to address many important issues.

- Merle Keeney asked what is remarkable? What is the wow factor? What is the family that is coming down from Crossroads going to think? If you look at Mercer slough – that is a memorable experience. He liked the idea of the floating pier. We should use the terraces for interesting experiences. A beach should be included. Need to open the stream to make it all that it could be. We should not limit ourselves and we shouldn't get into designing the small park elements.
- Rich Wagner mentioned that he is in agreement with most of the comments but would like to question if some of this is realistic. He is very concerned about having surface parking in the park. A lot of time the park will not be used. Must be sure that we have fire and aid vehicles access this area. He is concerned that we are providing too much parking and is confused about where we are going with longer term moorage. He also questioned why pier 2 is being removed since it is almost new although he understands the idea of public access. He suggested the group should consider removing the roof on pier 2 but keeping the pier itself, perhaps keeping it open during the day and locking at night. He likes the idea of parking toward 100th and Main. He believes that we must continue to explore the alternatives.
- Marcelle Lynde said that she would like to see a turn out or drive where people can look out over the water. There are very few places in Bellevue where people can pull over and look out over the park. We hear a lot about people wanting more parking in Downtown Park. In Kirkland for example, people park at the library and walk down to the waterfront. She liked the idea of the promenade but doesn't think it should be 100' wide.
- Stu Vander Hoek mentioned that he likes the idea of the floating boardwalk. The designers need to balance the program with the parking, keeping it at the west end and daylighting half of the stream. He noted that there could be underground parking off of 99th and/or 100th, but there should be some surface parking for boaters. He also wants to keep a soft edge along the shoreline. A promenade, similar to Mercer Slough, is a good idea. He would like to keep the creek at the east end. Mitigation at Main & 1st has to be evaluated prior to closing 100th to vehicle traffic. He believes that the scheme needs to emphasize history and education, environment and education. He would also like to see an overlook at 100th and Main and 100th as a one-way street.
- Doug Leigh noted that the South of Main land use plan assumed that there would be some parking on that portion of the site to accommodate the park.
- Stu Vander Hoek said that he would like to remind the group that parking should be coordinated with the Downtown Park Master Plan for parking.
- Hal Ferris noted that the proposed 20 year bond program does not include money for this project, and wanted to acknowledge how far in the future this park might be built. He cautioned against making future plans on today's reality and recommended very limited surface parking. He wanted to reinforce his support for the vista at 100th & Main. The design team talked about connections to downtown; streetscape connections to other parks could be a common theme that we should look at when we think about the big picture. There are still several little things like restrooms that need to be resolved. Hal doesn't think that permanent retail vendors would be successful on the waterfront but feels that it might be okay to have seasonal vendors or carts.
- Merle Keeney mentioned that he thinks that each of the proposed schemes has potential. We need to have a community building, eg the Whaling Building, that allows people to gather.
- Iris Tocher said that she would like to see more emphasis on topography and how to use it to the greatest advantage. She mentioned that she doesn't want to see surface parking. She would like to see a multi-use facility; it could be used for parking or it could be used for boys and girls club gatherings. The boaters need a safe place on grade as well.
- Marcelle Lynde said that she would like to see some places that would be oriented towards youth activities, such as natural play areas and opportunities to learn about and explore nature.

- Doug Leigh said that he would like to understand the scale of the activity in the water and would like to see an in-water master plan.
- Mike Bergstrom read a comment sent in by Steering Committee member Kevin Paulich who was unable to attend the meeting. – If we put a raised parking garage at the Downtown Park, we could have a view of the bay. It could have a waterfall at the top of the parking garage that could be a start of the water feature on the east side.

**6. Public Comment**

Doug Leigh then invited the public audience members to provide comment.
Bill Sternoff: Is impressed by the new consultants and impressed that Bob said something that we know but we do have an elephant in the room. We need to talk about the transportation. If you look at the website – the city talks about consensus… is it correct that the city is telling us. Bill would like the city to remove that from their website.
Pam Ebsworth: Thinks that there are some wonderful design schemes but we have to go back to the 100th closure. How do emergency vehicles operate in the park?
Bill Reams: Mitigation takes many forms. You can negotiate it. We created a beautiful walkway by moving a road. There are ways to address circulation and aesthetic design.
David True: Speaking on behalf of his employer, Charles Pigott, stated that his employer is the owner of the large boat currently docked in the park. His interest is continuing moorage at existing slip location and size.
Robert Drexler - What is to prevent kayak and canoe users from coming on to private property. Need to be sure to address security issue.

**7. Adjourn**

Iris adjourned the meeting and noted that the next Steering Committee meeting would be held in September.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS (who signed in):**

- C. Pigott
- Louise Brewer
- Robert Drexler
- Betty Mastropaolo
- Scott Hannah
- Don Mastropaolo
- David True
- John Evans
- Aaron Dichter
- Marvin Peterson
- Rod Bindon
- Dave Keyser
- Gordon and Carol Richards
- Pamela Ebsworth
- Bill Sternoff
- Ron Kinoshita
- Mark Williams
- Cherie Ohlson
- Mary and Ray Waldmann
- Philip Matthews
- Greg Itkin
- Bill Reams
- Mustafa and Nina Sagingou
- Gillian Tart
- Peg Barthelow
- Bob Dilg

DRAFT

- Dennis True
- Kathy Hodge
- Carol Starr
- Ray Fisher
- Al Mackenzie

DRAFT