



City of Bellevue **Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan**

Steering Committee Meeting #18

MEETING SUMMARY

DATE: June 30, 2009
TIME: 5:00 PM
LOCATION: Bellevue City Hall

ATTENDEES:

Steering Committee

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

City Staff and Consultants

Robin Cole, City of Bellevue
Mike Bergstrom, City of Bellevue
Patrick Foran, City of Bellevue
Matt Terry, City of Bellevue
Paul Inghram, City of Bellevue
Nancy LaCombe, City of Bellevue
Dan Stroh, City of Bellevue
Shelley Marelli, City of Bellevue
Michael Chiu, City of Bellevue
Warren Merritt, City of Bellevue
Michael Paine, City of Bellevue
Scott Taylor, City of Bellevue
Kris Liljeblad, Perteet
David Blau, EDAW
Marilee Stander, EDAW
Sandy Fischer, EDAW

SUMMARY:

1. Welcome and review of the agenda/meeting overview

Doug Leigh opened the meeting and welcomed all in attendance and reviewed the agenda. Tonight we'll be reviewing and approving the meeting minutes. Public comment period will come second on the agenda, followed by a summary of comments from the public hearing. The bulk of the time for this meeting will be spent on discussing the issues and coming to a consensus on issues in order to give the consultant team a direction to take in preparing the preliminary draft preferred alternative. Please note that upcoming meetings will take place on July 28th and July 30th.

2. Review and approval of the June 18, 2009 Meeting Summary

The meeting summary for the June 18th 2009 Steering Committee #17 will be reviewed during the July 28th 2009 meeting.

3. Public comment

Doug Leigh stated that only 30 minutes have been allotted for the public comments. As a reminder, the comments given here will not be included in the final EIS. The public hearing for the Draft EIS was last week. Written comments on the Draft EIS are due to the City on July 20th. Those comments and questions will be responded to in the Final EIS.

Rod Bindon deferred his time to Marv Peterson

Marv Peterson, President of the Meydenbauer Bay Neighbors Association spoke for the Association. He read a letter that the association wrote which contains a list of suggestions for the park alternatives (the letter is available in the project file at City Hall).

Anita Skoog Neil stated that she had a couple quick comments. At the transportation committee meeting that took place last week it was very clear that some of the transportation commissioners didn't believe the transportation reports saying that they drive those streets all the time and don't believe the traffic numbers. She also wanted the group to notice the strategically-placed trees on the visual simulations. She noted there is no access to the front door of Ten Thousand Meydenbauer. Anita reminded the Committee that the Bay is small.

Aaron Dichter thanked the City for the illustrations. He wanted to note that some of the slopes are shown incorrectly stating that there is a very steep slope along 100th Ave SE. He wanted the group to know that the simulations don't appear to reflect that.

4. Summary of comments from June 23, 2009 public hearing on the Draft EIS

Mike Bergstrom gave a brief review of the EIS hearing stating that he had already sent copies of the comments that were received on the DEIS including a number of the prepared statements that were submitted at the public hearing to the Steering Committee. He mentioned that they will continue to forward comments on the DEIS as they are received until July 20th. Since committee members were at the hearing, he did not go into great detail in this summary. Comments at the public hearing addressed a wide variety of concerns and issues; transportation, noise, the overall process, and wildlife, as well as others. They are all reflected in the materials that have been distributed to date. Just this evening, the City also received a verbatim transcript of the hearing and they plan to send it out to the committee soon.

5. Issue discussion

Doug Leigh noted that this agenda item will start with a presentation from City staff.

David Blau stated that after the brief presentation from Patrick Foran and Matt Terry several city staff members can respond to any questions that the Steering Committee has. The final task will be to discuss issues with the Steering committee.

Patrick Foran, the City of Bellevue Parks Director gave a presentation for the Parks Department. He was asked to provide the Parks Department and park planning perspective, to talk about park design and how it relates to the overall effort. He mentioned that he would also comment on a number of items that need to be clarified. He will briefly talk about the history, the heritage, and the vision in the parks system, as well as financial issues related to the acquisition and the marina. He will talk through comments on the different alternatives – likes, dislikes, and questions. Finally and in summary, he will comment on fear and legacy.

Patrick discussed the site history explaining that there is nothing in this plan that hasn't been going on in this Bay for years and years. Residential uses have existed side by side with commercial and recreational uses in this part of the Bay for a long time. That is the history and heritage of the Bay. The Bellevue Comprehensive Plan, the Parks and Open Space Plan and numerous community and citizen groups have all identified that becoming a waterfront city and reclaiming the waterfront is paramount. Patrick noted that this has been the Park department's #1 acquisition priority. That priority stems from the realization that there are 14 miles of shoreline in Bellevue on Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish combined and only 1.4 miles are publically owned. Not all of those areas are even accessible to the public since some areas are preserved for environmental stewardship.

Patrick explained that many years ago the City set about to create a waterfront park. The very first park purchases were at street ends because they often ended at water. He declared that it is remarkable to see that this concept has persisted for generations in Bellevue. This is not something that he takes lightly in terms of delivering on that goal. So where does this park fit into the park system? This park was never intended to exist by itself. It came about as an idea to connect special places and connecting Lake Sammamish and Lake Washington to the lake to lake trail. That was the idea of having these portals to the community through the park system to reclaim the Bay for public access. In the larger context, Patrick noted that the Lake to Lake trail is referred to as pearls on a string –connecting people to special places. Some of these special places include: Weona Park on Lake Sammamish which contains a forest with remnant old growth, Lake Hills Green Belt, the Botanical Garden, Kelsey Creek Farm.

The parks system in Bellevue is unique that way. It is not about individual spots; it is about connecting places. The pedestrian corridor concept in the downtown also came from this concept– ultimately it is intended to connect with Downtown Park and the waterfront. This park will be unique in that system – there is no other park property that has its unique characteristics and attributes such as adjacencies of commercial, residential, and downtown while being extremely accessible and walkable.

Financials – the City owns all of the properties from Meydenbauer Beach Park to the end of the Marina. Patrick explained that the cost of the property, which has been acquired over the last 20-30 years, is \$43M. Of that total, \$30M was from City funds and \$13M was from non-city funds. Other sources including grants are from a state agency called the Recreation and Conservation Office. They have provided a number of grants for this property acquisition- it is required that 14 transient slips must be included in the park.

A municipal bond to be paid off by 2018 assisted with the acquisition of one of the marina properties. The City is using the lease revenue from the Marina to pay those bonds off but there is no restriction in the bond that the money must be paid back with funds generated from the Marina. The city can extinguish the bond whenever they want. There are no restrictions or penalties to do that.

Comments on the Alternatives

Patrick is considering the park alternatives from an activity perspective. He noted that he believes there are three different distinct use areas including: Family orientation, program and activities areas, Gateway and the urban interface with the park. As he discusses those areas he will comment on the issues that have been brought forward for discussion.

