



City of Bellevue Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan

Steering Committee Meeting #20

**November 19, 2009 Meeting Packet
Agenda Item No. 2.b**

MEETING SUMMARY

DATE: July 30, 2009

TIME: 5:00 PM

LOCATION: Bellevue City Hall

ATTENDEES:

Steering Committee

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

City Staff and Consultants

Robin Cole, City of Bellevue
Mike Bergstrom, City of Bellevue
Patrick Foran, City of Bellevue
Matt Terry, City of Bellevue
Dan Stroh, City of Bellevue
Paul Inghram, City of Bellevue
David Blau, EDAW
Marilee Stander, EDAW
Sandy Fischer, EDAW
Newton Breiter, EDAW

SUMMARY:

1. Welcome and review of the agenda/meeting overview

Doug Leigh opened the steering committee meeting. Tonight we're looking to make a final recommendation of a preferred alternative. We want to start by letting everyone speak tonight about issues and likes and dislikes on the hybrid alternative introduced at the last meeting, so that we can see if we can work through this and get to a preferred alternative.

2. Discussion over Draft Hybrid Alternative

Doug Leigh – Three major issues to discuss tonight are:

- Closing 100th
- Elevated Pier Structure
- Floating Walkway and Moorage – these things are tied together

At this time, Doug suggested that we go around and let everybody add to the list or express their opinion.

David Blau interjected and said that he and Marilee would simply record and take notes while the steering committee talks.

Stefanie Beighle began by stating that she loves the hybrid alternative. She felt that Bellevue deserves a park; one with an urban and natural setting. That said, she felt there were still issues with access and parking. She felt better after hearing from the fire department, but was still concerned with access to the front door of 10,000 Meydenbauer. She still wasn't sold on the elevator and would rather see a stairway or something similar down to the floating walkway. Her other concern was with the loss of almost half of the permanent moorage – but she said she also understood that the park was for the entire city and that compromises would have to be made.

Bob MacMillan said there were two issues he was still grappling with. He felt that he needed more confidence that the city would respond to the whole traffic issue in Old Bellevue and the immediate surrounding area. He didn't think that he'd seen the city address traffic and parking issues in the immediate vicinity of the park. He believes the Steering Committee should send a strong recommendation that the process of addressing traffic concerns begin now. His other concern was the overlook. He understood Rich's concerns, but from his perspective, it is conceptual in nature. He compared it to the Mercer Slough, thought it represented a great deal, but agreed with Stefanie that a spiral staircase or other strategy could get people up and down.

David Blau asked him what he liked about the plan.

Bob MacMillan continued by saying that he likes the plan in general. But he thought the activity center footprint could be more compact– more towards 4,000 sf than 8,000 sf to create a less visually impactful size. Other than that, he liked the plan.

Tom Tanaka – Considering that we are dealing with a conceptual plan, Tom suggested that it's a plan that at some point we will say that this is the plan that we've come up with, we like it, although there are lots of details to be worked out. He liked the plan very much. There are questions that still need to be answered. He felt that for what the committee was tasked to do, they had come up with an excellent plan for a beautiful park for Bellevue. As far as 10,000 Meydenbauer was concerned, he felt hearing from the fire chief went a long way toward eliminating concerns raised by the residents' concerns. While neighbors found the elevated pier obtrusive and view blocking, Tom thought it was the signature feature of the park and will make it distinctive. As far as moorage, he saw concerns with that. He said that he looked into the amount of shoreline in Bellevue – 48,000 lf of shoreline. For existing parks, there was only about 3700 lf, which is not a lot. We're sacrificing some moorage slots to accomplish this particular design. It is a tradeoff, but I think that it's something we should do for the citizens of Bellevue. As a committee, Tom didn't think they should delay things. If there are flaws, they will come out in the FEIS. We don't need to answer those issues here and now.

