CITY OF BELLEVUE
PARKS & COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday
April 12, 2011
6:00 p.m.

Conference Room 1E-113
Bellevue City Hall
Bellevue, Washington

BOARDMEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Roland, Vice-Chair Robinson, Boardmembers George Grindeland, LaPine, Stokes, and Van Hollebeke

COUNCILMEMBER PRESENT: Councilmember Robertson

PARKS STAFF PRESENT: Shelley Brittingham, Pam Fehrman, Patrick Foran, Nancy Harvey, Shelley McVein, Camron Parker, David Pyle (DSD), Randy Ransom, Sheida Sahandy (CMO), Terry Smith

OTHERS PRESENT: Brian Parks, Anita Skoog Neil

MINUTES TAKER: Michelle Cash, *via recording*

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Roland at 6:00 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion by Boardmember Stokes and second by Vice-Chair Robinson to approve the meeting agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Boardmember Van Hollebeke and second by Boardmember Stokes to approve the March 8, 2011 regular meeting minutes of the Parks & Community Services Board as presented. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS/PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

5. BOARD COMMUNICATION:

Boardmember Van Hollebeke made the following report:

- Been in contact with SPLASH representatives and look forward to working with the organization.
- Signed up for a tennis class at Robinswood Tennis Center. The online sign-up process went smoothly.

Boardmember Grindeland made the following report:

- After a recent visit to the Bellevue Aquatic Center it is apparent that the community needs a new pool.
- Gumbo Night was well attended.
- Visited other community parks via Little League games.

Boardmember Stokes has enjoyed various community parks.

Boardmember George made the following report:

- Participated in a guided tour of Mercer Slough, which was quite informative.
- Walked the future Airfield Park property and suggested signs be placed indicating the future park plans for the property.

In addition, Boardmember George inquired where Robinsglen Nature Park is located. Mr. Foran clarified that this Park is similar to the Native Growth Protection areas. Staff will forward the location of this park to Boardmembers.

Vice-Chair Robinson spoke with someone who was originally opposed to the Meydenbauer Bay project but is now in support of the project. The citizen is anxious for the project to start and was going to communicate his support to City Council and Mr. Foran.

6. CHAIR COMMUNICATION:

Chair Roland recently visited Washington D.C.

7. CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION:

Councilmember Robertson discussed the following items:

- Council recently discussed the Chapin property. This property is nearly five acres located at NE 20th and Bellevue Way. The property was purchased in the 1980s for a future park property and has been vacant. The Bellevue Boys & Girls Club would like to partner with the city and locate a flagship headquarters and community center on the Chapin property. Since the community is in need of an additional community center, Council expressed an interest in partnering with the Bellevue Boys & Girls Club. Councilmember Robertson stressed the importance of engaging the community throughout the process. The Park Board will receive a briefing in the near future, and, if

the project is developed, the Board will be asked for input regarding programming for the community center.

- The city worked with the Bellevue Library to alleviate some of the parking concerns for their upcoming project.
- Since Boardmembers Van Hollebeke and Grindeland have been involved with SPLASH, Councilmember Robertson suggested that they review the study.
- Council received a letter from a citizen grateful for Park's staff and programs at Highland Community Center.
- Arbor Day is April 16. Boardmembers are encouraged to attend the celebration.

Boardmembers were thanked for their service on the Park Board. Since April is National Volunteer Appreciation Month, cake and sparkling cider were presented to Boardmembers as a token of appreciation.

8. **DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:**

A. Environmental Services Initiative

Chair Roland corrected the title for Discussion/Action Items 8A to the following:

Environmental ~~Services~~ *Stewardship* Initiative

Ms. Sahandy explained that the ESI was initiated by the City Manager's Office in 2007. It serves as a cross departmental umbrella to maximize coordination and impact from existing programs and to capitalize on new opportunities. She also summarized the various guiding principles and frameworks for the initiative.

Some of the 2010 accomplishments include:

- Annual Electricity Savings – City Facilities (approximately $33,980 annual savings)
- Annual Electricity and Gas Savings – City Hall (approximately $32,872 annual savings)
- Saving from Traffic Signals (approximately $188,000 annual savings)
- Savings from Fleet (approximately $30,000 annual savings)

Ms. Sahandy noted that the city recently received direct funding for electric vehicle infrastructure. With this funding, the city is working to provide "pay-for-use" charging stations at several public use facilities throughout the city.

Ms. Sahandy discussed the Eastside Sustainable Business Alliance and the home energy reports to raise awareness to consumers.

Specific Parks Department collaborations include:

- Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant funds used to upgrade recreational facility lighting infrastructure.
- American Forest Urban Ecological Analysis.
- Procurement of increased funding for Urban Forestry program.

