

**BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
MEETING MINUTES
September 12, 2002**

Present:

Bruce Bentley
James Fearn, Jr.
Susan Golub
O. Yale Lewis, Jr.
Sarah Neilson
Kathleen Warren

Excused: Kate Pflaumer

Staff:

Ken Bounds, Parks Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

Chair Bruce Bentley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Kathleen moved that the agenda consent items, the corrected August 22 minutes, and the acknowledgment of correspondence be approved. James seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Superintendent's Report:

Superintendent Ken Bounds reported on the following:

Christopher Williams: Parks Operations Director, underwent successful thoracic surgery on September 9 for removal of a non-invasive lung cancer. He is expected to be out of work for six weeks.

Pro Parks Summer Environmental Programs: The first season of Levy-funded environmental programs was a huge success. 20,000 kids participated in planting, creating recycling programs, beach walks, litter pickup, and other activities. Some learned about the Cedar River watershed; others built birdhouses and learned about birds; all participated in the environmental-themed Summer Reading Program in conjunction with the Library; many hiked, camped, rock climbed, and participated in habitat restoration work; and environmental stewardship activities were included for kids at 13 of our summer playground sites.

Summer Beach Program/Wading Pools: Almost 139,000 people visited the nine swimming beaches this season. This was the 33rd consecutive summer beach season without a drowning. 38,154 attended Green Lake, Volunteer Park, and Lincoln Park

wading pools $\frac{3}{4}$ an increase of 25% over both 2000 and 2001. Thanks to the Pro Parks levy funds which extended the days and hours at these pools.

High Point Playfield Lighting: Work is complete on the replacement of the lighting system at High Point; the new system will improve lighting consistency and reduce light spillage into the neighborhood.

Day of Caring Event: Approximately 400 volunteers from the Eddie Bauer Corporation will volunteer their time on Friday, September 13, at the Sand Point Magnuson Park complex, painting, planting, pulling invasive plants, and other projects.

Amy Yee Tennis Center: the dedication of the Amy Yee Tennis Center will be held on Sunday, September 15, at 2:00 pm. The Board was invited to attend. A large crowd is expected, including Mayor Greg Nickels, former Mayors Royer and Rice, and the Yee family.

Tree Policy Report:

The Board received a written report on the Parks Department Tree Policy's First Year Experience. Due to the full agenda, Bruce asked that the Board hold any questions/comments until a future Board meeting and commented that the report was very informative and well written.

Oral Requests and Communications from the Audience:

Bruce explained that the general public comment portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had or are not scheduled for a public hearing. No one signed up to give general public comment.

Ravenna Creek Daylighting Project:

Parks Project Manager Virginia Hassinger came before the Board to give a briefing on the Ravenna Creek Daylighting Project. She also presented a written report, which is included in these minutes.

Action Requested

At the September 12 meeting, a briefing and public hearing on the Ravenna Creek Daylighting Project design alternatives will be held. At the September 26 meeting, the Board will discuss the preferred alternative and make its recommendation to the Superintendent. The Board will be asked to make a recommendation to the Superintendent to accept the preferred alternative and direct the project team to proceed with design development based on this alternative.

Purpose of the Daylighting Project

The intent of the project is to daylight Ravenna Creek as an alternative to a proposed conveyance pipe within Ravenna Park. The creek is currently diverted into a King

County trunk sewer. King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Division plans to reroute the creek waters to Union Bay (Lake Washington) via a combination of a new conveyance pipe and existing City of Seattle drainage system. The project to daylight the creek addresses a priority in the University Community Urban Center Neighborhood Plan and provides a variety of associated benefits including increased habitat, drainage, and aesthetic opportunities.