Hal Ferris said he liked the plan, with some suggested modifications. He liked the daylighting and keeping the existing parking in the upper lot. He also advocated for keeping the existing pier at the Beach Park. More significantly, he liked the curved pier that protects and separates the swimming area from the boating area. He thought that the activity building as shown with a footprint of 4,000 sf was good, whether the entire building size is 6,000 or 8,000 sf. With the floating boardwalk and marina, he understood that its purpose is a way for the public to get to the water. He didn't think the floating boardwalk on the inside was successful as people would only get a view of the back of the boats. The configuration does not provide visibility. He thought that maybe the transient moorage could be at the end of pier 1, with no permanent moorage on pier 1, and the public would be able to walk out onto it. He thought that pier 2 could remain and then be connected inwards to pier 1. While this would remove the shoreline experience the floating boardwalk provides to the individual, the trade-off would be an over-water experience on pier 1. It would also keep transient boaters out farther in the bay. His intention was not to gain private moorage space – he thought that increasing public access was more important, but this approach might solve a number of problems. He thought the elevated pier, having a building at 35 feet all the way out to the water was too tall and too far out. It could be stepped down, so it would be a lower height but still high enough to get a view over the boats. He realizes that fire truck access below is

important, so another alternative would be to keep it at 35 feet high, but ended at an earlier point. He believes that seismic and structural pieces will make the structure appear less transparent than shown in the renderings. He was also strongly in favor of closing 100th. The traffic, parking, water quality, and boater safety issues could be included in a letter to the city council as issues that should be resolved but outside the Committee's scope.

Doug Leigh said that he also felt they had a good strong conceptual plan that included all elements brought forth by the committee, public, and consultants. As Tom pointed out, we're providing shoreline access to the public. With the hybrid, he thought there was too much activity around the floating walkway and the marina. The floating walkway is an important element of the park experience. He was in favor of a reduction in moorage to accommodate this experience. With the Meydenbauer Yacht Club, he felt there are other opportunities for private moorage. The bay is small and we are cramming a lot of boats into it. He was in favor of a reduction in moorage and refinement of the floating walkway so that it works well. Doug said he was fully in favor of closing 100th because of the benefit it adds to the park. He feels that access to 10,000 Meydenbauer could be resolved with proper design. The existing access is on a steep slope and a dangerous turn. It is not a safe street right now. In reference to the elevated walkway, he thought that design could solve the issues and that it would have to be a good response, done right.

David Blau said that that's the tricky part about concept – you get into debating about specific design.

Iris Tocher– You covered all the points. Thank you. Iris agreed with everything that Doug said except for the moorage. In addition, to build on what Tom said, Iris stated she thinks we need the floating walkway. Iris said she thinks it would give more privacy to the existing homes there if you brought the walkway away from the shore, as well as provide an over-water experience. She also said that she thinks we should reduce the number of permanent moorage. There is limited waterfront space for the city to have a waterfront experience and I'd like to bring my kids to the water to see the herons and fish. She thought that the extension to pier one could be knocked off to have fewer boats. It needs to be more of a people place and less of a boat place.

David Schooler said that he liked the hybrid a lot. With the entry and access alternatives to 10,000 Meydenbauer, he felt that the city and consultants had presented alternatives that are satisfactory. He agreed with Tom said about the moorage, what Bob said on the building, and what Iris said on the floating dock; if for some reason the floating dock is not acceptable under the Shoreline Act, then Rich's alternative would be acceptable. With respect to the elevator and pier, he said he had changed his mind and liked what Rich had sent out as an alternative. He said he would be happy with what Sandy and David presented as a modified Alternative 2. He very much likes the Alternative 2 stairway/water combination from Main Street down to the bay, better than Alternative 1. He read a draft that he had put together of language for recommendations to the city, addressing the nature of the park plan, 100th closure, vendors, transient moorage hours, and water quality. He saw the committee's task as a recommendation, and not a decision. Other city departments and commissions will weight in and the decision will ultimately be made by the City Council.

Merle Keeney said that he has spent several years working on several park master plans and this is probably the most vetted process he has ever seen. He noted that we've gotten a lot of input from the community and believes it's a good thing. This is a master plan, and we're putting in place holders and who knows what will be available as far as materials, products, and designs go. Following the first planning principle – a remarkable and memorable shoreline experience, is what drove him. He understands the concerns related to closing 100th, but believes those issues can be addressed. He believes this feature in and of itself will make the park experience memorable. The park project cannot be the solution for a much larger traffic concern; let's separate those issues but understand the city has to deal with them. He felt the walkway was a key element for the park. It wasn't about the view, but about being on the water seeing the shoreline. He wasn't decided on the elevator, and thought that maybe it could be brought back away from the shoreline. He said he was open to suggestions including it not being an elevator or mechanical device. Overall, he liked the variety of experiences that were created along with the integration of calm and urban and wanted to congratulate the architects on that.