- Increase of recycling containers at city park facilities.

Mr. Foran commended Ms. Sahandy for her part in growing the Environmental Stewardship Initiative into the program it is today.

Boardmember Van Hollebeke questioned if there is an initiative to move toward electric vehicles within the fleet. Ms. Sahandy responded that staff is cautiously optimistic about electric vehicles. The first steps are being taken (i.e., charging stations). However, vehicle availability and funding are hurdles.

Boardmember Grindeland expressed her frustration with the Puget Sound Energy consumption reports because there aren't suggestions offered on the report to improve usage. Vice-Chair Robinson and Boardmember Stokes agreed with this frustration.

Boardmember LaPine inquired what specifically caused the energy savings throughout the city. Mr. Ransom explained that it was a combination of actions, including:

- Shutting off lights.
- Technology available to provide better lighting output (i.e., Newport Hills Park lights were reduced to 24 from 72 lights due to newer technology).
- Retrofitting.
- Installation of motion sensors.
- Education for conservation.

Vice-Chair Robinson questioned if the energy savings are accurately predicted before the conservation efforts are executed. Mr. Ransom explained the process for calculating the estimated savings. Vice-Chair Robinson suggested that the information about energy conservation be shared with the community. In particular, she thought this information would have been useful when discussing the community concerns about the lighting at Newport Hills Park.

Boardmember Van Hollebeke inquired if there is a way for residents to have input or provide recommendations about environmental initiatives or ideas. Ms. Sahandy explained that the goal is to have a more robust interaction with the community (i.e., web portals, blogs, etc.). However, since resources are limited it may take longer than anticipated to get these interactions set up.

Boardmember Van Hollebeke would like to have the city's support to get multi-family dwellings included in Allied Waste's composting program. In addition, he would like the Parks Department to identify ways to get involved in composting.

Boardmember Stokes suggested that staff talk with Newport High School to encourage them to conserve energy, particularly with the lighting on their ball fields.

Councilmember Robertson reported that Council has approved a program to hire a company to conduct energy savings work for the city. The contract terms include performance based verbiage.

B. Shoreline Master Plan

As part of the Desk Packet, Mr. Pyle distributed a flier that was sent out to all Shoreline property owners to invite them to the upcoming Shoreline Master Program Open House on April 20 and the Public Hearing on May 25. In addition, he distributed two handouts: *Shorelands and Environmental Assistance* August 2010 and Revised April 2010 editions. This information was prepared by the State Department of Ecology and provided an overview of the Shoreline Master Program.

Mr. Pyle explained that the Shoreline Master Program was first adopted in 1974 and followed the passing of the State Shoreline Management Act in 1971. The current Bellevue Shoreline Master Program consists of a chapter in the city's comprehensive plan and also a chapter in the city's Land Use Code. There are several policies located in the comprehensive plan that inform the implementation of certain development regulations that are in the city's Land Use Code.

Mr. Pyle explained that the state implemented a settlement agreement in 2003 that required the passing of WAC 173-26, which are the guidelines for updating shoreline master programs in the jurisdictions that have shorelines. Based upon these guidelines, Bellevue's current SMP is lacking specific components required by new Ecology guidelines. Therefore, an update is in order.

Mr. Pyle discussed the objectives of the Shoreline Management Act, including:

- Environmental quality.
- Preferred uses.
- Public access.

In addition, he discussed the following:

- Bellevue's update objectives.
- Project schedule.
- Shoreline jurisdiction.
- Shoreline environments.
- Aquatics.
- Urban Conservancy.
- Urban Conservancy – Open Space.
- Recreational Boating.
- Shoreline Residential & Shoreline Residential Canal.
- Specific Recreation Policies.

Mr. Parker provided an overview of the public access to Bellevue shorelines, which includes 14 miles of shoreline in Bellevue. Approximately 12% of this shoreline is in public ownership. However, not all of the 12% is in a developed park state (i.e., areas of Meydenbauer Bay and parcels on Lake Sammamish). There is a significant amount of public ownership of wetland systems at Mercer Slough and Lake Hills Greenbelt.

Mr. Parker discussed the Parks & Open Space System survey results from the survey conducted in 2009. In particular, the community beach parks and trails through natural areas ranked high. These priorities are also high on people's wish-lists for additional development.

The following survey information was summarized by Mr. Parker:

- Frequency of Park Use by Facility Type.
- Frequency of Park Use by Facility Type by Youth under Age 18.
- Priorities for City Development of Parks and Recreational Facilities (top items included trails, community beach waterfront, and boat launch facilities).