Project Background

The daylighting project is the result of a decade long effort by the community to return Ravenna Creek to the surface. Since 1963, the creek has been diverted into a King County trunk sewer, which passes under Ravenna Park. Since Ravenna Creek water is primarily clean ground water, it does not require treatment. Diversion into the sewer system increases the flow to the combined sewer and the West Point Treatment Plant. This results in increased combined sewer overflow events, and increased pumping and treatment costs. In 1991 King County (formerly Metro) proposed building a pipeline to convey the water from Ravenna Park to University Slough (Lake Washington). The community reacted with a proposal to restore the creek to the surface along the entire route. King County delayed pipeline construction for several years while the community worked to develop a path for the creek. The Ravenna Creek Alliance was formed to support the community effort. They gained considerable support and funding, but were ultimately unsuccessful in gaining the support of King County, City of Seattle, and private landowners.

In April 2000 the City of Seattle and King County reached an agreement on the project. They agreed to daylight through Ravenna Park, to install art to mark the former route, and to complete the conveyance construction for the remainder of the route. They also agreed to work closely with citizens from the Ravenna Creek area and King County to design a route that accommodates current athletic field uses in the park.

Conceptual Design

The landscape provides a design challenge. The former creek valley in lower Ravenna Park has been filled and leveled. A soccer field and a Little League baseball field occupy virtually all the fill area (also known as the lower playfield), which is surrounded on all sides by steep slopes. In order to bring the creek to the surface, athletic uses will be impacted.

A committee of Parks staff and Ravenna area residents selected Peggy Gaynor, Inc. as the project designer. Gaynor prepared four design alternatives. The alternatives provide different solutions for accommodating both creek and the existing athletic fields. The designer's intent is to restore some of the natural creek landform by softening the radical cut-and-fills, which now characterize the lower creek valley. The degree to which this is possible depends upon the where the athletic fields are placed. The alternatives are described below.

Alternative #1 achieves creek daylighting with a terminus on the east side of the lower playfield. It leaves the existing Little League field intact in the southwest corner of the

site. Modified soccer is accommodated in the outfield area. The creek is characterized by two ponded areas, one larger wetland pond in the north and a linear pond east of the existing ballfield.

Alternative #2 achieves creek daylighting with a terminus on the west side of the lower playfield. It relocates the existing Little League field to the southeast corner of the lower playfield. Modified soccer is accommodated in the outfield area. The creek is again characterized by two ponded areas, one larger wetland pond north of the relocated ballfield and a small outlet pond in the southwest corner of the site.

Alternative #3 provides creek daylighting and a grass field with modified soccer on the lower playfield. The Little League field is relocated to the southeast corner of the upper playfield, which is located on a benched area above and to the west of the lower playfield. Relocating the ballfield also necessitates relocating play equipment and a portion of a maintenance road. The creek on the lower field is characterized by a meandering reach along the east side and a wetland outlet pond in the south area of the site. The grass field has an organic form with small "rooms" as well as a large soccer field space bordered by a seating height wall along the west slope.

Alternative #4 provides creek daylighting and an informal play meadow on the lower playfield. The Little League field is relocated to the southeast corner of the upper playfield, as in alternative #3. Modified soccer is accommodated in the outfield area. Relocating the ballfield also necessitates relocating play equipment and a portion of a maintenance road. The creek on the lower field is characterized by a wide meandering reach down the east-center side and wetland outlet pond and channel in the south area of the site. The grass field has an organic form with small "rooms" for picnicking, education classes, and other small gatherings.

Public Process

Three public design workshops were held in the spring of 2002. The goal of the workshops was to work with the community to create a vision for the creek. The preferred alternative was to be refined at the final workshop.

The original scope of the project was limited to the lower playfield at Ravenna (based on funding restrictions from King County). During the public process, King County agreed to allow their funding to pay for ballfield relocation, and a search for alternative athletic sites was conducted. Several alternate sites were suggested, but all sites with the exception of the upper Ravenna playfield were eliminated as candidate sites due to a variety of constraints (size, previous programming, etc). The preferred alternative that emerged based on public input at Workshop #3 involved relocating the little league field to the upper playfield (Alternative #3). However, significant opposition from other park users who were not in attendance at Workshop #3 led to an extended public process to resolve issues which threatened to split the community.