Alternative 1

- Out of the two alternatives he stated that he prefers the character of the northern portion of the park as shown in Alt. 1 believing that it provides attributes which complement the character of the site. By using the grade and the tree canopy there is an opportunity to provide a lot of different experiences that can be somewhat visually separated from each other. He prefers not to see a large open area without a tree canopy on that portion of the site.
- Regarding the question about stream day-lighting, he believes that we need to retain the parking in the ravine but there may be an opportunity to do more with the stream even in the parking lot areas. For example he would like to see the group explore ways to modify the access road to provide more areas for stormwater treatment.
- Patrick mentioned that he doesn't like the idea of an environmental education center in this park. He sees the whole park as an environmental education center. He also mentioned that he hasn't seen something that capitalizes on the view from the point where the environmental education center was shown but thinks it is an amazing viewpoint and would make a nice place.
- Patrick noted that he would prefer to think of what we have called in the past a community center as more of an activity center. He believes that the program uses for this center should relate to program of the family oriented outdoor spaces that it is located by. The uses he is thinking of are education related-such as boating, swimming, bay and lake ecology. This is a place where we can have a series of organized programs around the park. The summer day-camps for instance would be well suited for this site. Having a place where that is staged when weather is bad is a tremendous asset to the community. He believes we need a building to do that. Best example is Lewis Creek Park. It is a visitor's center which also functions as a day camp. He prefers to look at the uses that support the family function that is adjacent. If we don't have the building here there will be a tendency for all that activity to move to a choke point in the park near the waterfront and specifically the Whaling Building. That area will also need to accommodate marina functions and potentially ppv rentals. If we don't have this activity center, the Whaling Building will experience pressure to include those activities that are better suited for the activity center.
- Regarding the marina, Patrick made it clear that there is no alternative being considered which does not have leased moorage. The issue about whether there is or isn't leased moorage is moot. How much, what kind, and how will it be configured are the points for discussion. It comes down to a balance of competing issues. So what should the committee look to? Patrick suggested the planning principles and project objectives. Patrick's opinion is that the highest priority has been public access to the waterfront. The other thing that has been obvious is that environmental stewardship is of high importance. There needs to be a sensitivity to the boating community but we need to better understand what boating community we are currently serving and what we aren't currently serving. There is a large boating community that is not currently being served by the marina including day moorage, kayaks, etc. The state has studied this

question and has determined that the greatest public interest is in having public access to the waterfront. Patrick showed a slide of boater needs determined from a 2007 statewide survey. Public access, education, development of new boat launch ramps, providing recreational boating opportunities, management of existing boat launch ramps were highest priority. In comparing the two alternatives, Alternative 1 and 2 both do a good job of increasing access to the water by increasing day moorage and ways for people to get on the water. Alternative 2 is the alternative that hits the mark on the moorage issue. The reason is because that alternative does not show a priority for leased moorage over public access and environmental stewardship. The current marina occupies almost half of the existing waterfront which automatically limits public access. We have to balance the other priorities. This should not be an issue about the number of slips or boats that are being accommodated. Instead it is about meeting the project planning principals. In Alternative 1 we keep pier 2 and limit the ability to achieve those principals. The Alternative 1 scheme adds no new value to the park. Alternative 2 continues to respect the need for moorage but moves it into a configuration that opens up the lower portion of the marina and provides for more public access. It is important to have flexibility.

- Whalers Cove – the group has never spent much time talking about the area between Whalers Cove and the shoreline. Patrick suggested that the “Whalers Cove” area is probably the most important on the project. It is the narrowest area and potentially an area that could be congested. But in this instance, Alternative 2 shows that you can take a potential issue and turn it into an opportunity. By creating a separate path out over the water, the circulation area in this portion of the park is much greater and provides the opportunity for more activity and it allows a park experience that does not currently exist.
- At the gateway parcels the issue is building or no-building and this really is the big decision. This is where we will determine if the project hit the mark. Is it remarkable and memorable? Patrick said that he struggled with this portion of the park but determined that even though his inclination was toward an open park experience at this location, he feels that the planning principles are better met through an experience that would be provided in Alternative 2. There are examples of both good and bad commercial integration in other parks. In this particular case what he finally understood after seeing the simulations is that there would be an amazing view of the Bay all the way down the slope in Alternative 2. Alternative 1 doesn't allow for that as one's view is more oriented toward the neighboring properties when walking down the zigzag path. At the beginning of the process he realized that if we end up with something that everyone expects, we didn't hit the mark. The features shown on the kite parcels in Alternative 2 were unexpected. If you are going to do the terracing to create the plazas or platforms then a structure makes sense. Patrick noted that he doesn't object to the café or the restaurant – or there may be other uses that can facilitate the gateway. It could be a visitors' center or a place for tours for example.
- Patrick said that he is absolutely convinced that the road closed option is the best. As long as the residential access and safety concerns are met then he believes that it is the right thing to do. He suggested that this will be a dramatic test for the committee in determining the priority of pedestrian access over vehicular access. There's no comparison between entering a public space where cars are and where they are not. If we talk about this as a gateway, that implies that something special is on the other side. If the road is left open and the South of Main properties are redeveloped that opportunity to connect outdoors spaces across all properties will be severely limited.

At this point **Iris Tocher** interjected asking that the audience hold their disruptions and keep discussions to a minimum because it is difficult for the committee to hear over the noise.

- In conclusion Patrick pointed out that people are often afraid of something bad happening. He said that he can understand the fears that have been expressed and that he believes these concerns are real and important. But he also noted that the most successful plans are not driven by fear therefore the committee's major decisions should not be driven by the fears of the unknown. Patrick presented other examples of recent projects that experienced some of the same struggles and which ultimately met their objectives with great success. In regards to legacy, Patrick noted the he has been working with the City of Bellevue for 10 years. He has spent most of his time working on implementing the visions of previous generations and he finds that very rewarding. A lot of people have made great sacrifices to get to this point. The main test for you is if in 10 years from now when the park is being built, will you be able to reflect back on the decisions you made and believe that you did the right thing.

Matt Terry presented the position and opinions held by the Planning and Community Development Department noting that he would like to emphasize a few additional points and talk more about the context for thinking about the various issue. He wanted to start with the Comprehensive Plan – he emphasized that the waterfront connection has been in the city's plan for 30 years. He went back through the EIS and pulled out all the policies that were discussed there. He summarized those onto one page which was handed out to the committee. What became obvious is that the many years of careful and deliberate actions to acquire this property can be characterized as a very patient approach. The property acquisition has been taking place over the last 20 years. In some cases the city has opted for life estates to make sure that current owners could remain in their homes for the rest of their lives. The City also issued revenue bonds to pay for the marina knowing that they would someday want to redevelop the park.