Mr. Pyle explained how the new SMP regulations will improve public access to the shoreline. He also discussed the SMP impacts on Meydenbauer Bay Park. He noted that both the park and marina are within the shoreline jurisdiction and SMP regulations will apply. However, there may be portions of the park that are outside of the jurisdiction area. Meydenbauer Bay Park is required to be established, developed, expanded or modified consistent with the terms of the Council-adopted Master Plan.

Mr. Pyle summariezed the impacts of the new SMP regulations on current parks and proposed projects (i.e., Lake Sammamish Properties, Mercer Slough, and Lake Hills Greenbelt, Kelsey Creek Farm, Bellefield Office Park, Vasa Park, etc.).

Boardmember LaPine asked if the Bellefield Office Park parking could be redone under the new SMP regulations. Mr. Pyle confirmed that maintenance and repair can be performed under the new SMP regulations with some guidelines.

Mr. Parker asked Boardmembers if they would like to submit comments to the Planning Commission.

Boardmember Discussion:
Vice-Chair Robinson is glad the new regulations do not restrict the style of the Meydenbauer Bay Park Plan.

Boardmember George questioned who will maintain access on subdivisions of more than four lots. Mr. Pyle explained that the Parks Department is typically involved in the subdivision process. The forms of access vary (i.e., local community access, public access, etc.). Typically, the Parks Department works with the developer under public access to determine easements or dedicated tracks for access. Other times, the HOA may maintain the access. Mr. Pyle clarified that the maintenance is unique to each circumstance.

Boardmember George questioned if other alternatives are being considered regarding the subdivision thresholds. Mr. Pyle confirmed that the thresholds will be discussed by the Planning Commission. However, the Park Board is welcome to provide feedback. Mr. Pyle clarified that there are not many sites within the city where four lots could be accommodated. Boardmember George asked Boardmembers to discuss the threshold requirements so feedback can be provided to the Planning Commission.

Boardmember George inquired if staff is working with environmental groups throughout the SMP update process. Mr. Pyle clarified that although some environmental groups have attended public meetings, their attendance has not been consistent.

Boardmember George questioned if the property being purchased on Phantom Lake, by the city, is related to the shoreline program or Parks Department. Mr. Pyle clarified that the Development Services Department does not hold or own land. In addition, the SMP does not include an acquisition program, unless it's part of a restoration program. Mr. Foran added that he is not aware of any purchase on Phantom Lake.

Boardmember LaPine submitted a large number of questions related to the SMP. However, very few answers were received. Mr. Smith explained that staff is working on responses to the questions. Boardmember LaPine feels there are some pieces missing from the Plan. He would like an opportunity to provide feedback.

Mr. Foran encouraged Boardmembers to attend the available touch points regarding the SMP to provide more information. Boardmembers are encouraged to forward comments to staff. In addition, Mr. Parker encouraged Boardmembers to provide direction and a list of general topics to consider. Staff would then prepare a draft letter for Boardmembers to review/finalize at the May meeting.

Boardmember Stokes expressed his frustration for the short time frame to review the information. He would like a more efficient process provided when reviewing topics of this nature.

Motion by Boardmember Grindeland and second by Boardmember Stokes to extend the meeting until 8:15 p.m. Motion carried (6-1).

Boardmember Grindeland questioned how the cubic feet per second figures are calculated. Mr. Pyle clarified the calculation process. In addition, Boardmember Grindeland inquired how the Blueberry Farm on Bellevue Way would be impacted from the SMP if this route is selected by Sound Transit. Staff is currently uncertain about the impacts.

Boardmember Van Hollebeke expressed his appreciation to the Planning Commission for the invitation to comment on the SMP. He feels the Parks Board should take the opportunity to comment. In particular, Boardmember Van Hollebeke would like further information about the SMP's impacts on Meydenbauer Bay Park.

Boardmember Van Hollebeke questioned how much of the SMP Update addresses 40-50 years in the future, rather than reacting to the 2003 standards. Mr. Pyle explained that the original SMP was created in 1974. The revisions passed in 2003 are a baseline for cities and counties with shorelines. Boardmember Van Hollebeke would like to pave a path for others to follow that encompasses forward thinking 50 years into the future.

Chair Roland questioned if there are things in the current SMP Update that are of concern to the city's management and ownership of parks that the Board should be aware of. Mr. Foran clarified that the items listed on the PowerPoint slides were the main areas of concern for Parks. He added the following comments:

- Have Council-approved master plans recognized. If the master plans are approved, the CUP process is not necessary.
- Everyone in the marinas should be held to the same standards. The decisions made with the marina are determined by the Master Plan, while conforming to the shoreline regulations. The public has the greatest involvement through the Master Plan.
- The city has farms because it is part of the mission (historical and cultural interpretation). These are a valuable asset to the city and worth preserving and maintaining.
- The Meydenbauer Master Plan is restoring over half of the waterfront. One of the main purposes of reconfiguring the pier is to improve the ecology and keep the function.