Two additional workshops were held to bring all users into the discussion. The final workshop was held on September 5, 2002.

Preferred Alternative

Alternative # 2 is the alternative recommended by Parks staff. It achieves creek daylighting to the entrance at NE 55th Street by relocating the existing youth baseball field to the southeast corner of the lower playfield. Modified soccer is accommodated in the outfield. Retaining walls are used along the southeast corner to fit the relocated field into the existing grade. An estimated 20 trees, some significant in size and quality, will be removed to implement this alternative.

Justification for Preferred Alternative

Eighty-five people, representing a cross section of interest groups, attended the final conceptual design workshop on September 5. There was consensus on preserving the upper playfield as open space - no one supported a ballfield there. There was not consensus on the other options. The board of Ravenna Creek Alliance advocated that the ballfield be removed from the park entirely so that the creek can be "the best creek it can be". Given that there is no alternative for baseball replacement outside Ravenna Park, most of the attendees were in favor of accommodating the ballfield on site. Most in the room felt they could live with Alternative #2. This option compromises both creek and athletic uses but achieves the intent of the project.

Permitting

Environmental permitting includes SEPA and Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit will be required. Permitting activities will begin during design development.

Project Schedule

King County plans to build the creek conveyance pipeline in 2003. Parks is working to coordinate construction with the King County schedule. The schedule to complete construction documents by summer of 2003 is aggressive. The critical path is now the permit timing.

Project Budget

Design budget of \$183,000 has been allocated from Pro Parks funding. King County will provide up to \$1.7 million in 2003 for construction and artwork.

Artwork

Seattle Arts Commission (SAC) is implementing the design and commission of artwork associated with this project. They have selected Mark Brest Van Kempen as the artist. SAC has budgeted \$200,000 for implementation. The artist has been coordinating with Parks consultant design team.

Board Questions/Comments

The Board asked Virginia a number of questions. James asked if the stream quality would be affected $\frac{3}{4}$ Virginia answered that all four alternatives include restoration in the upper area, and that the water quality would be good in all four alternatives, although alternatives 3 and 4 provide better riparian corridor and more restoration. Bruce asked which alternative is the closest to the current park $\frac{3}{4}$ answered Alternative 1. James asked what the upper field is currently used for $\frac{3}{4}$ answered neighborhood commons and

unscheduled use including Frisbee, picnicking, free play area, and soccer practice. Sarah asked if Little League is scheduled all the time at the ballfield $\frac{3}{4}$ answered that the field is scheduled for baseball evenings 5 p.m. to dark and Saturdays from March through July and for soccer mid-August - mid-November. Sarah asked if the fields would be lighted $\frac{3}{4}$ answered no. Susan asked about a past idea to pump water from Ravenna Creek to Greenlake. Ken and Virginia answered that this idea proved to be too costly.

Virginia said the preferred choice is Alternative #2. Ballfield users are agreeable to any of the four alternatives. Kathleen asked if all four alternatives are within the project's budget $\frac{3}{4}$ answered yes, but the amenities (bridges, pathways, entry stairs, etc) that are funded vary from plan to plan. Some of the alternatives are more costly than others and leave less money for amenities. Sarah asked if safety concerns are greater with one alternative than another $\frac{3}{4}$ answered that safety at the pathways is a concern. Part of Ravenna Park is a deep, dark wooded ravine and a soccer field can bring more people into the park and increase safety.

Bruce opened the floor for public testimony.

Public Testimony

30 people testified to the Board.