Betina Finley was pleased that we chose to maintain access to the other end of the park and parking, and also pleased with the natural area design. She thought the activity center footprint could be more like 4,000 sf. An idea she had on moorage was to pull the beginning of pier 2 out and connect it to pier 1. Fundamentally, she is opposed to removing a pier that is structurally sound and relatively new. In terms of the floating walkway, she felt Rich could speak to his alternative to that. She liked his alternative. In terms of the elevated structure, she pointed out that we're dealing with a steep grade, and the alternative with switchbacks didn't seem to have committee support. She really liked the idea of the elevated pier, it demonstrates superior design, and would draw people out and would be unique to this park. She thought that shortening it was not necessarily a good thing because it would pull people out there but would not give them a way to get down. She felt that parking was resolved well for 10,000 Meydenbauer. She loved the water feature from Downtown Park to this park, and that Wildwood Park has an extension that comes through. In that sense, she wanted to close 100th making it more of a pedestrian experience. In terms of traffic, thinking out ten years, maybe a one-way couplet would work, with Main Street going west and NE 2nd going east. She is against having vendors in the park, it is not appropriate. People can bring their own food into the park, set up a barbeque, and not be distracted with the vendors. In addition, she thought that art and sculpture could draw people into the park. The planned Art Walk extends down through this park.

Stu Vander Hoek said he had concerns about parking and traffic, and about impacts on parking/traffic in old Bellevue. He thought there were issues that should be addressed regardless of the park; it's an ongoing conversation. He thought there were too many expectations on what would happen on the Chevron site – maybe there would be no commercial at that location on the 100th Street side; it might not even happen. The parking element might not happen either and that puts emphasis on ample parking in the park. He had concerns with short-term parking for permanent moorage, but understood there are many potential solutions. He would like to keep the door open to resolving this concern. Overall, he was very happy with what the consultants had done. He really liked the curved pier and floating boardwalk, though he recognizes the concerns about the boardwalk materials. The elevated pier is remarkable for him and he felt that design could help resolve concerns about it. He felt that 8,000 sf for the activity center was fine and that they could see what happens in the future. He liked the idea of limited hours and vendors and transient moorage. He thought the plan represented many different experiences and that if you cut things out now, you limit those experiences. He thought the consultants had done a great job.

Rich Wagner suggested that like any complex project, there are so many variables. In the big scheme of things, this is a great plan and he thinks it is generally very satisfactory. There are always details with any planning/design project that can cause concern. He noted that he would mention some of the concerns he has, understanding that there will be 5-10 years before the park is built. As a neighborhood resident, he respects that this part of the bay is very small. As a resident and a boater, he can't take his boat very far in there because the bay is small and shallow. His vision for the park was a quiet respite for a transition from the hardscape of the city. The building doesn't bother him. Speaking as a member of the boating community, it's hard to add slips and moorage and boating is important to the heritage of the city. He favored not reducing slips. He thought that EDAW had done a terrific job and that flipping the pier to the east side was a great idea. He thought Hal's idea was a good one and would get transient moorage out of the smaller part of the bay. He wasn't excited about the floating boardwalk as it limits small boats and that transient boaters are often not respectful of the environment. He feels that the promenade and the softened shoreline might be enough, and suggested taking the boardwalk out and adding more slips, bringing the connection from pier 2 closer to the shore. Maybe a pier extending out from the promenade to provide transient moorage could work, and could be curved. Regarding the elevated pier, he does not like the elevator right by the water. He can accept the building, but would move the elevator quite a ways back and then stepping down the pier. He was initially opposed to closing 100th, but with the uproar from the community and hearing from the committee, he was confident traffic would be resolved and can support the closure. But it can only happen if the transportation issues are addressed. He was against vendors, and supports the 8,000 sf activity building but felt its footprint should be smaller. In general, he is very proud of what the committee had done.

Doug Leigh said that he forgot to mention that there was a letter from Joanne Roddis which she submitted to the committee since she didn't get a chance to speak the other night.

Bob MacMillan interjected and wanted his name added to the list of those that wanted the pier from the existing park included.