Mr. Foran encouraged Boardmembers to attend the open houses, review the materials, and forward questions/comments to staff.

Motion by Boardmember Stokes and second by Vice-Chair Robinson to extend the meeting until 8:25 p.m. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Boardmember George inquired if Lake Sammamish is considered a legally establish park where new motorized boat launches would be allowed under the Plan. Mr. Parker clarified that the park would have the same designation as other parks (Urban Conservancy Designation). With the development of a city park, a boat launch would be permitted. However, there are some topographical concerns.

Boardmember LaPine asked Boardmembers to ponder the following items for potential comment at the next meeting:

- Page 33/Polies-15 of the Board packet discusses the ability to have a view. There is no verbiage in the SMP that states this should be a priority.
- The SMP discusses shorelines. There should be an additional piece added that addresses shorelines of national significance.

Mr. Foran requested Mr. Pyle's attendance at the next Board meeting. Chair Roland requested revised timelines be shared with the Board.

9. BOARDMEMBER COMMITTEE/LIAISON REPORTS:

A. Eastgate Corridor Study

Boardmember Stokes highlighted topics recently discussed by the Eastgate/I-90 Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). They included:

- Transportation opportunities.
- Transportation vision.
- How to accommodate drivers and growth in the area.

Boardmembers are encouraged to visit the CAC website for further information.

B. Network on Aging

Vice-Chair Robinson reported that the Bellevue Network on Aging will be making a presentation to City Council in May on Universal Design and encouraging its adoption for new construction in Bellevue.

C. Other Groups

None.

10. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

None.

11. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Future agenda items

None.

12. **OTHER COMMUNICATIONS:**

A. CIP Project Report

B. Arbor Day Proclamation

C. Puesta del Sol preschool newsletter featuring trip to Kelsey Creek Farm Park

13. **INFORMATION:**

A. List of upcoming Parks special events

Chair Roland encouraged Boardmembers to attend Arbor Day at Bellevue Botanical Garden.

B. May 10 – next scheduled regular Park Board meeting

14. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS/PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Motion by Boardmember Stokes and second by Chair Robinson to extend the meeting until 8:30 p.m. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Brian Parks, 16011 SE 16th Street, Bellevue, WA
Phantom Lake Homeowner's Association Vice-President

Mr. Parks explained that Phantom Lake Homeowners have concerns regarding the SMP, Eastgate Study, and the Airfield Park. Mr. Parks distributed a handout to Boardmembers of a map and "Petition in Opposition to Shorelines Master Restoration Plan."

Mr. Parks explained that lake levels at Phantom Lake vary by approximately two feet and has high water/flooding problems. The average lake level is up approximately 18 inches over the last year. For the past 10 years, it is up over a foot average. Therefore, there is a high water problem, particularly with mature old-growth trees. In addition, the park properties are typically flooded a significant amount of the year. The wetlands are being devastated from the water and new wetlands are being created up shore. Approximately 75% of the water budget for Phantom Lake is from storm water. The high waters are causing nutrient loads (phosphorus and nitrogen) to the lake, which triggers toxic blue-green algae blooms.

PL-2:
The SMPs restoration plan includes PL-2, which is not a natural stream. To restore this stream is justifying it as a stream when it is actually stormwater run-off. On the other hand, there is a great need on the outlet channel to conduct maintenance to get natural flow out of the lake.

The Phantom Lake HOA suggests that the restoration of the inlet channel be transferred to the outlet channel where there is a greater need.

PL-3:
The Phantom Lake HOA opposes PL-3. The HOA is concerned about view obstructions from overgrown brush or trees.

Over 90% of the Phantom Lake residents signed a petition to oppose PL-2 and PL-3. The HOA suggest PL-7, which changes the restoration to the outlet channel.

In addition, Mr. Parks expressed concern about the water in the detention pond. The Utility Department is damming the flow to the ordinary high water mark, which inhibits flow and causes sedimentation in the channel. Further information was included in his handout.

Anita Skoog Neil, 9302 SE Shoreline Drive, Bellevue, WA

The public input portion of the SMP has been ongoing, since summer 2009. Ms. Skoog Neil stressed the importance that the SMP mandates no net loss.

Although the SMP guidelines call out for public access, Ms. Skoog Neil feels there is disagreement amongst the Planning Commissioners about this topic because there is also a strong mandate within the guidelines to protect private property rights. In addition, she feels there are conflicting opinions about views versus trees.

Ms. Skoog Neil asked Boardmembers to ensure that any Park project mitigation is conducted onsite.

15. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Boardmember Stokes and second by Boardmember Grindeland to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).