Kit O'Neill: supports a new Alt. #5; President of Ravenna Creek Alliance (RCA); presented both a verbal and written description of RAC's proposed Alternative #5, looks like the right-hand side of either Alternative 3 or Alternative 4, or some blend of those two but does not include a ballfield. It costs \$.5 million less than Alt. #2; RCA doesn't want Alt. #2

Alice Cummings: supports Alt. #4 or #5; also presented written testimony; attended 3 of the 5 workshops; lives near park; bring stream back as close as possible to its former condition

Tom Ostrom: consider ecological impacts of daylighting the creek; maximize the creek width; consider the width of the buffer and the diversity of the riparian area

Jim O'Halloran: supports Alt. #4 or #5; lives nearby; heavy park user; Virginia has done good job involving the public on this project; he understands neighbors concerns and no longer feels the park needs a ballfield; do a few long-term things and do them very well

Elaine Woo: supports Alt. #5; also presented written testimony; former nearby school principal and nearby neighbor; kids learn about the environment in this park $\frac{3}{4}$ can't learn it in the classroom

Jeannie Hale: supports Alt. #5; also presented written testimony; Laurelhurst Community Club president; don't daylight creek and have ballfield at lower level; Laurelhurst Community Club is involved because they take a global stand on issues; daylight the creek to maximum extent possible

Mark Brest van Kempen: believes Alt. #2 is absurd; also presented written testimony; is an artist hired by the Seattle Design Commission to do artwork for this project; turn the creek into a spectacular gem; the ballfield can be moved elsewhere ³/₄ the creek cannot

Janet Way: supports Alt. #5; from Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund; creek should take precedence over the ballfield; do the best creek possible

Dan Wood: supports Alt. #1, 2, 3, or 4 but not Alt. #5; Roosevelt Greenlake Little League president; represents 600 families that play little league at the park; great opportunity to bring kids to the daylighted creek when they play ball there

Brett Frusaker: supports Alt. #5; representing Ravenna Bryant Community Council which represents 3,000 households; lives in neighborhood and uses park; ballfields are very expensive and would take money away from daylighting the creek

Judy Shephard: supports Alt. #2; thanked Board for listening to the various issues; thanked citizens for their involvement; creek is only small part of this park; don't make the best possible creek ³/₄ make the best possible park

Tim Rood: supports Alt. #2; one of first major proponents of the project; 80-90 people were at the September 5 meeting and Alt. #5 didn't exist at that time; his neighbors support established uses of the park; to say there wasn't a consensus at the September 5 meeting could mean that different groups were working on different issues

Jorgen Bader: supports Alt. #5; gave written testimony; talked about history of the park and his use of it as a child; he attended first 4 of the 5 workshops; Alt. #5 is not a new idea; don't alter the east embankment

Tony Leese: lives near park; leave upper playfield alone ³/₄ it currently has multiple varied uses; there are no ballfields in the Arboretum or Volunteer Park

Susan Baker: supports Alt. #2; has worked on Ravenna Creek since the 1980's; at the September 5 meeting, people agreed that the ballfield would be put somewhere else; if attendees knew that an Alt. #5 was to be presented they would have been at the meeting to testify against

Laura Dixon-Dibvad: supports Alt. #5; gave written testimony; Co-chair of Ravenna neighborhood planning group which wanted more "nature" in the neighborhood; Alt. #5 is not a new idea; she was at the September 5 meeting and believed people agreed to Alt. #2 because Alt. #5 wasn't on display.

Otto Rombouts: lives near the park; also presented written testimony; ballfield is needed; concerned with the removal of 20 healthy trees; keep the plan simple and keep the trees

Jeff Jason: park neighbor; involved in the Ravenna Creek Alliance for 7-8 years; helped preserve Ravenna Woods; wants creek daylighted but objects to Alt. #5 being ram-

rodded at the 11th hour; there is no Alt. #5; the information was never posted at the Ravenna Creek information kiosk; refuted nine points of e-mail sent by Kit O'Neill to a number of people

Lisa Decker: lives in Thornton Creek watershed; Sierra Club volunteer; we won't ever get new creeks but can protect what we now have; healthy creeks are rare in a city; choices made now will last for generations

