



# Meydenbauer Bay

## PARK AND LAND USE PLAN

### Questions and Answers from March 14, 2009 Site Walk and March 19, 2009 Steering Committee meeting

#### Site Walk

##### Area 1 – Marina

Q: How many slips in the Bellevue Marina are currently vacant?

A: As of the March 19, 2009 meeting, nine slips were vacant. (By April 30<sup>th</sup>, only four slips were vacant. During May 2009, all slips were rented, and as of May 28<sup>th</sup>, one vacancy opened up. As slips open up, our marina manager works to fill them.)

Q: What are the vacancy rates on Lake Washington marinas?

A: We do not have current information on other marina vacancy rates.

Q: What is the net revenue from marina slip rentals?

A: The 2007 net revenue from all three piers, and duplex rental was \$96,694. 2008 figures will not be available until mid year.

2007 Marina Cash Flow	Gross Revenue	Operating Expenses	Net Revenue before debt service and interest	Debt Service	Interest Income	2007 Net Revenue
Piers 1 & 2 <sup>1</sup>	368,826	109,826	259,000	275,025		
Pier 3 <sup>2</sup>	128,670	48,844	79,826			
Total	497,496	158,670	338,826	275,025	32893	96,694

Q: Why is the revenue shown above less than what was reported at the March 19, 2009 Steering Committee meeting?

A: The numbers given at the Steering Committee meeting misinterpreted reserve contributions.

<sup>1</sup> Includes rental from dock master duplex.

<sup>2</sup> Does not include Yacht Basin duplex revenue.

- Q: In addition to current revenues, what are projected revenues from marina?  
A: The Marina Finance Plan adopted in 1998 establishes a process for assuring that adequate funds will be available to repay the \$4.1 million generated from the sale of Limited Tax Levy General Obligation bonds by the city for purchase of the Meydenbauer Bay Marina. Each year a cash flow update is provided to ensure that adequate funding is available for debt service and marina operation.

#### Area 2- Grand Entry/South of Main Plan (SOM)

- Q: What type of public/private relationship would implement coordinated redevelopment at SOM, including what the City would fund and what the developer would fund?  
A: The Bayvue East parcel is seen as a potential contribution to SOM coordinated redevelopment to provide parking for park use or other public benefit. Details of coordinated redevelopment would be determined at the project level.
- Q: Is there any difference between the land use shown for SOM in the alternatives?  
A: For both alternatives, the land use proposal is shown the same, consistent with the January 2008 Preliminary Preferred Land Use Plan.
- Q: What is the elevation of the floating boardwalk in Alternative 2?  
A: If it is built as a floating walkway, it will sit directly on the water. It could be developed on short pilings, but that is a design/permitting decision made at the project level.
- Q: What is the height of the elevated view platform, and are there any existing structures on the site that can be used as a benchmark to understand that elevation?  
A: The elevated view platform is approximately 35 feet above existing grade, slightly higher than the east Yacht Basin duplex.
- Q: Will the proposed pedestrian promenade also serve as emergency/fire access?  
A: Yes, the promenade will provide emergency vehicle access.
- Q: Will the existing overhead wires be placed underground?  
A: Undergrounding is the goal, and typically occurs with redevelopment of property or public-sponsored street improvement projects.
- Q: On Alternative 2, will the proposed improvements between the café and street obstruct views from the street level?  
A: Alternative 2 shows improvements between the café and street which are built into the hillside, taking advantage of the grades and affording the public views of the water. Portions of the structure are above grade, but are not intended to obstruct views.
- Q: Do the plaza improvements shown in Alternative 2 include steps and trellis?  
A: Yes, there are plaza steps and a covered but open seating area in the plaza to allow for viewing during inclement weather.
- Q: Which trees will remain and which will be removed?  
A: Identification of trees to remain and to remove will occur with project level design.

### Area 3:

Q: Will the plan include locating mid-block connections in the upper block area?

A: Mid block crossings are a project level design decision, that will be made considering traffic and pedestrian safety.

Q: What does the recently updated Ped-Bike Plan propose for this area? Lake Wash Blvd should consider bike lanes.

A: The recently adopted Ped/Bike Plan indicates:

- a “high” priority for wide bicycle shoulder (note that “wide shoulder” can also include a shared land) on the south side of Lake Washington Boulevard, and
- a “high” priority for wide bicycle shoulders on both sides of Main Street from 100<sup>th</sup> Av NE to Bellevue Way (component of the Lake to Lake Trail system).
- a “medium” priority for bicycle shoulders along both sides of 100<sup>th</sup> Ave NE from Main to NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and
- a “low” priority for bike shoulders on both sides of 101<sup>st</sup> Ave SE, from Main to SE 16<sup>th</sup> Street, when street is overlaid, if feasible.

Q: Where is the south ROW property line for Lake Washington Boulevard adjacent to Whaler’s Cove, and what is planned for the large evergreen trees?

A: The trees appear to be on the ROW, and their disposition is a project level design decision.

### Area 4:

Q: How is emergency access provided for Whalers Cove?

A: Whalers Cove will continue to be served by 99<sup>th</sup> Av NE and from Park property via the promenade. Emergency vehicles traveling west along the pedestrian promenade exit the park through 99<sup>th</sup> and those traveling east along the promenade exit the park at Meydenbauer Way SE.