- Matt noted that he would like to emphasize the notion of patience and the notion of getting this right. Ultimately you and the City Council will make the decision about what right means. There are four important points that can be extracted from the referenced policies that should help to guide your decisions today. First, the importance of the connection between the downtown and the water. The plans that you have seen illustrated for Alternative 1 and 2 really emphasize the areas south and west of Main Street and Lake Washington Boulevard and rightly so. But it is important to note that the connections from the surrounding neighborhoods and the Downtown will be equally as important. It is those experiences which will most likely be experienced during people's day to day activities such as walking their dogs. The importance of the visual connections between Main Street and the waterfront cannot be over stated. Bellevue's downtown is one of the few major Cities that don't have an orientation to a major water body. This park is the only portal for achieving that. The function of this park and the way that it provides connection to the water is emphasized in the policies. A significant park and waterfront destination is emphasized over and over in documents that have been in place for 30 years. This is one of the few significant cities which have a downtown that doesn't have a connection to water. Consider Portland, Seattle, Vancouver, San Francisco, etc.
- Matt believes that the urban context should be reflected in the park design and program. It is important to consider how this park should complement the rest of the system. This is the only park in our system that has a close urban connection with nature. One thing that Patrick

didn't talk about was the experience that the park users will have during all seasons. During three of the four seasons it is usually raining. During that time it is important to have a place to get out of the rain, view the water, talk to friends or just relax. That need reinforces his support for a building in the park which leads him to support the uses shown in alternative 2.

- The open space component of the park is important to downtown but it's adjacency and edge next to Main Street is also very important in how it is treated Matt noted. We need to consider how the design elements can reinforce the pedestrian attractiveness of the park.
- Opinions on the Chevron and Meydenbauer Bay Apartment properties redevelopment- Matt believes that the land Use plan is appropriate for the park and that it provides the incentives that are required for it to develop appropriately. Those elements include the through block connections, the parking and the private uses that are configured to support the surrounding park uses. He doesn't believe that you can achieve that kind of redevelopment through a regulatory approach; you need to do that through incentives. The modest change in density that is proposed will help give incentives for redevelopment.
- Clearly the closure of 100th Avenue SE is an important point that is hugely controversial. Matt noted that he tends to agree with Patrick that the street closure will help support a strong pedestrian experience but he does acknowledge that it will cause an inconvenience to some. Matt talked about two other Bellevue parks where streets were closed to provide better options for the park. These two include the Downtown Park and Ashwood Park. Both parks were greatly improved by closing a road that cut through the properties.
- In considering the seasonal nature of the park, Matt suggested that a use that accommodates an indoor activity such as a coffee shop, that is quiet and peaceful, where people can enjoy that park experience indoors would tend to accommodate that three season use.
- Matt continued discussing the connections to and from the park and again pointed out that it is not only about creating connections to the park but also about creating some sense of excitement along the path from Downtown to the waterfront.
- In closing, Matt noted that the test tonight for the Steering Committee is not so much about getting it right or wrong; it's about really understanding the people who will use the park. The City is growing and Downtown will have 65,000 people working there by 2020 and 14,000 living there. He suggested that the challenge is how to balance the interest of these diverse users including residents, people who live and work downtown, and people who live in the city and want to travel to the park to experience the waterfront.

Mike Bergstrom introduced City Staff who are available to answer questions tonight. Michael Chiu from Public Safety, Warren Merritt from the Fire Department, Scott Taylor with Utilities, Nancy LaCombe with Transportation, Michael Paine who is working on the Shoreline Master Program update. We thought it would be good to have them present as a resource. Michael Chiu needs to leave not later than 7:30.

David Blau introduced the EDAW team members who were present; Kris Liljeblad, Sandy Fischer, and Jan Mulder who is the project manager for the EIS.

Iris Tocher noted that Tom Tanaka was not able to be at the meeting tonight. He did write a letter to the group related to the issues listed in the Steering Committee packet. Iris will read that letter into the record throughout the discussion. She wanted to kick the discussion off by reading his introduction (the letter is available in the project file at City Hall).

David Blau wanted to pick up where we left off at the last Steering Committee meeting. In the previous meeting, he asked the committee for early guidance on how they would like to handle the discussion. This is what he heard:

- Take issues one at a time
- Have some order to the sequence of issues discussed
- Minimize looping back but do spiral back around to look at all the issues together
- EDAW was asked to give a list of the issues; those are in the memo. We broke it into two lists. One where we think we may have full committee agreement. If we need to take any of those off the agreement list we can move it to the discussion
- Go with a majority opinion – trying to get unanimous concurrence is rarely achieved in any project. Allow for dissenting opinions
- Stay true to the planning principles
- The SC wanted another simulation view of the project from the bottom of 100th Ave SE looking up the slope.

David Blau talked through the new simulations and described several elements that were different between the two alternatives. There was a question in the last meeting that he wanted to address regarding the slopes that are shown on the different alternatives and specifically the difference between the slopes shown on the road open and road closed variant.

For reference, David showed a list of decision guidelines titled the Six Levels of Consensus that can be used tonight to during the discussion. David also described the other materials that are posted in the room. There is one sheet that lists all of the major park elements that we believe the Committee has consensus on based on previous discussions. The other seven sheets list items where he doesn't think there is consensus. Topics on the first list include: Removal of existing structures, relocating and enlarging the beach, adaptive reuse, the upland land use plan, the softening of the shoreline edge and removing coverage on the piers where possible.

Stefanie Beighle asked David if EDAW had done a view of the elevated walkway from inside 10,000 Meydenbauer noting that she had asked for it in the last meeting.

David Blau responded that they hadn't.

Bob MacMillan said that he does not believe that either of the road closed alternatives reflects the need to have access to 10,000 Meydenbauer's front door.

David Schooler said that this is something that he requested at the last meeting

David Blau continued with his introduction to the first discussion. The topics on the first list include the removal of the existing single family residences and two duplexes, relocating and enlarging the beach,

keeping the beach in the plan but shifting it, adaptive reuse of the whaling building, the Land Use plan, softening the shoreline, removing the concrete edge and going to a riparian edge that has more ecological value and finally removing coverage on the piers. David suggested that that the first question is do you all agree that these are consensus items?

Doug Leigh commenting on the upland land use plan specifically wants to make sure that we are getting benefits from and emphasizing the pedestrian connection. That will particularly affect the area north of Lake WA such as sidewalks, landscaping, art, LID improvements that help offset the development in the park. He doesn't know if this is the right time to have that discussion as a refinement toward the recommendation.

David Schooler thinks we may have covered that in the Land Use plan and thought that some of the specific improvements were discussed in the Land Use plan.

Doug Leigh said that he is concerned that these details will get lost if they are not documented. The park has a synergy and energy at 100th & Main but the energy is lost as you walk west on Lake Washington Boulevard because you can't see the park. We do want to see improvements to the pedestrian experience as well as traffic calming measure.