Gordon Macdougall: teacher; works with watersheds; democracy in action is happening at tonight's meeting; restore creek as much as possible; good example for kids and great learning opportunity

Kim Bylund: supports Alt. #2; lives near park; heavy park user; protect the upper field as it is used extensively by park users; #2 is best compromise; #5 subverts the process that has been gone through and it squelches the voice of little league families

Marsha Miller: supports Alt. #2; lives near the park for last eight years; upper playfield is important part of the neighborhood; many apartment dwellers, who don't have yards, use the upper playfield; wants to keep a ballfield in the neighborhood; supports daylighting the creek

Pam Johnson: supports Alt. #5; working on YES for Seattle to protect and restore creeks; hopes the Board will have vision and courage to consider something that wasn't in front of them tonight; daylight the creek to the fullest extent possible

Tom Lacine: supports Alt. #5; teaches policy planning; he helped write Alt. #5 and speaks for the neighbors who aren't at tonight's meeting; don't eliminate ballfield $\frac{3}{4}$ just find another place for it; it's the City's responsibility to find places for ballfields; be brave; think outside the box

Phillip Grega: supports Alt. #2; infrequent park user; frightened of Alt. #3 and #4; concerned with safety issues of tall retaining walls, aesthetics, security

Mary McCabe: supports Alt. #5; works for YES for Seattle and has been studying creeks for the past two years; daylighting creeks is a great idea; do it to the fullest extent possible

Shelly Bower: supports Alt. #5; has led lots of tours to urban creeks; creeks need space and adequate buffer; don't let ballfields encroach; there are alternative sports to those that require designated ballfields

Peggy Gayner: is the designer of Alternatives #1, #2, #3, and #4; the contours in the park get steeper as you move from Alt 4 back to Alt 1; there was no total consensus at any of the meetings

Richard Ellison: member of Save Seattle Trees and is concerned about the loss of trees in the plan proposed by the Parks Department; believes Alternative #5 goes too far

Pat Marcus: park neighbor; she and her four children have used the park for the past 20 years; many parents are at home with their kids tonight or would have been at the meeting to testify; requested that the ballfields be kept for organized sports for kids, either at Ravenna or a nearby park

Oral testimony concluded. Bruce reminded the audience that written testimony to the Board will be accepted until the afternoon of the September 26 Board meeting. The Board will discuss the topic and make its recommendation to the Parks Department Superintendent at that meeting.

South Lake Union RUP:

Parks Property Manager Terry Dunning and King County/Metro staff, Judy Cochran, came before the Board to request a Revocable Use Permit to allow King County to utilize approximately 10,000 square feet of park property on the southwest corner of the South Lake Union Park parking lot to accommodate construction staging for the King County Denny Way/Lake Union Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Project. A written briefing was also given to the Board and is included in these minutes.

This project is Phase 2 of the King County Control Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Program. This project will link the Phase 1 facilities along the east side of Lake Union with Phase 3 and 4 of the CSO storage and treatment project involving the Elliott Avenue West, the West Mercer Street, and the Myrtle Edwards Park facilities.

Use of park property will consist of construction staging as well as a temporary detour route for the pedestrian path along Valley Street. All excavation and construction activities will be conducted within the Valley Street right-of-way adjacent to the South Lake Union Complex.

The permit period is expected to be for 9 months from September 2002 through June 2003. The permit fee total of \$29,160 was calculated in accordance to the Permit Fee Schedule using the continuing Use Permit Fee. Payment of the fee will be deferred until March 2003 to allow consideration of possible physical improvements in lieu of the permit fee. Deferment will allow the Department to evaluate and coordinate possible improvements with the development conditions of the South Lake Union complex at that time. Restoration will be evaluated and required upon completion of the work to a condition acceptable to the Department.

