



**Seattle  
Design  
Commission**

**APPROVED**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**5 September 2002**

Gregory J. Nickels,  
*Mayor*

Donald Royse  
*Chair*

Tom Bykonen

Ralph Cipriani

Jack Mackie

Cary Moon

Iain M. Robertson

David Spiker

Sharon E. Sutton

Tory Laughlin Taylor

John Rahaim,  
*Executive Director*

Layne Cubell,  
*Commission Coordinator*

Projects Reviewed

12<sup>th</sup> Avenue Street Improvements  
Transportation Discussion  
Discussion with Richard Conlin  
Thornton Creek Park 6

Convened: 9:30am

Adjourned: 3:30pm

Commissioners Present

Jack Mackie, Vice Chair  
Ralph Cipriani  
Cary Moon  
Iain M. Robertson  
David Spiker  
Sharon E. Sutton  
Tory Laughlin Taylor

Staff Present

John Rahaim  
Layne Cubell  
Brad Gassman  
Anna O'Connell



Department of Design,  
Construction & Land Use

700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104-5070  
phone 206/233-7911  
fax 206/386-4039

---

**5 Sept 2002** Project: **12<sup>th</sup> Avenue Street Improvements**

Phase: Preliminary Design

Presenters: Carroll Smith, SDOT  
Phi Nguyen, Parsons Brinckerhoff  
Ed Mah, Nakano AssociatesAttendees: Jerome Pederson, Seattle University  
Bill Zosel

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00285)

**Action: The Commission thanked the team for coming and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Design Commission recognizes the proponents' long-term work with the community;**
- **finds it difficult to provide feedback without knowing the proponents' design intentions and urges the team to lay these out in future public meetings for use in working with constituents to develop a shared vision;**
- **recommends that the team to pursue consistency wherever possible, whether it be in the street geometry, lighting, street furniture, and possibly choice of street trees, but recognizes and appreciates Seattle University's distinctive landscaping as an important means of wayfinding;**
- **urges proponents to plan for future and create opportunities for developers to look into and collaborate on the design palate that you have established;**
- **encourages the proponents to work with the Arts Commission to get an artist involved in the project early on;**
- **advises SDOT to push forward the timing of future street repaving work so as to coincide with this project; and**
- **approves the preliminary design.**

The project before the Commission today is improvement of the 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor between Madison and Yesler. This is part of a one-mile long corridor of 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue slated for improvements. A model block between Columbia and Marion is currently under construction.

The present configuration of the street is one northbound lane, one southbound lane, and a two-way left turn lane in the center. The community has requested the addition of a 4'-5' bike lane in each direction. Street bulbs will be introduced at some intersections to shorten the distance for pedestrians crossing the street and to make pedestrians more visible to drivers. Street bulbs will be placed at the north end of this section near Seattle University where there is significant pedestrian traffic. At the south end, toward Jefferson, bulbs will not be added because pedestrian traffic is lighter and to keep better continuity for the bike lanes. Other additions include pedestrian-scale street lighting, groundcover and shrub landscaping around added street bulbs (groundcover and shrub landscaping strips mid-block will remain the same), and more street trees. The reconfiguration will eliminate approximately 35% of the existing street parking.

For landscaping, the plant palate developed by the City for the model block will be used in this section of the corridor, including plants like white rock rose and rhododendrons. In total, approximately 30 street trees will be added. Types of trees being looked at for the east side of the street where there are overhead power lines are the 25'-30' tall Pacific sunset maple and Raywood ash. For the west side of the street, taller trees can be planted and proponents are recommending sweetgum and European hornbeam trees.

The existing street trees are London planetrees, which are not desirable under power lines. The City has recommended that, in order to maximize the time in which there is a canopy, the planetrees be left in place and the new street trees be planted between them until the new trees provide a sufficient canopy.

While the bike lanes will be included in the reconfiguration of the street, funding for the project does not cover repaving of the street and channelization/painting of the new bike lanes will not happen until the street is repaved. Existing funding for the entire corridor is as follows: \$400,000 for street improvements, \$120,000 for landscaping, and \$400,000 for lighting. Seattle University has agreed to pay for installation of the pedestrian lighting and street trees that front their property.

