



City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle Parks and Recreation

Christopher Williams, Acting Superintendent

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 4, 2014

TO: Councilmember Sally Clark

FROM: Christopher Williams, Acting Superintendent, Seattle Parks and Recreation

CC: Councilmember Sally Bagshaw
Councilmember Tom Rasmussen
Councilmember Bruce Harrell
Bernie Matsuno, Department of Neighborhoods
Kathy Nyland, Mayor's Office
Patricia Lopez, Department of Neighborhoods
James Bush, Department of Neighborhoods
Mark Mead, Seattle Parks and Recreation
David Graves, Seattle Parks and Recreation
Brian Hawksford, Councilmember Rasmussen's Office
Jeremy Racca, Councilmember Harrell's Office
Jesse Gilliam, Councilmember Clark's Office
Lily Rehrman, Councilmember Bagshaw's Office
Alberta Bleck, Councilmember Bagshaw's Office
Kate White, Councilmember Bagshaw's Office
Lish Whitson, City Council Central Staff
Rebecca Herzfeld, City Council Central Staff
Mary DeJong, Cheasty Greenspace Trails & Bike Park (Applicant) mary@waymarkers.net
Joe DeJong, Cheasty Greenspace Trails & Bike Park (Applicant) joeldejong@me.com

SUBJECT: Responses to Questions about Cheasty Pilot Pedestrian and Mountain Bike Trail

Thank you for the opportunity to provide more information about the Cheasty Pilot Pedestrian and Mountain Bike Trail. Responses to questions posed by Councilmember Clark in her e-mail message of July 30, 2014 are written in blue font by Seattle Parks and Recreation and red font by the Department of Neighborhoods.

If you have any questions about these responses, please feel free to call me at 684-8022.

Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) with Project Proponents:

1. What is the scope and cost of the entire Cheasty Greenspace Trails and Bike Park Pilot Project ("project")?
 - a. Has DPR approved specific trails within the project? *No. Because we have only concept drawings and no preliminary designs, we don't have any specific trails to approve or reject.* Has DPR denied (formally or informally) authorization of specific trails as part of the Project at this time? *No (see answer above).* The proponents of the project would like to pursue additional funding (not from the Large Projects Fund (LPF) award) for interior paths and the "free-ride" area. How will DPR approach this with both the proponents and the opponents of the pilot project? *The Project Advisory Team (PAT) approach will address changes to the initial proposal. Parks is not in favor of the free-ride zone. Interior paths may be acceptable depending upon location and construction.*
 - b. The NMF application describes optional installation of skill elements "alongside" the trail. Has DPR approved this concept? *No, Parks has not seen the design for these features. Depending upon the type of elements, Parks may not allow them. Others may be subtle enough to not affect the nature of the site, i.e. logs with flattened surfaces.*
 - c. We understand that the total cost of the project is estimated at \$750,000. Please provide a budget showing how the total project cost breaks down in terms expense and anticipated fund sources (Neighborhood Matching Fund, DPR, grant funding) for each task. Are project costs already broken into phases? If needed, please break down into phases. *The proponents submitted a draft budget equaling \$597,078 in fixed costs and an additional \$59,707 for support of the capital campaign for the project. The proposal includes:*
 - *\$53,000 for planning and design phases; the proponents have \$30,000 in funds at this time to support planning/design.*
 - *\$314,511 for Phase 1 construction; the DON grant would be applied to Phase 1 costs.*
 - *\$115,817 for Phase 2; and*
 - *\$113,750 for Phase 3.*

Seattle Parks supports the planning and design phases and Phase 1 of this project as well as full forest restoration of the site. Parks estimates a cost of \$452,254 to complete planning/design, Phase 1 and forest restoration. These costs will include an extended public involvement process, Parks management costs and cost for the three-year monitoring program, which were not in the proponents' draft budget. The proponents will need to raise the sum of \$452,254 plus 10 percent for the capital campaign for the project. Parks does not support Phases 2 and 3 of the proponents' plan.
 - d. The NMF application estimated that design costs would be \$27,000. Given the cost allocation provided for question 1b, does DPR think that is still an appropriate estimate for the design of all or part of the project? *No. As stated in the response to questions "c" above, the proponents estimate planning and design costs to be \$53,000; Parks estimates planning and design costs to be \$86,500.*
 - e. The NMF award is for construction of a bike trail, yet there is no design yet for a bike trail beyond the concept map. Who "owns" design of trail? Who will pay for design of

the trail? *The design will come from a contractor hired by the proponents through funds they raise. Parks will review the design through its development at 30, 60 and 90 percent completion. These design documents will also be vetted through the PAT.*

2. Please provide a written description and a timeline for completing the public process and the technical review of the proposed design.
 - a. Please describe the issues that the Project Advisory Team (PAT) will be asked to consider.