David Blau – There is tremendous agreement on the overall thrust of the plan and the committee's charge to complete it. There is agreement on the partial daylighting, the curved pier, the relocated and enlarged beach, and the activity center (although it could be smaller). In terms of 100th, there seems to be agreement to close it with traffic issues resolved. There is strong support for the notion of the elevated pier, but it needs refinement. We need to look at the tightness of the marina and floating boardwalk and there seems to be agreement with the solution to access to 10,000 Meydenbauer. People like the connections of the park with water features and like the idea of art and sculpture along the way.

The red writing (on the wall notes) shows areas of concern. I'd offer that a couple are smaller items and a couple are bigger. The notion of the activity center as being around 8,000 sf could be resolved fairly readily; the small pier at the end of the park; the treatment of the elevated boardwalk; vendors; intensity of use and the moorage and the floating walkway... does that sound accurate?

Betina Finley expressed concern over the pier at the end of the park in regard to safety and lack of lifeguards.

Hal Ferris suggested there might be "no lifeguard on duty" signs. Maybe there could be a small footbridge going across the creek to the pier. It provides a swimming option or destination, as well as a view opportunity. He thought it would be disappointing to take it away.

David Blau suggested that the committee not resolve any issues until they agreed on a list of issues for discussion. Some of items that still need discussion are:

- Existing pier
- Activity Center square footage
- Elevated pier treatment
- Floating walkway and moorage configuration
- Vendors
- Anything else?

David Schooler recommended that there be a companion piece with the Master Plan graphic.

Doug Leigh stated that there was a start of such a document distributed earlier.

Rich Wagner agreed that a companion piece would be a great idea and suggested that we add other items or guidelines. For example, the clear intent is to protect the peace and quiet for the homeowners as this evolves forward. The floating walkway could create a conflict with adjacent homeowners.

Iris Tocher – One thing that she liked about the floating walkway is that it brings it away from homes.

Rich Wagner asked what about the boaters coming in with their radios etc?

Hal Ferris – As a member of the planning commission when we received the Bel-Red plan, we appreciated the list of issues and didn't revisit the issues that the steering committee dealt with. Hal thinks a concluding report that captures our thoughts is important.

David Blau suggested starting with the simple ones first.

The Committee said to start with the easy ones first.

David Blau – Is it okay if we offer an opinion first?

The Committee agreed.

David Blau thought that with so much activity in the rest of the park, and consultants' goals for restoration, retaining the existing pier at the swim beach could be problematic with respect to restoration. It was his recommendation to take it out.

The committee discussed it.

Hal Ferris liked it, but didn't feel that strongly about it.

David Blau stated that the committee was in agreement – the pier comes out eventually.

With the activity center, there are a lot of things that could be done to tuck it into the hill. Before, the committee was voting approximately 2/3 for a bigger space.

Doug Leigh thought it should be there to support park activities.

David Schooler wondered if it would work to say up to 8000 sf in size to support park activities, with a footprint of approximately 4000 sf?

David Blau asked the committee if it was agreeable.

Doug Leigh stated to make sure it is tucked in, and not lose that. He thought it should be in character with the park.

David Blau asked if everyone was okay with it – Yes. He asked the committee to give a little latitude to deal with parking.

Iris Tocher said of course and brought up Whaler's Cove guests.

Bob MacMillan asked if parking would be subterranean?

Iris Tocher replied that it would be very masked – natural looking.

David Blau moved on to the elevated pier, about which there was a range of issues. He felt the issue is less about whether to have it and more about the treatment. The consultants showed the two simulations – one with the full extension, and one similar to what Rich drew. From the design team's perspective, he felt they would like to preserve the notion of getting all the way out to the water.

Iris Tocher wondered if there was a way the committee could make a general statement about bringing it out to the water and letting design solve it later?

Rich Wagner said that if we were told that is what we want to do – that we want a very attractive design with a beautiful stairway... I agree that maybe we shouldn't hammer out the detail. I would like certainty, such as language that offers other alternatives.

David Schooler respectfully disagreed with bringing it out over the water and making that the memorable feature. To him what they have is a knockoff memorable experience. He thought of the scale of the bay over the last 48 hours. He thought it needs to be as light as possible. He thought the elevated pier is too big for the space.

Merle Keeney asked how far the water was from the road.

Marilee Stander replied that it was approximately 170 feet.

Stefanie Beighle thought that the pier must pass over the road to give pedestrian priority. She asked for clarification on where we had elevators. She thought that maybe we only need one. She thought that they really need to get over the driveway for safety and experience.