Hal Ferris said that he agrees. We have spent a lot of time on the upland area and we need to capture more of the details of the work that was previously done. Not sure where that happens between now and the end of July. He suggested that we need to agree on the plan and the language.

Rich Wagner suggested that a simplification of those elements should be added to the list. All agreed.

David Blau introduced the topics that deserve a healthy discussion. He is hoping to work from least controversial to most. We will start with the ravine and stream daylighting, then the building uses and structures, piers and watercraft, followed by other uses such as the café and seasonal vendor kiosks, then parking, public access and finally 100th Ave SE.

What we want you to do is reflect on the principles as much as possible as you go through this discussion. We heard you say that we need to respect those. If you need an opinion from the consultant team, just ask. David then asked if that is agreeable to the committee.

Stu Vander Hoek responded saying that he did not want to be a contrarian but he wanted to know the rationale behind leaving the two issues that most people are interested in until the very last. Why not start with the most controversial?

David Blau said that they set it up that because it seemed like a good way to set up for some difficult discussions by getting the flow moving.

Stu Vander Hoek said that he understands and agrees with the concept.

David Blau said that he would like to get direction from the majority of the committee that we can draft a representation of what the majority of the committee wants to see. There will be another chance to edit that plan on July 28, 2009 during the steering committee meeting.

Issue # 1: Stream Daylighting

Iris Tocher started by reading the portion of **Tom Tanaka's** memo that referred to stream daylighting. Tom's memo stated that he supports daylighting half of the creek because retaining the existing parking is in the best interest of the park users and replacing those parking places lost through full daylighting will be difficult and expensive.

Iris Tocher said that she supports daylighting the whole stream and thinks that parking can be accommodated elsewhere. She wants to create a respite from the downtown so she would rather see it go.

Marcelle Lynde said that she supports daylighting the whole stream; it is part of Bellevue and the open stream system. The only caveat would be that there needs to be a parking structure near that end of the park.

Rich Wagner said he supports full daylighting and added that we will need to work on parking.

Stefanie Beighle commented that she prefers the full daylighting but finds the partial daylighting acceptable.

Bob MacMillan is in favor of keeping access off 98th Street. He did like Patrick's idea about enhancing the entry sequence and parking area with ecological improvements but prefers to only have partial daylighting.

Merle Keeney said he has gone back and forth on this. He feels that the steep walk without any access would limit people's ability to use and enjoy the space. He has decided that it would be better to maintain the parking.

Stu Vander Hoek supports partial stream daylighting and keeping access along that west end.

Betina Finley said she also supports the partial stream daylighting and said that she likes having that existing parking there. Partial daylighting will also allow emergency access to be retained to that part of the park.

David Schooler stated that what intrigued him about the early idea for stream daylighting was the idea of having an urban stream on one end and a natural stream on the other. But it occurred to him recently that there is a question about the western stream that has not been addressed. How much water flows through that drainage pipe? Does it have water 3 months a year? What we should do depends on the answer to that question.

David Blau responded by saying that at the master plan level we have not chosen to try to get all the data on water volume and runoff in that stream. There are a whole volume of considerations when doing the engineering and design that would suggest various approaches such as only allowing some of the water to flow through the ravine in a case where volumes would be too high and might destroy the restoration. That issue goes far beyond the master plan level. David asked if any of the City staff know any more about that stream. If there is water there 11 months/ year would want to open it up all the

way.

David Schooler asked if city staff knew anything about water flow in the area.

Scott Taylor with the City's utility department said that he did not know the flow volumes. He also noted that since we are in an extended dry period it would not be unreasonable to go out there to pull a cover of the catch basins and check for low flow conditions.

David Schooler commented that if there is water in the ravine 11 months out of the year he would vote to fully daylight the stream but if there is only flow three to six months out of the year he would support partial daylighting.

Hal Ferris said that he supports opening up half of the creek and keeping the existing pier which he thought provided another view and experience out over the lake.

Doug Leigh noted that he supports full daylighting of the stream. The main reason he supports it would be much more enhanced to follow that stream all the way up. Even the existing parking is difficult to get to. Gives us the opportunity to take stormwater from others areas and to clean and treat.

David Blau – There is a split in the vote; 6 for full daylighting and 6 for half daylighting. He asked if there was anyone who would like to change their position.

Rich Wagner – concerned about counting the checkpoint at this time. Some elements of that include access and parking. Can there be a fully daylighted option and still retain the access?

David Blau responded saying that he did not believe that doing both was a viable option at the upper part of the ravine where there is little room for anything more than an access drive.

Rich Wagner wanted to confirm that this is not the final decision that is being made, it is only a draft.

David Blau agreed and said that to clarify there are pipes on the streets that are emptying onto the south side of the park as well. We are split so does anyone want to help make a decision?

Marcelle Lynde asked how much of a difference does it make for police and fire to have that access road?

Warren Merritt from the Fire Department said that there are some benefits to having it open for EMT. We have not experienced any fires in that area.

Iris Tocher asked if it makes a difference if the access comes off 99th vs 98th?

Michael Chiu from Public Safety said that there was no safety issue with closing off that access and that in fact, more calls have been related to parking lots than anything else; cars break-in and auto theft. Patrol of the park is not effective in that parking area because of limited sight lines.

Rich Wagner stated that he would like to change his position and see the parking retained.

David Blau asked if everyone can agree to partial daylighting. All agreed that they could go along with that preliminary decision.

Issue #2: Building Uses and Structures

David Blau started the discussion on this issue by asking if the committee agrees with Patrick's description of the building as an activity center, noting that the first building for discussion is the center near 99th Ave SE. All steering committee members said yes. David briefly described the concept for that building in both alternatives. David then went on to explain that at a master plan level we would not but a precise square-footage requirement on a building since that is a design level detail but if you want to give guidance on whether we go towards the smaller or larger option.

Stefanie Beighle asked how big the center is at Lewis Creek State Park.

Patrick Foran said that he thought it was about 7,000 sf but that would need to be confirmed later. The lower level is buried so what you see above grade is about 4,000 sf.

Bob MacMillan suggested that we should talk about this issue in terms of footprint. If some of the area can be tucked under the footprint may be smaller.

David Schooler said the in going over the pictures, he wasn't sure if the group had discussed the ice house, also called the harbor master building. He wasn't sure if that was to be retained in both alternatives.

Robin Cole noted that it was to remain in both options and went on to describe that it is currently used by the harbor master. We have evaluated the continuation of that use in the DEIS.

David Schooler suggested that we take one building at a time starting with the environmental education center. He wanted to know if the group agreed that it should be removed from consideration. The whole committee agreed that it should not be in the preliminary preferred alternative.

Hal Ferris since the buildings are spread out all over the park it is important to list them separately. He thinks that it is difficult to discuss the buildings without their context but is willing to start there.

