



## City of Sammamish

### PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

#### MEETING SUMMARY

**March 22, 2004 Meeting – 6:30 P.M.**  
**Sammamish Plateau Water & Sewer District Headquarters**  
**Next meeting April 26, 2004**

#### **PRESENT:**

Manager Jeff Watling, Park Planner Hope Gibson, Cornell Amaya, Paul Brodeur, David Lee, Joyce McCallum, Lynn Rehn, John Rossi, Patrick Schlight, and Tom Schloetter.

Robert Armstead and Chris Leyerle were absent and excused.

#### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Acting chairman Pat Schlight called the meeting to order at 6:37 PM. The minutes from the March 1, 2004 meeting were approved.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Mary Doerr and Marianne Wilkins presented an information packet from the Friends of Pine Lake to the Commission containing suggestions for planning Ebright Creek Park.

Susie Latham introduced herself as a member of a group of residents near Ebright Creek Park who feel that the park should be more of an active park to serve the youth of the neighborhood.

Stephanie Crinklaw, who lives in the Montage neighborhood on 212<sup>th</sup>, told the Commission that her children have to travel to Marymoor Park for soccer and baseball practices on weekday evenings and Sunday mornings at 8:00 AM. She feels that limiting the utilization of available land can only be accomplished by limiting the number of participants in youth sports, which is not a viable solution.

Dan Defranco, who lives adjacent to Ebright Creek Park, stated his preference for a passive park, and urged the Commission to consider the effects on adjacent residents in its planning decisions.

#### **ONGOING BUSINESS:**

##### ***a) Trails, Bikeways & Paths Plan (TBP Plan)***

Delora Kerber, Director of Public Works, attended the Commission meeting to engage in dialogue about coordinating Public Works efforts and TBP planning.

Addressing Commission concerns that the TBP draft contained limited options for trail transportation corridor design, Delora informed the Commission that the Public Works Department is aware of the limitations of the Public Works standards, which were adopted at incorporation. The Public Works department has considered alternative approaches, such as soft surface designs for the 228<sup>th</sup> & Pine Lake Road Extension project, and has encouraged developers to design more aesthetically appealing implementations of sidewalks and trails. The department has a Public Works Standards revision project underway, and is very open to working with the Commission to identify alternative trail/transportation corridor methodology.

NEXT STEPS:

Delora encouraged the Commission to tailor the language of the TBP Plan to include interim solutions and allow for flexibility on a project-by-project basis. The Commission will continue to review the TBP draft and submit comments and suggestions to Jeff and Hope.

**b) Master Plan Model: Ebright Creek Park**

Jeff presented the agenda for the March 23, 2004 study session with the City Council. The 3 agenda items are 1) the TBP Plan, 2) Draft Master Plan Model/Ebright Creek, and 3) Parks Bond. One of the key discussion items for the Master Plan Model will be the process of determining park classification within the overall framework of planning a park. Jeff explained that normally developable land is classified at the point of acquisition into general categories. Classification at this point considers factors such as terrain, size, service area, and passive or active designation. The City Council had designated Ebright Creek as a neighborhood park at the point of purchase.

In revisiting the planning process for Ebright Creek, Jeff informed the Commission that the Council was considering a survey to determine the needs and wants of the residents of the intended service area. Questions arising from this exercise:

- How do we determine the survey area without predisposing the classification? (The classical chicken and egg debate).
- How far back in the classification process do we need to go for Ebright Creek?
- How do we speak to this process and move forward with park planning in light of the City's code prohibiting trails in wetland buffers?
- Will focusing on planning issues with Ebright Creek create too narrow a vision when it comes to the overall Master Planning process?
- Will the design of the survey influence the results?
- Will this planning process require revision of the Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan?
- If survey results differ from previous planning, which direction will we take?
- Who is responsible for determining the classification for a park? Which classification does the Commission adhere to in planning--from point of acquisition or from resident surveying?

Paul suggested that we hold an Open House at the park site prior to the survey to give residents a better visual reference in responding to the survey.

NEXT STEPS:

The Commission will explore the issues at the March 23<sup>rd</sup> joint study session.

**c) Park Bond**

The importance of a Park Bond has been widely discussed and acknowledged by both the Commission and the Council. A Park Bond is one of the quickest ways to overcome the capital and resource shortages for the City's development of parks. Jeff educated the Commission about the normal timeline and procedural periods for bond issues, which are generally done in 3 phases: strategic planning, council approval, and campaign. The City can be involved in the strategic planning phase, but once the bond has been approved by the Council, the City must take a hands off approach during the important campaign period. During this period, citizens and citizen groups must carry the banner in winning public opinion for the bond. For a Park Bond to pass, it must carry 60% of the votes.

John noted that it may be difficult to ask the public for a bond when the City has not delivered any new parks to date. Joyce argued that we should work toward floating the

bond during this Fall's election, as it appears to support a high turnout. The Commission and Staff agreed that a clearly stated mission and strategy, along with detailed project identification would be necessary to present a bond offering to the public. Jeff informed the Commission that the Mayor and Deputy Mayor had recently made some progress with King County Executive Ron Sims regarding transferring a portion of Section 36 for development of active recreation facilities. Paul made a motion to ask the City Council to engage a bond consultant to help the Commission move forward on Park Bond planning. The motion was carried unanimously.

**NEXT STEPS:**

The Commission will request that the City Council engage a bond consultant to help educate and guide the Commission in the preliminary steps of developing a Park Bond offering.

***d) East Lake H.S. update***

Jeff reported that all eleven adjacent neighbors have been contacted by the City, and although there were varying degrees of concern, all neighbors were open to allowing the project to move forward. Formal discussions will begin shortly. In addition, Skyline H.S. practice field was identified as a possible candidate for increased shared use.

**NEXT STEPS:**

City Staff will begin discussions with Issaquah School District. City Council needs to appropriate funds for the East Lake H.S. project.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Jeff informed the Commission that the City has recently received an increasing number of requests and inquiries about off-leash dog areas. It is an identified growing need for the community and will need to be considered in future planning.

**MANAGER'S REPORT:**

***a) Pine Lake Park***

Hope reports that delays in construction due to rain may postpone the park's re-opening to late May/early June, but that overall the construction efforts are going well.

***b) Summer Outdoor Cinema Series***

Jeff reports that Skyline H.S. has agreed to host the cinema series on its practice field.

**ADJOURN:**

Meeting adjourned at 8:56 PM.