Tom Tanaka agreed with Stefanie and Iris. He put it in baseball terms - to cut it off early is like hitting a triple whereas taking it all the way to the water is a homerun.

Hal Ferris thought that the water and fountain can be the signature feature. He thought that you have an elevator and you need a stairway. In being skeptical, he brought up that maybe by the time this was design and all the required structure were in place, it would block visibility. He thought that holding it back and having a nice landing behind the driveway is still a nice view of the bay and over the boats. For safety, he felt that there was not that much traffic coming in and out of the condos.

Stu Vander Hoek thought that hearing about the loss of 170 feet of visibility cemented it for him. He thought the city needed to have it.

Betina Finley recalled the Mercer Slough and how kids love to go out to the end of it. She liked it minus the elevator.

David Blau – At the time of design, if it looked heavy, the consultants wouldn't even want to go there... who would? He reminded the committee that they are just thinking at the master plan level and hope is to get to the water.

Doug Leigh thought that maybe the committee could capture some design intent. He asked the question, "What's the experience you are trying to capture"?

David Blau thought adjectives would help.

Doug Leigh noted the connecting circuit without having to cross vehicular traffic and noted that they could probably have stairs easier than an elevator, rather than not having the experience.

Betina Finley brought up an example of the pier at Seattle's Pier 66, although it is a different material.

List of Adjectives – Safety first, pedestrian priority, maximize view of the water, transparent...

Doug Leigh said he wouldn't want it to be locked in regarding an elevator, either in or out.

Rich Wagner said he wanted the word scale and appropriateness or some language that allows future folks to keep this at a proper scale with its surroundings in order to take care of these details in the future.

David Schooler thought that covered the elevator and not the pier.

David Blau asked the committee if that issue was resolved.

The Committee said they were okay with it.

David Blau asked about a range on moorage? Some wanted to keep it, some were okay with losing slips. David Schooler offered the opinion that they lose some slips, but would allow for more turning room and would give the ability for more space.

Hal Ferris asked if you make pier 1 a double loaded pier, could you pick up more slips.

David Schooler was against that and was more interested in a variety of sizes.

Rich Wagner was not in agreement. He thought the boating community is important. He mentioned that the boating community had paid for the marina for the city and to have ten folks vote on removing it wasn't fair.

Iris Tocher complimented Rich on his representation of the boating community and noted that everyone is here to represent people. She disagreed that the marina people paid for the park. She reminded him that the City of Bellevue, maybe 40-50,000 people paid for the park and as she understood it, the City doesn't make that much money from the marina. She said that Rich talked about the small bay, and how fragile it is, but that she must say that boats don't help it.

Rich Wagner said that he got her point, but that none of what she was saying makes it so the committee needed to reduce slips.

Doug Leigh thought it needed to be influenced by the needs of the park. If we could meet the needs of the park and keep all of the moorage, it would have been okay. He thought the yacht club right next door was serving this need and reduction of slips at the park would benefit the park.

Rich Wagner noted that the Yacht Club is a private facility, not public.

Merle Keeney said they were looking at this as either/or and it didn't need to be that way. He thought they wanted to have a floating walkway and could try to preserve as many slips as they could.

See Wall Note Summary for preferences

David Blau asked the committee about the vendors. Last time, they were 11 to 1 with Tom's letter vote. The question was simply 'what is the text that goes along with the park concept?'. He reminded them they had different options.

Hal Ferris asked if it would be limited to food and beverage. At Marymoor Park they have a kiosk only on the weekends. Would they only have so many days of service?

Doug Leigh said that demand should support it. Vendors should not be subsidized. If they had to subsidize to support it, then it could be questioned.

Betina Finley said that first of all, people have plenty of access to items on Main St. There's a grocery store within walking distance. She has kids and knows what it's like with vendors – it changes the experience. She liked the idea of people having picnic shelters and didn't see the benefit of vendors.

Patrick Foran interjected with a few thoughts. He said they should judge what should be in this park by whether it adds value or detracts from value; if everything fit. He worked in 3 parks systems with all sorts of kinds of parks. He reminded the committee that if you look at our parks system now, it is high class and quality. What he envisioned were food items for people that aren't picnicking, people that forget suntan lotion, kayak rentals, filling the gap. He understood the fear of Coney Island, but that wouldn't happen. He thought that it is primarily a management of the park issue and providing the user a better experience.