Q: Why do both alternatives show the beach relocated?

A: If the stream is daylighted, the mouth and wetland mitigation area will conflict with the existing swim beach. Also, relocation of the swim beach is consistent with the Steering Committee’s early concept to move from natural to active as you go from west to east.

Q: How large is the proposed swim beach?

A: The current swim beach is about 75 feet long. Both alternatives show an enlarged swim beach, with Alternative 1 about twice the size of the existing and Alternative 2 slightly larger than Alternative 1.

Q: Will any of the residential piers be retained?

A: The residential piers are not intended to remain.

Q: What is the width, length and elevation above water of the arced public pier?

A: As shown on Alternative 1, the curved pier near the swim beach extends roughly 340’ into the bay and has a total length of approximately 400’. As drawn, it is approximately 12 feet wide, but actual width could be determined at project level and would be

influenced by its function. This pier could float or be on fixed pilings; that decision would be based in part on input from permitting authorities at project level design.

Q: How do the viewing terrace and community building blend with the open space and beaches below?

A: Steep grades allow building into the hillside which minimizes the above grade structure from the street side and provides light and views from two stories on the water side.

### Area 5

Q: What are the impacts to existing improvements at the beach park from daylighting the stream?

A: Daylighting the stream, either partially or fully, would require that the existing restroom be removed. With partial daylighting, the existing Beach Park pier could remain.

Q: What would be the width of the creek bed if opened?

A: Stream configuration including width and depth will require additional engineering and design at the project level.

## March 19<sup>th</sup> Regular Steering Committee Meeting

Q: Does the City have a policy that park sites must generate enough revenue to cover the cost of operating them?

A: Cost recovery policies are found in the 1999 Council adopted Recreation Program Plan (Plan). The Plan generally applies one of three pricing policies to each recreation program.

1. Full Subsidy programs are those that serve a broader public interest and have largely an indivisible set of benefits. No revenue is generated by or sought for these programs. Examples include drop-in programs, city wide events, general park use.
2. Merit Priced programs also serve a broad community benefit, but they are delivered for the most part as classes and activities, and participants can be identified as the beneficiaries. The pricing policy for these programs seeks to generate enough revenue to recover direct program costs. Examples include day camps, youth sports, and senior classes.
3. Full Cost Recovery programs seek to generate enough revenue to recover total costs. Activities are priced competitively within the local market. Individual benefit can be clearly identified. Examples include golf, tennis, and adult sports.

Q: Are any Bellevue Park sites completely supported by cost recovery pricing policies?

A: Only the Golf Course seeks to generate enough revenue through cost recovery pricing to include capital costs.

Q: How does that relate to the Bellevue Marina?

A: The Bellevue Marina has a Council adopted 1998 Marina Finance Plan which ensures that General Obligation bonds sold to assist with the acquisition of marina properties can

be redeemed by 2018. The Marina Finance plan also provides for operation and maintenance of the marina properties through 2018.

Q: How much does the Marina Finance plan contribute toward debt service annually?

A: Debt service by year is projected in the Marina Finance plan. For the years between 2008 and 2018, when the bonds are scheduled to be repaid, the annual payment estimate ranges from \$400,400 to \$546,750.

Q: What portion of the 2007 expenses and revenue for Piers 1 and 2 is attributable to the duplex?

A: All expenses for all marina residences are documented in a single fund. Gross revenue from the dockmaster duplex in 2007 was \$12,600. Net revenue was \$11,166 which reflects the cost of leasehold excise tax.

Q: Will the EIS evaluate access to parking under the kite parcel from Lake Washington Boulevard?

A: The EIS will evaluate access to underground parking under the kite parcel from Lake Washington Boulevard, but will also include evaluation of access to that parking, as well as to the Vue Condominiums, from Meydenbauer Way SE.

Q: Will structures included on the kite parcel in the alternatives interfere with views from 100<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and Main Street?

A: The intent is for any structures to enhance rather than interfere with the views.

Q: Why is the elevated pier in Alternative 2 shown at 35 feet above the water and not 20 feet?

A: The concept for the elevated pier was to keep the elevated viewpoint level from mid slope. The element is conceptual and as with each of the alternatives, modifications can be recommended by the Steering Committee in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

Q: What is the depth of the water at the proposed relocated swim beach?

A: The 2008 hydrographic survey provided by Moffat & Nichol shows the slope of the lake bottom and consequently the water depth to be consistent along the shoreline between the existing Beach Park pier and Pier 1. As drawn, and with existing conditions, the water depth at the swim beach is approximately six feet 45-50 from shore. Actual swim beach details will be determined and designed at the project level.

Q: What emergency access is required in the natural areas—such as the park core between the existing beach park and 99<sup>th</sup> Av NE?

A: Fire access for buildings shown in the park core portion of the alternatives can occur from Lake Washington Boulevard or 99<sup>th</sup> Av NE. Ambulance access to the interior of this area can be accommodated by a walkway approximately 8-10' wide.

Q: Will landscaping be used to screen the concrete garage wall which is visible from the water side.

A: Yes. A full landscaping plan would be done at the project level to address this type of issue.