

City of Sammamish

PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

MEETING SUMMARY

September 27, 2004

Commissioners Present: John Rossi, Chris Leyerle, Tom Schloetter, Joyce McCallum, Pat Schlight, Paul Brodeur

Staff Present: Jeff Watling, Hope Gibson, Janie Smith

Meeting was called to order at 6:35

Approval of Summary: No meeting minutes were recorded due to technical difficulties.

Public Comment:

Mary Doerrer, 1224 212th Ave SE, Sammamish: She presented a flyer advertising a community performance by Peter Donaldson about the interdependence of salmon and people in the Pacific Northwest and encouraged City staff and Park Commissioners to attend.

Ilene Stahl, 21553 SE 28th Lane, Sammamish: Thanked the Park Commission for the progress made on the Ebright Creek park concepts and felt it was a good compromise. However, she still has three concerns:

- The approach at last meeting. It is important to bring a larger focus to Ebright Creek and its watershed.
- Stream and wetland buffers. We need to cross them but there should be no trails in buffers.
- The off leash area is in close proximity to the stream buffer and dogs would have to cross through buffer and stream which would be disadvantages with the noise and smells.

Marrienne Wilkins, 20917 SE 12th St, Sammamish: Commented about trees in the different options. She stated that it appeared that the tree count had gone up. Jeff explained that there are 113 trees of 12 inches in diameter or greater on the site and this has always been so. Hope added that the numbers of trees being removed only change with the types of questions people ask such as how many will be taken down in specific areas i.e., buffers.

Ongoing Business:

Ebright Creek Park

John stated that he wanted the public to be aware during this portion of the meeting that commissioners needed to express feelings and discuss ideas and would not necessarily be coming to any decisions.

Jeff gave an overview of the last public meeting from the presentation of the park concepts to the public, to go-ahead by park commission and council.

A discussion followed regarding what did and did not work at the last public meeting and how to format the upcoming meeting. Following are key points of discussion:

- Not everyone could hear everyone else's discussion due to too many groups at last meeting.
- Need to provide free platform for comments giving all a chance to hear
- Quick introduction
- Introduce consultant team
- Introduce site
- Note environmental realities
- Leslie's walking tour
- Focus on consensus
- Show competing values
- Turn it over to community to provide comments
- Don't want to turn it into 'PBS crossfire'
- Not a debate
- Don't want to orchestrate who talks when
- People might get a random number and speak in that order
- Podium? Yes
- Microphone? Yes. Could go to people
- Podium may appear too formal – don't want people to feel nervous
- Microphones make people uncomfortable
- Will have copies of concepts
- Doodle and turn it in the night of the meeting or turn it in Monday the 4th after thinking about it
- Biggest challenge – don't want to promote polarization
- Want to find commonality
- Achieve consensus
- Number the differences in the concepts so they can be identified
- Good idea to make sure everyone can hear what everyone else says
- Limit to 3 minute conversation. Intention is to respect all comments by having time for all
- Concepts have been seen on the website, at the last public meeting and city council meeting.
- Manage the two hours

- After the 'tour' have a ten minute look at concepts – a hands-on time, opportunity to have people understand the concepts
- We have 2 hours, welcome the public, start at 7:05, Leslie walks people through concepts till 7:30 or 7:45 – public comment
- Direct people to look at the concepts before comment period starts
- Website is still available to give feedback, mail in, drop off

Discussion about Freed House

- In discussion with council, some question arose that needed to be answered so the City contracted with an architectural firm specializing in historic preservation. Some key questions are the cost to relocate and cost for restoration. What could we consider as ongoing operations – programming and cost.
- Is the intention of the City to take financial responsibility for owning, insuring, maintaining, etc?
- City vs Historical. No answers, questions have been raised. No specific determination of roles.
- How can we go forward if these things are not defined?
- Limited park budget – other needs in the city.
- Experts need to look at costs of relocation, restoration, etc.
- What is the community vision?
- Questions – how does this operate, who operates? Who pays for subsidy of this?
- Is the developer doing anything to contribute to cost? Provided land – their obligation has been fulfilled.
- House was in a different location, was moved onto a lot that was to be set aside for that house, under current agreement, an interested (private) buyer would buy and renovate by owner and used as a residence.
- By sighting the house on Ebright – would preclude other uses.
- Only 5 or 6 usable acres on the site – vision of having historical home, if that is what community wants, has impact on other uses.
- One of the purposes of retaining the architect is to determine issues with renovation and restoration.
- A lot of unknowns – who will pay for what elements.
- Nobody wants to see environmental degradation. We need to take issues seriously. Lots of ways we can go – its possible to do interesting things, done right will not have negative impacts on property. We need to protect, but that doesn't mean not touching it. Its possible to do things without ruining.

We as a city need to know how to deal with dogs in our parks. How do we provide that space in our park systems. Some cities create a concentrated dog area, others disperse off-leash areas. We think a dispersed approach is best. Between ESP and BLP there may be some opportunities for an off-leash area.

Trails, Bikeways and Paths Plan

Trails Plan and Parks Plan are ready to be forwarded to the City council as comprehensive plan amendments and are ready to be forwarded to the planning commission. They are very impressed with both documents they and like the vision and strategies laid out in both documents. Had some questions about some policy issues. A public hearing is scheduled for October 21st which will be hosted by the planning commission and park commission for public comment before being taken to council – scheduled in November. First reading Dec 7th, second reading and adoption Dec 14th. Otak, Public works and Parks will be meet to make sure there is consistency in the document in terms of esthetics and right of way.

New Business:

Park Commission alternate positions:

Council suggested these remain open to increase pool of applicants. There are also 5 regular positions that will expire this year. Now is the time to ask those commissioners to think about reappointment. The positions that will be open are: Lynn Rehm, John Rossi, Pat Schlight, Tom Schloetter and Chris Leyerly.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:20