David Blau suggested that we start by discussing the community center (activity building).

Marcelle Lynde wants to distinguish between an environmental education center that is dedicated to those activity vs. an activity center that could have some environmental education programs.

David Blau asked again if the whole group was in agreement that the environmental education center should be eliminated.

Doug Leigh responded by saying yes as long as that doesn't preclude us from having environmental education programs in the park.

David Blau agreed that in fact the whole park would have environmental education opportunities --even outdoor classrooms could be an option.

Doug Leigh read Tom Tanaka's comments which in summary said that the concept of multi-use buildings is fine. He would fall into a neutral category on that point.

Rich Wagner asked if we should assume that an activity center small or large includes a restroom.

Doug Leigh said that yes that would be a building code requirement.

David Schooler commented that the activity center should not be used for commercial uses such as room rentals for weddings. He thinks it is a good idea to have that building because you need a place to get out of the rain.

Patrick Foran made a clarification saying that the activity center that he described would not preclude rentals. Again, he suggested that the committee refer to the Lewis Creek Park center as a model. Its primary function is a visitor's center and an environmental education center. There are a lot of private organizations who struggle with places to meet such as Boy Scouts. The activity center could be rented out when they are not being used for the programmed park uses.

Doug Leigh – thinks that neighborhood clubs and Boy Scouts should be called civic not commercial uses. He is specifically concerned about private events that are going to go late into the evening.

Patrick Foran stated that this is more of a management issue. Weddings are not a predominant use in any of the current facilities. Hours of operation are a management issue not a master plan issue.

Doug Leigh noted that one of the more unique aspects of this park is that we have a harbor master on site. Could they do more in the way of supervisions?

Patrick Foran responded saying they could but we also have park rangers to do that work. There are numerous buildings around town where you could have that kind of use. You could have a wedding in the park now in fact. There is no restriction against that.

David Blau offered that it is acceptable to show a range in the master plan for building size. Then when that facility is designed, you will explore all kinds of details about size and footprint.

Stu Vander Hoek said that he supports small activity center in the range of 4-5,000 sf. There is a community need for that building.

Betina Finley prefers the larger activity center based on the Lewis Creek example and because she recognized that there are a lot of functions that need to go into these buildings such as storage. The topography makes it easier to do.

David Schooler believes that the smaller center works best. Storage of canoes and kayaks would not happen in that building. They would be closer to the shore.

Hal Ferris said that he would support the larger size stating that he thinks a building the size of the Lewis Creek Park center would be fine.

Doug Leigh stated that he supports the smaller activity center noting that the downtown park functions well without any buildings.

Iris Tocher said that she supports larger center

Marcelle Lynde said that she also supports the larger center

Rich Wagner stated that he supports smaller

Stefanie Beighle said that she supports the larger.

Bob MacMillan said that he supports the smaller center.

Merle Keeney noted that he supports the larger center. He thinks that the Lewis Creek center allows us to serve more functions.

Bob MacMillan reiterated that he was more interested in the footprint than the overall size stating that if it was a 4,000sf footprint you could make the building larger. Bob asked that his vote be changed.

Stefanie Beighle asked if that was something they could specify in the Master Plan.

Patrick Foran responded saying that you would normally go through this at a more detailed design phase when you determine exactly what the program is. The danger of setting a size now is that you lose the flexibility to design the building to meet the program.

David Blau asked if the whole group could agree to the larger center. They all agreed.

Issue #3: Piers and Watercraft

David Blau reviewed alternatives and said that he wanted some commentary from the committee on the piers and number of slips and wanted them to know that flexibility is needed since we don't know things like the size of the vessels. It may be necessary to loop back around on this one after talking about the individual in-water elements.

Iris Tocher read Tom Tanaka's memo which in summary supports moorage alternative in Alt 2. His comments were that while the committee must be cognizant that this represents a loss to the boating community, it is part of the trade-offs that we must consider in developing an extraordinary park for all of Bellevue and not just those who are boat owners.

Marcelle Lynde said that she agrees with Tom

Rich Wagner said that he supports retention of pier 1 and 2 in their present locations. He would be opposed to the scheme in alternative 2 especially the expansion of pier 1 west of the existing pier.

Stefanie Beighle believes that we should remove pier 3, keep pier 2, but wanted to know if the pier layout shown in alternative 2 would allow enough room for the arcing pier.

David Blau said that it probably wouldn't be possible.

Stefanie Beighle suggested that the consultants explore other options for pier configuration that allows for both the arcing pier and the expanded moorage off pier 1. The group agreed. She also asked if it was possible to add leased moorage along the arcing piers.

David Blau said that it would not be possible.

Bob MacMillan can agree with that proposal. He likes the configuration of the arced pier but would like to see expanded moorage.

Merle Keeney noted that he is leaning toward alternative 2 because it provides a single point of contact with the shoreline allowing for restoration. He would like to see another option for the layout in order to keep the arcing pier.

Stu Vander Hoek said that we should remove pier 3 but retain pier 1 and 2. He is not convinced on the arcing pier concept but is willing to go along. He also asked how the number of slips was determined. Were there some criteria discussed that suggested the min and max?

Stefanie Beighle mentioned that we did talk at one point about how many Bellevue residents actually have boats there. That was given to us at one point.

Merle Keeney said that the number of slips is dependent on several different variables including revenue and the size of the boats.

David Blau added that the EIS provided a bookend for those numbers. If we go outside that we will run into problems.

Doug Leigh said that there is an aesthetic impact as well. He thinks that the scale of the moorage is not consistent with the size of the water body.

Rich Wagner expressed his concerns that he has not received any input from the boating design side of this issue suggesting that we have not had any professionals look at this plan and therefore thinks this has never been specifically addressed. For example, alternative 2 looks very attractive but when you relocate and extend the pier in that direction, the boats will be further out into the Bay where there is more boating activity. The wake and wave motion can be very significant further out in the Bay. He does not remember reading about that in the EIS. He strongly recommends the retention of pier 1 and pier 2. Design wise, the amount of real estate used for those boaters is very efficient. The amount of real estate that is consumed in the existing configuration is appropriate.

David Blau asked if the rest of the committee thinks that we have enough guidance to determine a direction for moorage and pier configuration. Right now we are trending to a strong statement that the concept shown in Alternative 2 is preferred with some modifications to accommodate the arcing pier.

Iris Tocher said that she feels that the issue of looking out for the best interest of the boaters is not part of the committee's charge and is not in the planning principles.

David Blau asked to go quickly around to get a feeling for preference.

Betina Finley wants to retain pier 2 and 1 as is. She thought that removing the roof is not even necessary although she would not be opposed to it.