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Would like to know what the quality of space will be on the street/sidewalk.
  - Proponents stated that trees will be lining both sides of the streets for canopy to bring the two sidewalks closer together and that a more intimate space will be created.
- Would like proponents to clarify what is funded at this point.
  - Proponents stated that the new street trees and the groundcover and shrubs within the new curb bulb areas are funded.
- Feels that the proposed plan is not consistent enough and that the two sides of the street should be brought closer together through consistent tree type and spacing. Would like to know why there are so many different tree types and differences in what is planted on the two sides of the street.
  - Proponents stated that the Pacific sunset maple was selected by the neighborhood as their signature tree and is being planted in the model block. In addition, there is a break in character between the area north of Jefferson, which is more business-oriented with more pedestrian traffic. South of Jefferson has less foot traffic and is more residential. The change in tree type delineates this break in character.
  - Proponents stated that Seattle University wants to maintain their signature tree in the right-of-way along their campus.
  - Proponents further stated that they had to work with what is there because the City does not want to take the existing trees out.
- Believes that it is important to spend time deciding a project's design goals. Would like proponents to think about whether they want a different character between the north and south or whether these two areas should be brought together. Would like proponents to clarify in future presentations and meetings the design purposes behind their decisions.
- Would like to know the extent of the power lines.
  - Proponents stated that there are lines all along the east side of the corridor. There are telephone and telecommunications lines with power lines up above.
- Feels that this neighborhood is a strong attractor to the core of Seattle and making this improved area attractive and complete is important. Because the cycle of street maintenance can be lengthy, hopes that the proponents will contact SDOT and encourage them to push up the schedule on repaving this street so it coincides with improvements. Is frustrated that there are piecemeal efforts and things are not always completed from beginning to end.
- Would like to know if SDOT has given any sense of when repaving might happen.

- Proponents stated that it has not been determined. SDOT is aware of the project, which would cost \$500,000, but it is not clear when they will have the money to complete it. Proponents further stated that they will make the Commission's wishes known to SDOT.
- Understands the practical reasons for having several different kinds of trees, but would like to know what the aesthetics and affect on feeling will be.
  - Proponents stated that the Raywood ash and sunset maple are lower and for the east side of the street. The trees on the west are taller and more vertical, so do not give a feeling of canopy so much as walls to the street.
- Is concerned about the shift in character and believes there is opportunity to provide a strong, unifying feature in the neighborhood. Feels that there should not be a shift in approach from north to south and urges proponents to provide continuity through the neighborhood. Also believes the change in character and nature between institutional places to the north and the more community spaces to the south is an interesting issue and concerned about reinforcing that distinction.
- Would like to know if the zoning changes along the corridor.
  - Proponents stated that it does. At Cherry it is NC240 node, which also has the University's MIO overlay. On the north side it is L2 and L3 and south of the University it is mostly midrise.
- Would like to know if opportunities for street furniture or art enhancement have been identified for developers to tap into.
  - Proponents stated that there is nothing in the budget now.
- Would like to know if opportunities for art or street furniture have been designed into developments that are already happening and that could tie into framework of street design.
  - Proponents stated that they will suggest this to those who are developing along this corridor.
- Feels that using vegetation to unify an area that is in other way unified—i.e., buildings, uses, amount of soil—and for us to imagine a perfectly unified environment is not viable. Encourages the Commission to reconsider using trees as the unifying element. Feels that choosing trees needs to be a practical decision and trees should be chosen based on whether they will grow well in a particular place. If we demand consistency, then there will be small trees on both sides of the street, and does not feel that is a good solution. Believes that Seattle University has a good reputation for landscape and that they are sensitive to planting and maintenance needs and that the Commission should not be as prescriptive in types of trees.
- Believes that if you examine urban arid places, you can find corridors with consistency and a sense of place without any tree canopies. Encourages proponents to look at textures, street improvements, banners, and other ways to get unification.
- Understands the proponents' rationale for where they put curb bulbs. However, feels that as the neighborhood changes there is a good possibility that the south end will have just as much pedestrian traffic as the north end and suggests that the team plan for future development and change.
- Would like to know why proponents can't choose just one or two tree types.
- States that then there will just be small trees.
- Believes that there is not going to be a canopy anyway because the streets are too wide and the trees are too small. Is pushing for more consistency rather than less.
  - Proponents stated that the pattern will be broken on the west because of the existing trees that will remain.