Betina Finley asked if they would store stuff there or move?

Patrick Foran didn't know.

Rich Wagner said that it's easy to hear and describe this right now, but in ten years, maybe they would get something different – they needed to be clear: "Kiosks at Whalers Cove would not be okay." He felt that location should be included.

Patrick Foran said that giving a description of items/materials that service park visitors and that they must have to do with the nature/culture of the park would help.

David Schooler said the vendors and items could have restrictions.

Hal Ferris said he was willing to say that vendors/kiosks need to be located away from the condominiums.

Patrick Foran said that naturally it will be near the activity.

Betina Finley said that maybe they should just put a café in the activity building.

Iris Tocher offered that they don't put language that says where, but more about what they want.

David Schooler stated that if they were not closer than 100 feet from residents, the same would apply on the other areas.

Rich Wagner said that would work.

David Blau asked if they could close it.

Betina Finley said they couldn't agree.

Merle Keeney said it's more about 'will we consider in the master plan having vendors?'

Rich Wagner said okay.

David Blau said - All good? No objections?... Any other concerns? Other business? He said the consultants would like to go on into sharing what the master plan products would be and other things that would be captured and memorialized in the master plan document.

Robin Cole said that what they are trying to do in the document is capture all of the concepts and issues that the committee developed over the course of planning this. They started an outline after Tuesday's meeting and spent most of the time making sure that they have gotten all of the committee's recommendations included. They would make sure and get an overview of the discussions that got the committee through to the preferred alternative. They had identified concerns that aren't necessarily part of the project, but that would help make the project better or make sure the committee's concerns were heard. They were looking at a self-contained document with graphics that would, after this stage, take their preferences in the form of the preferred alternative through the final EIS. The recommendation report document would be included in the final master plan, which is typically a broader document than the recommendation.

David Blau described it as a very graphic book that would cover all of the components.

Robin Cole didn't know how the committee wanted to proceed with your comments.

Doug Leigh was open to ideas.

Iris Tocher offered that they take a ten minute read break?

Stu Vander Hoek interjected, accepted the document, and excused himself after thanking everyone.

Hal Ferris said that in the opening paragraph – the background, the steering committee... he thought that it captured their ideas. They could come back in November and have a quick review to make sure that our comments are captured.

Rich Wagner said they should have a discussion after the document was drafted, as it would certainly make him uncomfortable not approving the recommendation text.

Iris Tocher said that one thing that occurred to her is that they would all be issued a final report. She didn't know how they deal with their open meetings, but maybe they read this and come together with a big celebration and enjoy it! It would be great to have fun.

David Schooler suggested that instead of city money, they pay for it and have a great time.

Rich Wagner thought it needs to be both. They need to abide by the law.

Doug Leigh said they'll have written comments then.

Hal Ferris said they had lots of these at the planning commission. It wouldn't take that long.

David Schooler said there were two things he would add. He thought the consultants did a good job. One thing would be to limit transient moorage hours and the second is that the plan is conceptual in nature in the summer of 2009 and that people can change it later.

Betina Finley's fear with the paragraph was that they put too much time into it to give up by saying things may vary.

David Schooler said they could leave that out then.

Hal Ferris reminded them that they were advisory anyway.

Mike Bergstom asked to clarify the process - if that's your route, you're working with EDAW to draft these documents into process, stay a committee, and then wrap it up.

Doug Leigh said that they would get to the Council on Monday and tell them the status.

Iris Tocher said they could be disbanded as a committee and not worry about talking to each other.

Hal Ferris said they've had longer pauses when they changed consultants. It's unofficial and they didn't need to deal with it. They just wouldn't meet and then when they have a final draft, they'd get together and take care of it.

3. Meeting Adjournment

Doug Leigh thought they were done.

Patrick Foran – It's been quite a ride and thank you for sticking together. With so many interests, it was befitting of the vision that was thought about 30 years ago.