David Schooler said that he has not heard anything in the meetings that he has been at – with the reduced number of slips, will this enterprise cost the city money? Although he is not a boater, to him the docks are much more important. They have very different strengths. He said that he would go with the majority on that issue

Hal Ferris said that he also agrees with the majority and believes that it is best to retain and add on to pier 1 but explore an option of putting the additional boats on the other side. He also likes the arcing pier. He is concerned that all these in water elements may become crowded as alternative 2 is drawn.

Doug Leigh said that he prefers to see a reconfiguration of pier 1 because it allows the most flexibility for all boaters including ppvs.

Iris Tocher strongly believes that piers are just parking for boats. They take up a lot of room in the water, they are commercial, and they are structured. She is in favor of as few slips as possible. She said that she wants as much access for people as possible not just people who have boats. Looking at a 20 year timeline and the city will change significantly over that time. She stated that she supports the curved pier, pier 1 reconfigured and expanded, and the floating boardwalk.

David Blau noted that 10 of 12 members noted that there is a preference for the alternative 2 configuration, with integration of the curved pier

Doug Leigh noted that the important thing is to get the uses discussed into the plan but it is not important that they stay in their current configuration.

Patrick Foran noted that to address Rich's point, the more flexibly the plan allows the greater the chances are that we can meet all the program goals.

Hal Ferris thinks that it is too rigid to just ask for support for alternative 1 or 2. He is concerned that all the words that have been said are not noted on the sheets.

David Blau commented that we will take some time between now and the meeting in July to explore marina and pier layout.

Rich Wagner said that he thinks that the concept of flipping the pier extension on pier 1 should be considered and requested that it be included in the notes. He would rather see pier 2 stay but he would also be okay with the extension on pier 1 to extend in the other direction.

Betina Finley said that she wants to retain pier 1 and pier 2.

David Blau asked if the whole committee could agree to the guidance given. The committee all agreed.

Doug Leigh asked the consultants to go back and look at functional aspects of the elements that we would like to be in the plan but we need to make sure we aren't creating any potential conflicts.

Issue #4: Other uses – the café, seasonal vendor kiosk

David Blau stated that the appropriateness of any small commercial retail in the park is the main thing in consideration under this issue. If you look at urban parks around the world you will almost always find some level of that type of activity. We have never, at a master plan level, got down to the question of do you have vender kiosks. We are working at a micro scale here. We need to back up and look at the big question; is it appropriate to have some level of commercial activity in the park?

Hal Ferris started the discussion. He stated that he thinks we have a strong commercial development on Main Street. It is close enough to the park that people can go there. He is in favor of commercial activity east of 100th but not west of 100th Avenue SE. We need to have restrooms that service the facilities that we have. Kiosks where they are located on the alternative 2 plan would not be preferable.

David Schooler said that he doesn't want commercial west of 100th other than boat rentals. Would like to see kiosks but doesn't see a good design solution for their locations. Thinks there are plenty of other food establishments in the area. No restaurant.

Betina Finley – agrees with David. Would like to see more picnic areas if family would rather bring their own food in. She noted that there are several parks in Europe that do not have commercial uses. She does not support commercial use in the park.

Stu Vander Hoek supports small seasonal kiosks in the park but would not support the idea of a café. The drawings do have some appeal to them but there are other places in the area to get that. Yes to kayak and canoe rentals.

Merle Keeney said that he tends to support what David and Stu said. Yes to mobile vendor carts but no to a café or large permanent kiosk.

Bob MacMillan said that he wouldn't want any retail or commercial activity west of 100th Avenue SE. Only boat and kayak rentals are acceptable.

Stefanie Beighle noted that she would support small seasonal kiosks connected to the bathrooms & boat rentals

Rich Wagner does not want to see commercial west of 100th Avenue SE, possibly some movable seasonal kiosk/ carts but not permanent. Boat rentals are okay.

Marcelle Lynde said that she likes the idea of a café use only at the top. Not souvenir stores but the café would be okay. She also likes the idea of kiosks.

Iris Tocher noted that she is okay with the café and the carts/kiosks

Doug Leigh read Tom Tanaka's comments. In summary Tom supports café at the top of the entry as shown in alternative 2, because he thinks that an amenity such as this makes the park more attractive to users.

Doug Leigh said that he is not in favor of any commercial activity west of 100th Avenue SE. He would advocate that we encourage retail and commercial uses east of 100th Avenue SE.

David Blau asked for another hand vote for some of these things

- Café in the park west of 100th Avenue SE – 3 in favor. The three in favor agreed that they could live without a café in the park.
- PPV rentals unanimous support
- All but two committee members agreed that they would not object to movable seasonal vendor kiosks in the park. Eight out of twelve said that they could support more than one movable seasonal vendor kiosks.

David Blau asked if the four remaining can live with that decision.

Betina Finley again stated that she is opposed to any kiosks.

Issue #5: Parking

David Blau began by reviewing the alternatives and specifically the parking proposed in each alternative. He stated that this issue can't be closed until the pier treatment is determined.

Hal Ferris asked if public parking in the mixed use buildings east of 100th Avenue SE was studied in the DEIS.

Stu Vander Hoek said that he didn't think we could guarantee that in the master plan when you are only relying on incentives and it's not a requirement. The options for providing parking east of 100th Avenue SE are limited.

David Schooler suggested that you could mix those two - do a surface lot in the short term sell it later as long as it is redeveloped to include parking. If you condition it that way you might limit your developers who could take on that requirement.

Iris Tocher said that she was nervous about relying on redevelopment to supply parking. She stated that she would be more comfortable if parking was provided in the park.

David Blau stated that it might make more sense to address the parking question at that location after the discussion about the kite parcel treatment. He then continued to describe the design concept for the kite parcel in each of the alternatives. David suggested that the group take these various components of the kite parcel design one at a time.

Starting with the elevated pier treatment, who is in favor of the pier treatment shown in alternative 2?

Stefanie Beighle interjected saying that she was having difficulty making that decision because she doesn't know what it will look like from 10,000 Meydenbauer.

Bob MacMillan said that he liked the treatment but was not sure about the impact.

Marilee Stander, project manager with EDAW stated that the existing duplexes and covered marina currently obstruct more of the view of the Bay than the elevated platform and elevator tower would. She went on to state that we do have a computer model that illustrates this view although it is very rough and may be difficult to understand. The committee asked to see the view during the next meeting even if it is in a rough format.

David Blau asked if the committee was ready to recommend if we cut the elevated walkway off at the shoreline or extend out over the water.

Rich Wagner asked if David was still asking about the floating boardwalk and the curved pier.

David Blau stated that he would like to de-couple the floating boardwalk from the kite parcel discussion and focus on the first question about the elevated pier that extends out to the waterfront. 8 people out of 12 are in support of the alternative 2 treatment of the kite parcel.

Rich Wagner said that he didn't have enough information to understand what that means. We have decided that there is no restaurant. The alternative 2 kite parcel treatment suggests that there would still be a building there. Would it be?

David Blau responded saying that it would not be required.