- Understands the importance of consistency, but feels that it does not have to be in the trees. Proponents could make other things consistent, while maximizing the health of the trees.
  - Proponents stated that there may be a miscommunication and that putting in pedestrian lighting is being confused as how they are dealing with the landscape. The landscape, street trees, and lighting will together develop consistency and give a gateway feeling.
- Appreciates Seattle University's landscape and supports keeping every block of campus consistent.
- Urges proponents, both of whom have a good record of working with artists on streetscapes, to contact the Arts Commission and get artists on board. This could be a good opportunity to work with the Emerging Artists program.

### **Key Visitor Comments and Concerns**

- A visitor from the community stated that the Commission's discussion reflects some of the tension between Seattle University and the community. Seattle University wants to maintain a distinct edge, but neighborhood people would like more unity. For example, the University wants its kind of tree on the street that borders campus and another kind of tree on the other side of the street. There is no forum to resolve this kind of design issue and the institutions present on this street are not subject to design review. In general, the community would like this street to be better for living on and would like to integrate the interests of the community and institutions.
- A representative of Seattle University stated that the university has not developed very much on this street and the Sullivan Law School is the first university building built on 12<sup>th</sup> in 50 years. The university is paying for the installation of the trees and lighting from Madison to Jefferson, adjacent to the campus because it is their goal is to identify the perimeter of the university's edge consistently. They struggle with the tension with the community regarding different lighting and street trees.
- The visitor from Seattle University stated that it is not a goal to create a north zone and a south zone, but the curb bulbs differ from north to south because of the nature of the use in those areas.
- A representative of DCLU stated that a street vacation in this area will come before the Commission. It would be helpful for the Commission to know that when master use permits review are done, there is an opportunity to adopt and implement neighborhood plans. What is effective, where there are long-range issues that cannot be resolved, is if there are menu items within a plan that can be applied on a block-by-block basis.

---

**5 Sept 2002** Project: **Transportation Discussion**

Phase: Staff Briefing

Attendee: Ethan Melone, SDOT

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00073; 221 | DC00262; 219 | DC00231; 169 | DC00242)

**Summary:** The Commission discussed large transportation projects: SR 519, SR 520, the Monorail, and the Viaduct. With regard to SR 519, the Commission feels that the critical issue with this project is pedestrian safety and urban design implications, especially at the intersection of 1<sup>st</sup>, Occidental, and Royal Brougham. The Commission would like to meet with Grace Crunican of SDOT to provide input on any new thinking of this project.

The WSDOT team working on SR 520 Translake expansion will present an update to the Commission on 17 October.

The Commission discussed their Op-Ed piece on the Monorail that appeared in the 5 September *Post-Intelligencer* and also the Ethics and Elections Commission's staff advice to Council regarding a monorail mock-up.

Commission staff outlined several upcoming meetings that will ensure ongoing Commission involvement on the Viaduct project.

**Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Stated that the first phases of the SR 519 project are under construction at Atlantic St. It will essentially be an overpass for pedestrian traffic. The second phase, which the Mayor addressed in his recent discussion with the Commission, is to do essentially the same thing at Royal Brougham.
- For future phases, there is a struggle with this complex issue between industrial users and pedestrian safety.
- The present design is the only solution that just barely worked—it was a multi-year effort to get this far and all parties involved still are not happy.
- Feels that the critical element is the intersection of 1<sup>st</sup>, Occidental, and Royal Brougham—there are major pedestrian safety and urban design implications.
- Assuming the design goes forward, suggests there must be opportunities for pedestrian enhancement at that key intersection. Feels that something should occur at 1<sup>st</sup> and Atlantic.
- Would like to know what the Commission can do or how they can provide assistance on the urban design side.
- Suggests that the Commission work with Grace Crunican, SDOT, and the Mayor if the current plan for the crossing is a given. It should be approached as an opportunity to define and create pedestrian-oriented space. If it is done well, that would be mitigation. There are successful places elsewhere where trucks and pedestrians are in the same spaces.
- Would like to get a meeting on SR 519 to get up-to-date information.