4. Wall Note Summary

Concerns –

Hal Ferris:

Marina

- consider using Pier 1 for transient moorage and public access
- keep Pier 2

Elevated Boardwalk too tall

- too close to shore, drop it or pull it back, structure is too large

Doug Leigh

Intensity of activity in the marina

- suggest reduced moorage and refined floating boardwalk

Blocked views

- lots of different ways to design the elevated boardwalk

Iris Tocher

Too much activity along the promenade if you don't have the floating boardwalk

- suggest reducing permanent moorage to address this
- remove expansion of Pier 1

Stefanie Beighle

Concerned about 10,000 MB visitor access

Not sold on the elevator

- consider using stairs

Loss of permanent moorage

Bob MacMillan

Traffic Issues

- consider other improvements
- strong recommendation to the city to improve traffic

Size of the activity center

- make footprint max. 4,000 sf

Tom Tanaka

Access to 10,000 MB

- feels better with ideas expressed by fire department

Existing Pier

- consider keeping (Bob MacMillan also)

Activity Center

- keep 4,000 sf footprint

Floating Boardwalk

- concerned with the location

David Schooler

Activity Center

- what Bob said

Floating Boardwalk

- what Iris said

Marina

- what Tom said

Merle Keeney

Elevated Boardwalk

- concerned about elevator

Betina Finley

Loss of Pier 2

- concerned about removing it

Floating Boardwalk

- prefers Rich's solution – it doesn't have to be a loop

Elevated Structure

- Does not like shorter concept – must go to water

Traffic

- Need to find solutions

Vendors

- Are not well suited here

Stu VanderHoek

Parking and traffic

- Needs to be an ongoing effort

Chevron site

- Developer may not do what we want

Parking for permanent moorage

Materials used for boardwalk

Concerned with hours of use – vendors and transient moorage

Rich Wagner

Impossible to add permanent moorage

- Do not remove the number of slips

Likes Hal's idea for the marina

Floating boardwalk

- Too close to the shore
- Transient moorage shouldn't be that close

Doesn't like elevator

- Too close to water

Closing 100th Ave SE

- But can support this

Vendors

Size of activity center

Likes-

Stefanie Beighle

Love hybrid alternative

Natural to urban treatment

Beautiful

Done what you were asked to do

Bob MacMillan

Like plan in general

Tom Tanaka

Likes the plan very much

Excellent

Elevated structure makes the park distinctive

Rich Wagner

Delighted with the process

Great plan, in general

Proud of what we've done

Betina Finley

Design of North end

4000 sf Activity Center footprint

Access to 10,000 MB handled better

Water feature connecting to DT Park

Closing 100th

Use art to draw people to park

Stu Vander Hoek

Very happy with plan overall

Curved pier

Floating walkway

Elevated pier and overlook

Great job

Iris Tocher

Agree with Doug's points

Like floating boardwalk

David Schooler

Like nearly all of the plan

Access alternatives to 10,000 MB

Like Rich's version of elevated pier

Like Alternative 2 water feature

Merle Keeney

Absolutely captured the planning principles

Close 100th for park memorable experience

Floating walkway is key

Variety of experiences

Tom Tanaka

Moorage reduction – ok

FEIS will flush out issue

Hal Ferris

Good plan

Partial daylighting
Curved pedestrian pier
Beach
Activity Center – smaller is better
Close 100th

Doug Leigh

Strong conceptual plan
Close 100th, access to 10,000 MB can be enhanced
Support elevated pier with strong design

ISSUES-

Concerns to Resolve

Existing Pier – remove
Activity Center Footprint – up to 8,000 sf w/ footprint of 4,000 sf
Elevated Pier – expression of design intent, see Companion Document Elements
Floating Walk and Moorage
Vendors

Companion Document Elements

Clear focus on protecting quiet bay – transient moorage

Capture key design intent of the elevated pier
Lightness/transparency
Safety first – pedestrian priority
Provide maximum views of the water
Must connect to the floating boardwalk
Most feasible and accessible route
Scale – consistent with surroundings

Preserve floating boardwalk
Maximize the number of slips (lose as few as possible)
Maintain as many slips as possible

Vendors
Limit in numbers
Items that serve park users
Food and beverages only – nonalcoholic

Portable
Consider neighboring properties, i.e. Whaler's Cove/VUE Condominiums

Limit hours of operation

PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS (who signed in):

Rod Bindon
Sue Drais
Pamela Ebsworth
John Evans
Kathy Hodge
Peter Marshall
Don Mastropaolo
Ann and John O'Neil
Bill Reams
Nathan Rimmer
Joanne Roddis
Betty Schwind
Firman and Jean Smith
Carol Starr
Mark Williams