Iris Tocher said that it would be nice to have a place to get under cover in that location.

David Blau asked if the four that don't have a preference for alternative 2 can live with the alternative 2 kite parcel treatment. All four agreed that they could.

Doug Leigh stated that you have a much more focused view in alternative 2; alternative 1 could present a better connection visually to the water from the Main Street. He stated that he can live with this decision if there isn't as much structure as is shown in the illustrations. He can support the majority without a building. It could be plazas, steps, covered areas.

Stefanie Beighle asked if the cars go under the walkway in alternative 2. That would make a difference in terms of pedestrian access.

Betina Finley agrees with what Doug said but doesn't support any commercial use at the top. She remembers talking about a viewing platform but does not want to see any commercial use.

Merle Keeney stated that he was also a dissenter but can live with the structured approach shown in alternative 2

Marcelle Lynde asked for clarification. Does that mean that we won't have any buildings at all in this area?

David Blau said that was what he was hearing that we should take the building use out of that area.

Iris Tocher suggested that we could still have a shelter that might even have sliding doors.

David Blau asked for a vote regarding taking the elevated structure all the way out to the shoreline.

Rich Wagner stated that he is opposed to any elevated structure and the elevator tower.

David Blau asked for a show of hands for taking the pier out to the water – 9 were in favor, only 1, Rich Wagner, said that he could not live with that treatment. Both Hal and Doug said that they could.

David Blau then asked about the floating boardwalk. He asked for a show of hands to indicate support of the looped trail out over the water. It may disappear if the new pier 1 configuration precludes it. 10 of 12 want it in the plan.

Rich Wagner said that the drawing for alternative 2 show boats on the yacht club side of the pier. He suggested that we take a close look at that to see if it would work given the proximity to the yacht club.

David Blau stated that since the strong majority supports the structured approach to the kite parcel, we have the option to create a parking garage under the elevated pier and plaza. How many of you support parking under the elevated pier?

Betina Finley asked if the parking will be for people who will be using the docks.

David Blau responded saying that we were not dictating who could park where.

Stefanie Beighle asked if a boat house would be tucked under with the parking. If there isn't an opportunity to have boat storage in that location, she would not support the parking structure at the kite parcel.

David Blau said that we could have the boat rentals in that location.

Marilee Stander asked David if he was asking the group to take the program elements into consideration when determining the parking numbers. The parking in the EIS alternatives was provided to meet the park program needs.

David Blau said that he was hoping to loop back to that question.

David Schooler asked if the parking for marina slips was taken into consideration and if so, how were the numbers determined? And were they included in the 106 total?

Mike Bergstrom noted that when the parking numbers were tallied, the consultants used the land use ratios to determine the number of required parking spaces.

David Schooler comments that it doesn't look like there are very many drop-off or short term parking spaces for the marina close to the whaling building. There are a few but not many.

Stu Vander Hoek – if there are 105 slips out there today, how many parking stalls are available out there?

Robin Cole noted that although they aren't marked, the estimate is between 60 and 70.

Stu Vander Hoek then asked what the usage was for those stalls during a Fourth of July weekend. So how do 106 spaces come close to accommodating parking needs when during peak usage?

Kris Liljeblad a transportation planner from Perteet answered that they didn't analyze maximum peak use they evaluated a standard daily use.

Stu Vander Hoek insisted that we need to meet the demand at a minimum.

David Blau asked for a show of hands related to the parking issue. He asked how many people would err on the side of less parking. Only one person supported that. Stephanie Beighle said that her decision does depend on the ppv rental availability storage on the kite parcel. If the boat storage is there she would support more parking. Eleven of twelve members would prefer to see more parking.

Issue #6: 100th Ave SE Street Closure

David Blau opened the topic by saying that as your park master planners it is our view that the entry experience and arrival experience down to the water is better accommodated with the road being closed. He also mentioned the importance of removing conflicts between bicycles, people and cars on a curve and a steep slope. Our environmental and traffic analysis did not find that we are anywhere near having a significant adverse impact. However there certainly is an inconvenience.

Bob MacMillan said that he would like to start the discussion. Being a resident of that specific neighborhood and living in the Astoria he has firsthand experience with this issue. He has been walking the neighborhood and watching the critical intersections for the last few weeks and has been trying hard to find a workable solution. He thinks he may have found one that would also improve the experience of Old Bellevue. Bob suggested that the City look into redirecting west to east traffic on Main Street beginning at 100th Avenue SE to northbound directions that gives the traffic an alternative to go eastbound on 101st Avenue NE that will tie into other eastbound directives. He asked Nancy Lacombe to confirm that there is a diamond interchange proposed in the future at NE 2nd Street which provides direct linkage to 405. The other alternative would be to go up to 4th Avenue and go the other way. There is a lot of through traffic that has no interest in visiting Old Bellevue; instead they are using Main Street to get to cut through that part of town. The key to the whole thing is to have the ability to redirect traffic into a one-way configuration from Bellevue Way back to the west to Lake WA Blvd. The exception to this couplet would be to allow traffic to continue in an easterly direction between 100th and 101st Ave SE that could redirect traffic to the neighborhoods in the south of Bellevue. He thinks that this may go a long way to solving some of the traffic congestion issues.

David Blau asked if we could get an opinion from Nancy and Kris on Bob's proposal. He is just looking for a reaction; conceptually, could that work?

Nancy LaCombe said that there are a significant number of cars that are moving east on Main through Old Bellevue which means in terms of 2020 projections that at least 400 cars would be diverted up 100th Avenue NE. This is not an option that has been studied.

David Blau asked Bob if that governs his position on the road closure issue.

Bob MacMillan responded that it goes a long way toward doing that.

David Blau asked for a show of hands in support of the closer of 100th Avenue SE.

Rich Wagner interjected saying that he wanted to have more discussion before making that decision.

Merle Keeney— keeps going back to the principals and just can't envision a road next to people going down to a park. What Bob said is that he had a possible solution. Transportation has the responsibility to solve the traffic issue in Old Bellevue. Preference is to close 100th Avenue SE.

Stu Vander Hoek is in favor of closing 100th Avenue SE. Two of the first principles are that the park should be remarkable and memorable. There is no question in his mind that if the road stays open those objectives cannot be met. He did agree that there has to be a well thought out strategy for parking and circulation. The whole network needs to be looked at. He encouraged community members to stay involved to make sure that the Transportation Department follows through on this issue.

Betina Finley said she understands what the community members are going through stating that she had a 22 story building go up a block from her house. This isn't a freeway; this is a park that will potentially quiet your neighborhood. She feels that it is for the greater good of the City to have a wonderful pedestrian experience. She is also on the Arts commission and she hopes that there will be some wonderful pieces of artwork along that route. She stated that she wants to see 100th Avenue SE closed. She is also intrigued with the idea that Bob mentioned at the beginning of the discussion regarding a one-way couplet.