- WSDOT will present an update on the SR 520 Translake expansion to the Commission on 17 October.
- The Commission's Op-Ed piece on the Monorail appeared in today's *Post-Intelligencer*.
- The Ethics and Elections Committee's staff recommended that the City cannot authorize money for the mock-up.
- There will be an ETC council meeting on 12 September to discuss their remaining pre-vote activities.
- The City Council is not taking a position on the Monorail and is letting the citizens' initiative appear on the ballot.
- Recommends that other Commissioners look at the Las Vegas monorail website.
- Several upcoming meetings have been organized for the Commissions' continued involvement in the Viaduct project.

**Key Visitor Comments and Concerns**

- A representative from SDOT stated that the design of phase 2 of SR 519 may change and the Mayor has given Grace Crunican, Director of SDOT, time to come up with a compromise to make it work.
- He also stated that SDOT is developing design alternatives for SR 519.

---

**5 Sept 2002** Project: **Discussion with Richard Conlin**  
 Attendee: Richard Conlin

Time: .75 hours

**Summary: The Commission met with Richard Conlin to discuss street and alley vacations procedures and large transportation projects, such as the Viaduct, Monorail, and Translake SR 520 expansion. The Councilmember would like to see the process for street and alley vacations standardized and encourages the Commission to get involved in transportation projects early on.**

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- The Commission requested that Councilmember Conlin address two issues: street and alley vacations and transportation issues.
- Feels that the onus is on the proponent to provide a good reason for a street or alley vacation.
- One public benefit proposal in South Lake Union that might work is to create an escrow account that developers who get vacations granted could deposit money into as their public benefit.
- Feels that we need to look at underlying land use issues and have a plan for alley networks that looks forward. Alleys are underused in some places because they are not very developed.
- In South Lake Union, the community is willing to give up their alleys because they see them as a liability and do not see the long-run necessity of keeping them.
- Feels that at the very beginning of a vacation meeting, proponents should be given all the reasons that the Commission does not like/want vacations so they have all the information from the beginning.
- Believes that in West Seattle Junction, the community wants alleys to be an integral part of their business districts and they have gotten assistance on this from SDOT.
- Feels that once alleys become too much of a street, it inverts the block and becomes hard not to interrupt main street activities. There needs to be a middle ground; a back door for parking, trash, etc.
- In providing a menu, developers would also need to look in the neighborhood and think like a neighbor to see what they need. Does not want them to go shopping from a list; they need to go out and look and see what is missing in that neighborhood.
- Encourages Beverly Barnett and SDOT staff to be ruthless and make the threshold apparent so proponents do not invest hours and money into a vacation and then get told no.
- Would like to know how the Commission can effectively give City Council input on transportation issues.
- Finds it difficult for the Commission to always get involved early enough because the state is not required to present projects; they present projects to the Commission only out of courtesy if asked. WSDOT needs to know that the Commission is the City Council's eyes on such projects.
- Would like to look at the Commission's purview and push it further to perhaps gain some control over design review of these larger project that goes beyond just an advisory or academic role.

- With regard to the waterfront, the Design Commission and Planning Commission met with SDOT and agreed to come up with an at-grade alternative for the Viaduct to put on the table.
- Believes that, because there is no waterfront plan, the transportation agenda is driving the decision making and we could be giving up an opportunity to make great public life on the waterfront. More urban design and public life thinking should be at the table now rather than fitting into the plan later and the Commission and CityDesign are ready to play a role in this.
- Would like Councilmember Conlin to come to the 17 October presentation of the Translake SR 520 expansion project.

#### **Key Visitor Comments and Concerns**

- Conlin feels that the vacations procedures are gone about backwards and everyone would benefit from their standardization. Beverly Barnett and other SDOT staff are currently working on a standardized procedure.
- Feels that vacations should be a threshold decision, i.e. we should ask if it is acceptable from the standpoint of the street grid. If not, that is the end of the process, if so, then move on to step two where proponents must show how this vacation fits from a design standpoint and how it will benefit to the public.
- Would like to see a menu of public benefit items so that they are clearer and encourages rigor when looking over public benefits trade offs. Urges the Commission to look at the implications for land use and transportation.
- The street and alley networks are supposed to be driven by neighborhood plans and sub-area transportation plans.
- Believes that to raise public awareness on transportation issues, the Commission can continue to do things like write Op-Ed pieces. To effectively communicate to City Council, using an essay approach to analysis that provides a clear explanation of the Commission's recommendations/opinions is very helpful. In addition, the earlier the input the better off Council is because as a project moves toward funding, more decisions are set.
- Believes that it's possible to increase the Commission's purview and will consider taking getting this on the state legislative agenda.
- Is interested in looking at an at-grade alternative for the Viaduct.
- Feels that the Commission's work to raise questions for voters and get information out to people with regard to the Monorail has been useful.