OUTCOMES

The intent of the PAT is to develop consensus within the community on the nature of and layout of the pedestrian and bike trails, to create metrics and thresholds to measure the success of the project, and to provide a format for receiving public input and providing information to the public.

PROCESS

Parks is waiting for the initial schematic design drawings for the project from the proponents. At present, there are only concept drawings and no construction specifications or schematic designs. Once we receive schematic documents, Park will review and comment on the plans and provide feedback to the proponents. The proponents will then revise the plans and provide the PAT with early design drawings and specifications for review and comment.

Parks will hire an outside facilitator for the PAT meetings and establish the schedule for the meetings. Currently, we plan to hold four meetings tentatively scheduled for September and October. More meetings may be added if necessary. Please let us know if you want to know more information about the formation, composition and charge of the PAT.

Review Categories for Cheasty Mountain Bike Pilot

Parks will require a review of some or all of the following categories of potential impacts of the Cheasty Pilot Pedestrian and Mountain Bike Trail as part of the planning proposal as well as a basis for the quarterly review of impacts of the pilot project. This list is a draft and may include more elements or exclude others as determined through further review by Parks and the upcoming PAT meetings and public process. This list and subsequent focused impacts should be seen as an initial guide for review of the environmental impacts of the pilot.

- *Existing Conditions & Trends – A review of the current condition of the area to include known environmental and social conditions, uses and existing concerns such as slopes, wetlands and debris.*
- *Water Quality - The site contains known wetlands and has year-round water flow, so water quality and water control issues are a significant. Factors will*

include impacts to: wastewater, storm water drainage, solid waste and wetland impact and protection.

- *Forest Condition – Parks has performed two levels of review of forest conditions of the site. Current review is through the Green Seattle Partnership Inventory process that guides restoration efforts in Parks' 2,500 acres of forested parklands. Sampling is done to determine forest type, forest condition and potential forest trajectory.*
- *Endangered Species – Urban forests provided benefits that include wildlife habitat for existing species as well as potential habitat for returning species. Wildlife inventories are long-term and require significant funding. Measurements of habitat quality, diversity of flora, soil quality, bird populations and other measures that can be replicated on a quarterly basis would be of the best use to determine impacts.*
- *Air Quality – Parking has a direct impact on air quality as do the reduced trips to more distant venues.*
- *Citizen Participation – Public process will include development of a Public Advisory Team (PAT) that will contain a diverse and balanced membership. This group will report out as the pilot is developed and will help set the metrics for the quarterly and final report. The PAT process will be held in a public forum, allowing the public to engage in the pilot development.*
- *Environmental Justice – Social and environmental justice issues are important criteria for the City of Seattle and Seattle Parks. The proponents of the plan will be required to provide outreach to all members of the local community to ensure inclusion and assure equitable use of the resources of this site.*
- *Community Facilities & Services – How the project will affect local facilities and services will be examined. As example the Veterans Hospital may experience an impact through parking for staff and or clients.*
- *Historic Properties (SHPO & Tribal Contacts) – Historical research will be done to identify any potential impacts to historical resources.*
- *Noise Control- Impacts from users, vehicles and walkers may be examined via onsite interviews and observation, as well as research from similar sites.*
- *Contamination & Toxic Materials – A review of the site for hazardous materials will be ongoing during the pilot phase. Prior to initial work a review will be done for known contamination areas.*
- *Energy – Energy use may be forecasted through existing models.*
- *Alternatives – The development of alternative trail locations, trail types and construction methods will be examined through the PAT and through internal review by Parks.*
- *Project Mitigation/Modifications – Any mitigation measures necessary to address the impacts should be included in the study.*
- *Permitting – Local, county and state permitting for wetlands, steep slopes and forest restoration should be addressed through the planning process and with the use of professionals in the field.*

Potential Quarterly Review Categories

Staff evaluation of the trails would include:

- *General trail condition*
- *Estimated trail usage*
- *Increased parking issues or impacts*
- *Noting areas of trail erosion and/or standing water, with recommended fixes*
- *Noting areas of trail damage, with recommended fixes*
- *Evidence of bicycles not staying within the constructed trail corridor*
- *General vegetation health within the immediate trail corridor*
- *Areas of damaged and or dying vegetation within the trail corridor*
- *Any signs of wildlife (note that a lack of wildlife present during a visit does not mean that there is no wildlife in the area, only that they are not present at that time). Seasonal changes in wildlife use and life cycles may impact affect this measure.*
- *Maintenance activities undertaken during the preceding quarter include trail maintenance and vegetation management activities and volunteer hours. Records to be acquired from Green Seattle Partnership CEDAR system.*
- *Records from Parks PLANT system to evaluate impacts on Parks maintenance activities.*
- *Increases or decreases in trash and or encampments in area*
- *Development of unplanned trails.*
- *Staff evaluations should be written with attached photo documentation.*

- b. How will the PAT's input be incorporated into the project?

Incorporation of PAT input will be through facilitated interaction with the designers and Parks staff.

- c. Will the PAT complete its work before DPR gives its approval for the final design of the project?

The PAT's work is projected to last six to nine weeks, but it may be extended if necessary. We believe that pertinent design issues will be addressed in the PAT and will then be incorporated into the design.

3. How will DPR identify which factors it will evaluate during the three-year term of the pilot project? *The PAT and Parks will identify these criteria, metrics and thresholds.* How will the success or failure of the pilot be measured? *Success will be measured through the metrics developed. See above response for areas to be investigated.*

4. Please outline the timeline and process for how DPR will create a citywide policy describing approved and prohibited uses for Greenbelts, Greenspaces, and Natural Area Parks. *New Citywide policies will require significant development time as well as public input. Tree-related policies for Parks and Seattle Department of Transportation have taken several years. The tree protection ordinance for the Department of Planning and Development has been in process for over six years. Work on a departmentwide policy regarding greenbelts and natural areas would begin in the fall of 2014. There is a fair amount of research and outreach to forest stewards, natural area supporters and other interest groups. After working with a broad constituency and Parks staff, a draft policy could be ready for review by the Board of Park Commissioners in the late spring 2015 with adoption by summer.*

How would the timing for adoption of a citywide policy affect the work on the project? *Provisions could be made in the policy to cover the Cheasty pilot so the adoption of a greenbelt/natural area policy would not be affected. Keep in mind that at the end of the Cheasty pilot, assuming the project moves forward, Parks will take final action on the bicycle and pedestrian trails that will have to be consistent with any adopted greenbelt/natural area policy. One of the purposes of this pilot project is to enable Parks and the public to understand the impacts of a mountain bike trail in a greenbelt; there are already existing pedestrian trails in our greenbelts and natural areas and we anticipate a three-year window for evaluation.*

Regarding the question of whether the trail would be developed on property owned by the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA), Parks would only be considering a trail project on Parks property. We might want provide some kind of connection or access from SHA's New Rainier Vista. The proponents and Parks staff are in discussion with SHA about allowing entrance through an area SHA has already set aside as a community park on SHA property. The proposed trail is not dependent on this access.

Department of Neighborhoods (DON):

1. From the LPF award to the project, funds are set to be dispensed as below and that the DON contracting process ensures that funds will only be used for construction of the bike trail.

\$67,200	for completion of 1.5 miles of bike trail construction
\$15,000	construction contingency
\$ 9,800	Sales tax
\$ 8,000	Fiscal agent fees
<hr/>	
\$100,000	Total Award

Does this mean that the LPF funds may not be used for design or planning? ***Yes, LPF funds are dedicated for physical construction of the perimeter loop trail.*** Are construction” and “completion of construction” defined strictly as physical construction rather than preparation for construction? ***Construction is defined as “physical construction”.***

2. What happens if the applicants need more funding for design and planning prior to construction? ***Applicant must work with the Parks department to develop final plan for the 1.5 mile perimeter bike loop and LPF funds will not be released until the design is approved by DPR.*** Can the awarded funds only be used to reimburse the applicants for the physical construction costs? ***Yes.*** If so, how long can the funds be held? ***One year after contract is fully executed and changes to the timeline can be amended with DON upon DPR approval for the perimeter loop trail. If the perimeter loop trail is deemed unfeasible and applicant identifies another use consistent with results from the master plan process and approved by DPR; DON is willing to discuss repurposing funds for other physical construction components.*** 3. Is it anticipated that DPR will cover costs associated with geotech, SEPA, wetlands review, etc.? ***DPR is responsible for SEPA costs. Applicant is responsible for all other planning costs including geotech and wetlands review.***