David Schooler said that he would like to see 100th Avenue SE closed with two possible caveats. The first is the traffic projections dependent upon City improvements to up to NE 2nd or beyond.

Kris Liljeblad stated that the project is in the City's CIP plan and was most likely included in the 2020 traffic projections.

David Schooler said that if that is the case he would prefer to close 100th but make it as a condition for the park development to happen. The second question is regarding access to 10,000 Meydenbauer. We owe those people either a new front door or access to their current front door. Also, there has to be access to the apartment parcel immediate north of 10,000 Meydenbauer. Need to determine if current access to the Meydenbauer Apartments off 101st can accommodate two-way traffic.

David Blau agreed that we would look into it and asked if there was an opinion on that from the City. Robin Cole said that she would look at the access to the Meydenbauer apartments. Part of it depends on when the development of South of Main happens.

David Schooler stated it is frustrating as a committee member having raised this opinion repeatedly to hear that we will do it next time.

Marilee Stander asked David Schooler to explain in more detail what he thought should be required for access to 10,000 Meydenbauer.

David Schooler asked if there is a way to redo the front door or to provide access at another point.

Marilee Stander asked for additional clarification on what David Schooler meant by access. Are your concerns with having a driveway close to the front door or having a pedestrian access?

David Schooler said that he is concerned with having a drop-off as near their front door as possible.

David Blau said that there is more detail that needs to be worked through at that site.

Hal Ferris believes that in order to meeting the Planning Principles, we need to close 100th Avenue SE. He does believe that there are some design issues that need to be addressed. Even moving the bollards up the walkway, just 50 feet would make that access possible.

Doug Leigh believes that we have to close 100th Avenue SE to fulfill the planning principles. He doesn't think that all of the traffic or access issues have been solved. The only alternative to closing it would be to have a one-way narrow drive that could continue to provide access. He also said that he would like to see the bottom of the intersection become plaza vs. asphalt.

Iris Tocher summarized Tom Tanaka's opinion saying that he was in favor of closing 100th Ave SE. Tom said the benefits of closing the street are that it adds more area in the entrance to the park and makes the entry truly grand. Tom thought closing 100th is consistent with the 5th Design Principle in which pedestrian activity should be given priority over automobiles.

Iris Tocher said that she would like to see 100th Avenue SE closed but wanted to see some way for 10,000 Meydenbauer to have suitable access.

Marcelle Lynde said that we should close 100th Avenue SE, stating that fixing all the other transportation issues in the area is not a burden that should be placed on the park project. She encouraged people to stick with the process. She does not think that these details should be discussed because that is a design detail. The project will not be able to get permits if fire truck and EMT access is limited.

Rich Wagner asked Kris a question. All these numbers in the DEIS "Queue" etc. etc, can you please explain what those mean. Were they taken at a particular time? Are they snapshots, or were they an average?

Kris Liljeblad responded saying that the intersection analysis tool they use is called Syncro. He believes that Rich Wagner was referring to the wait times at intersections. They looked at the forecast year of 2020 and the afternoon peak hour. What is the average delay for a vehicle at an intersection?

Rich Wagner didn't think that answered his question. Did that model represent actual counts or was it computer generated.

Kris Liljeblad said that the numbers in the model are based on actual counts; the model represents a simulation of the conditions.

Rich Wagner is very frustrated that he is being asked to make recommendations on points that he feels have a serious lack of information. The 2020 forecast is not looking far out enough. He doesn't feel like we can answer this question. He stated that he has a hard time believing what is in the analysis shows because of the new density that is being added in the upland areas and Main Street is already congested. From a park design standpoint he would agree that closing 100th Avenue SE would be better for the park. He is worried about being asked to make this decision when he doesn't know if the City will address the transportation issues in this area. Is the traffic suggestion going to be solved by a detailed traffic study because he doesn't think that has been done?

David Blau summarized Rich Wagner's comments and asked if this conclusion is that the road should remain open in the master plan.

Rich Wagner said that he agrees that the closure of 100th Avenue SE is good for the park design, but feels it could wreak havoc on traffic. He believes more study should be done on the traffic impacts. He would like to place his vote in undecided.

Stefanie Beighle said that she is concerned with the traffic and access issues. She said that she is voting for closing 100th Avenue SE because it meets the planning principles.

Bob MacMillan said that he is in favor of closing 100th Avenue SE but he would like to make sure that the City does more study and pursues solutions to today's traffic problems as well as future problems.

David Blau thanked the committee for their guidance and said that he believes that we came to some decision on all of the issues that were listed. He briefly summarized those decisions.

Marcelle Lynde asked if it is possible to get a rendering from somewhere up the slope to be able to see what that structure will look like from different angles as a pedestrian.

David Blau said that there is a way to prepare a rough model that will show the rough scale of structure.

Marcelle Lynde said that even an artist's rendering would be fine or the model shown on top of a photo.

Rich Wagner said that David Blau did a great job of breaking this all out and working through all the issues tonight.

Stu Vander Hoek thanked the group for their hard work and said that he probably won't be able to attend the next two meetings. The caveat is the transportation issue. If that isn't fixed, this discussion will have to be revisited.

Hal Ferris said that he would like to be sure that we can circle back to some of the details; don't want to lose the goal of the upland property, connections to water from downtown park to the waterfront, trails up the ravine – where do they connect to? He said that he feels that if we don't make recommendations on some of those details, we have not completed our task. There is another level of detail that could be discussed during the next meeting. Where is the language that reiterates the discussion that we've had.

Doug Leigh said that all the other connections within the park that connect to public ways should be considered and acknowledged. Also talked about the length of left turn pockets at intersections with Main Street, what are the implications for that?

Merle Keeney at what point do we let the designers do the job.

Doug Leigh is not asking for a design but there needs to be input so that as comprehensive plans are updated the intent is known that that is an element that is important to connecting to the park.

David Blau noted that those items will be memorialized in the master plan.

David Schooler said that there are two outstanding issues that he believes deserve a statement to the City Council. Those are boat safety in the Bay and water quality of the Bay.

Iris Tocher thanked the city and the consultant team.

Mike Bergstrom reminded the committee that more comments from the EIS will be delivered to the Steering Committee before the next meeting.

6. Meeting Adjournment

Doug Leigh closed the meeting.

PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS (who signed in):

Louise Brewer
Bob Drexler
Bill Reams
Rod Bindon
Lois & Hank Chellson
Betty Mastropaolo
Marv Peterson
Bob Dilg
Dan Lewis
Mark Williams
Betty Schwind
Connie Broz
Bob Broz
Aaron Dichter
Sue Drais
Ed Sweo
Marilyn Jorgensen
Bay Waldmann
Terry Greve
Anita Neil
Dennis True
Mustafa Sagirogue
Robert W. Thorpe
J. Baruffi
Sandra Boyd
Carol Starr
D. R. O'Hara