**5 September 2002 Commission Business**

- |                         |    |   |
|-------------------------|----|---|
| <b>ACTION ITEMS</b>     | A. | <u>TIMESHEETS</u>                                       |
|                         | B. | <u>MINUTES FROM 15 AUGUST 2002</u> —APPROVED            |
| <b>DISCUSSION ITEMS</b> | C. | <u>UDRC UPDATE</u> —CUBELL                              |
|                         | D. | <u>PUBLIC OUTREACH EVENT</u> —CUBELL                    |
| <b>ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>    | E. | <u>HIGH POINT MEETING</u> —SEPT. 12, 6:30PM, HOLLY HALL |

---

**5 Sept 2002** Project: **Thornton Creek Park 6**  
Phase: Concept Design  
Presenters: Chris Woelfel, Seattle Public Utilities  
Attendees: Cheryl Eastberg, Seattle Parks and Recreation

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00284)

**Action:** **The Commission appreciates the proponents' approaches to this project and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Commission encourages the proponents to elaborate on their approaches to the project by pulling in other agencies such as public schools and SDOT;**
- **strongly supports the subtle gestures, but believes that the key to success of this space is mental and physical access and encourages the team to create safe and visible access to the park;**
- **compliments the team on recognizing the importance of stream and community restoration;**
- **encourages creative solutions for the less-developed elements like the bridge problem, i.e., floating bridge, flat bridge, etc.;**
- **recommends that signage be placed where appropriate so the public is aware of what is happening in the park and how they can become involved;**
- **compliments the proponents on their mailings to inform the public of what is happening in the park and recommends that more public outreach materials explaining the park and creek be distributed;**
- **encourages proponents to make their list of priorities accessible to the public so people can understand the project goals, priorities, funding sources, schedule, and the hierarchy in which elements of the plan are being implemented for use as a tool to inspire;**
- **commends the local residents involved who pioneered the restoration efforts;**
- **urges the proponents to find a way to recognize the volunteer efforts that have/will make this park possible; and**
- **recommends approval of the concept design.**

The project site is a small, little-known park located beside Northgate Mall through which Thornton Creek flows. A fund of \$200,000 has been allotted for creek restoration in this park. Once a field of blackberries, volunteer, SPU, and Parks Department efforts have brought in stands of native plants and some conifers. So far, the focus has been on managing vegetation along 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

While the project has funding, there is a lack of clarity as to what is going to happen when because there are no permits yet, which affects scheduling. They hope to space out the work over about three years so as not to scare all the wildlife away.

The proponents held public meetings for the project, but much of the public's energies are focused on the bigger projects in the neighborhood—the new library and community center. They have worked with the community in deciding what needs to be done in the park and how to prioritize these. The plan is to work on trails, the creek, and then plants. Much of the labor itself will be done by community members and other volunteers. They also hope to initiate projects through the Parks Department's environmental

stewardship program at the new community center.

The park is shaped such that it has many edges, but not much area inside. Plants will be added to the wetland to increase the feeling of being inside rather than on the edge of something. At the southwest corner of the park, there will be some identification that this is a park entrance. Access to the park is currently very limited. The bus stop will be moved north and grading around the adjacent apartment complex will be eased to connect it to the park and make the park accessible to tenants. A youth group, Earth Corps, will put logs in the creek for kids to walk upon. Creating a bridge to go over the creek is desirable, but difficult given the topography and scale. Because the park and creek are small, a small bridge would be appropriate. However, the land around the creek is flat and floods during the rainy season. In order to make a bridge that is long enough to be used during the rainy season, the bridge would have to be very large.

A temporally accessible trail from the site of the future Northgate community center to the park will be made into a year-round path and a trail in the southwest part of the park will be moved to make it more accessible. The addition and improvement of trails is somewhat controversial because although it increases accessibility for humans, an increase in visitors will scare of some of the wildlife. The compromise is to create trails in some areas, but leave some space for wildlife.

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Would like to know if there are ways for the team to tap into public schools for volunteer efforts.
  - Proponents stated that park coordinators have worked with schools frequently, but the Parks Department has been reorganized and she is not sure how this change will affect things.
  - Proponents stated that there is a creek steward program at SPU and a nonprofit education organization that may be able to coordinate efforts.
  - Proponents stated that in planning the restoration, they have come up with small projects that kids can do. For example, they have divided eliminating invasive species into bite-size pieces, so groups can come in and complete a piece.
- Would like to know what happens to the creek at 105<sup>th</sup>.
  - Proponents stated that Thornton Creek goes into a culvert and flows under the road and then comes out on the other side and flows along the street.
- Recommends that the proponents somehow make a note of the creek at the surface so people are aware that it is there as they drive over it. Perhaps make a symbolic bridge so people know that they are crossing the creek.
  - Proponents stated that there are signs that announce Thornton Creek Watershed, but no signs where people cross the creek. Proponents agreed that signs where pedestrians and cars cross the creek are a good idea.
- Would like to know if the funding is SPU money.
  - Proponents stated that the money they have now for the creek restoration is SPU money. Proponents further stated that they are hoping the community will be able to get grant money for the trails.
- Is concerned about the priorities for what will get finished when. Would like to know if proponents can move signage to make people aware of park up on priority list.

- Proponents stated that they can.
- Would like to know if the team has done or is planning to do any broad public outreach on work in the park such as eliminating invasives, especially canopy trees, because that can be hard to sell to the public. Feels that this is important also because it guides people in landscaping their own property.
  - Proponents stated that they are looking at the whole master plan and for each project they notify people when they are implementing parts of this plan. In more detailed notifications they let people know the limits of construction, duration of a project, what is going to be done, what kinds of trees are being removed, what preferable trees they are trying to establish, etc. Proponents further stated that notification is done before a project.
- Believes that this is a fabulous project because of the physical restoration of the creek and the fact that an agency that does not traditionally do this kind of work is taking the lead. Complements SPU's work with the Parks Department toward a larger vision. Feels that the low-key approach is good and that working with volunteers will not only benefit the park, but the youth who are involved. Overall, finds this to be an excellent community-building project.
- Recognizes that proponents are grappling with difficult access problems and encourages them to pull in other agencies to help with possible street improvements, additional sidewalks, etc. Also encourages the team to go to SDOT to seek their help in getting improvements. Believes that the team's priorities are on target, but would like to see them pursue more visibility for the park as well.
- Would like to see pedestrian access where the trail meets 105<sup>th</sup>. Suggests proponents talk to Peter Lagerwey about additional use of the trail. Believes that small projects like this are important for neighborhoods.
- Would like to add to the compliment of having children as citizens doing work in the park. Believes that this could be strengthened by the addition of institutional support. Usually individual teachers do small projects, but if proponents could get an entire school involved including students, teachers, and parents, would have a more powerful effect.
- Suggests that the team create a one-page document that has the site location, priority projects, potential/future projects, and who can/will do these projects so that in the future there is a record of what is to happen. This would make it easier for people to tie in and get involved during any time during the process.
  - Proponents stated that they have done three or four mailings to about 1500 people regarding the project, but believes it would also be good to inform people of what has been decided and planned for the park and creek.
- Believes that the bridge presents an interesting framework for solving that problem and that the team can find a creative solution like a flat bridge. Also feels, that since this project is being built over time, it will constantly be modified, which provides the opportunity to take opportunities where they come like using fallen logs in the creek.
  - Proponents stated that they will talk with DCLU and the Parks Department about using a flat bridge.
- Would like to know how the team is going to recognize the volunteers' and children's efforts.
  - Proponents stated that they do not know, but that is a wonderful question and they will put it forth to the partners in the project.

- Believes that permeability is the key to the project.
  - Proponents stated that there are ways to make it more accessible, but they are not sure how ADA accessible they will be able to make the park.

**Key Visitor Comments and Concerns**

- A representative from the community stated that she is excited because this is a tool to inspire organizations, community groups, schools, and the government to have a hand in creating havens for wildlife.
- The representative would like to know if the Commission recommends that the trail go all the way to Roosevelt or should the end it in the park.
  - A commissioner stated that the importance is access to the park rather than access through.