In addition to the permit fees, or improvements in lieu of, the Department has requested mitigation work in the amount of \$23,300 to compensate for loss of parking and anticipated impacts on the South Lake Union Armory, the Seattle Parks Foundation, and the Maritime Heritage Foundation. Mitigation includes the repair of a drainage/ponding

on Terry Avenue next to the Armory, and demolition and removal of rail and ties along the Valley and West Lake Union pedestrian path.

Insurance/liability and indemnification requirements have been met. In accordance with the approved procedures for issuance of permits, notice of this application has been published in the Daily Journal of Commerce.

Terry pointed out the affected area on the map that was sent to the Board. Judy gave a brief overview and said the project is half completed. There are three tunnel segments to the projects, with one being located at Valley Street. King County has worked closely with the Park Department on the permitting process and is trying to minimize any effects on traffic.

The Board asked if there is a downside to the permit. Terry answered yes, that is why there is mitigation. The project was begun before the Parks Department moved to the South Lake Union facility. Parking, and how the Parks Department conducts business at the facility, will be affected. The mitigation will eliminate current flooding problems at Terry Avenue and will remove the railroad ties from the portion of the park at Valley Street. Terry said this is a win-win situation for both the Parks Department and King County Metro. Kathleen asked if there are any objections from the community and Terry answered no.

Yale moved that the request for the permit be approved, Kathleen seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Sand Point Tennis Center Briefing:

Parks project manager Kevin Bergsrud came before the Board to give a briefing on the Sand Point Tennis Center Design. Kevin displayed a large color drawings of the design concept. A written briefing was also given and is included in these minutes.

Background

The proposed Sand Point Tennis Center is located on the grounds of the former Naval Air Station Seattle in northeast Seattle. Since the closure of the air station in the 1970s, tennis facilities or a tennis center have been included in several conceptual plans for base reuse. Proposals for a public tennis center in Seattle began in the early 1950s and intensified in the late 1960s. By the early 1970s a potential site was identified in central Seattle. The Forward Thrust bond issue funded the development of the Seattle Tennis Center.

Racquet sports have been played on the Sand Point peninsula since the 1940s with the construction of Building 6 in the southwest portion of the park. This facility remained intact until the early 1970s. Outdoor tennis courts adjacent to the building remained through the decommissioning of the naval station and exist still in 2002. Building 6 was condemned by the Navy prior to transfer to the City of Seattle and is planned to be demolished for construction of low-income housing.

Since the 1970s, different plans for Sand Point Park and then Sand Point Magnuson Park have included facilities for tennis. When 196 acres of Naval Station Seattle was transferred to the City, the 1975 Jones & Jones plan identified outdoor tennis courts to be located south of the current Junior League Playground. Six outdoor tennis courts were constructed near the northeastern boundary of the park. These courts have remained in continuous use.

The Worthy and Associates Magnuson Park Master Plan (1988) indicated the existing tennis courts would remain. In 1991, the Navy declared that they would decommission the then Naval Station Puget Sound and transfer the remaining 151 acres to local agencies. With this transfer, the Parks and Recreation - Tennis Advisory Council proposed the use of either Building 27 or Building 193 for a 12-court tennis center. At the time of the proposal, it was estimated that the cost for a "bare bones" conversion to be \$555,000. This would include preparation of the surface for 12 courts, heating, and lighting equipment.

The 1993 Community Preferred Reuse Plan for Sand Point identified for the first time a tennis center on the peninsula. It was proposed that a "North Seattle Tennis Center", with eight courts be located on the east side of Building 47, the former recreation center. The Rich Haag Associates plan of 1994, "A Vision of Magnuson Park", described a "first class, state-of-the-art tennis center with six indoor, four convertible, and four outdoor courts", various support facilities, and an overhead bridge connection to Building 47.

In 1999, the Sand Point Blue Ribbon Committee reported to the Mayor and City Council and included a Citizens Plan that identified a tennis center to the east of Building 47. In November 1999 City Council Resolution 30063 adopted the Magnuson Park Concept Plan. This plan was the first to identify an indoor tennis center on the Building 222 site, with six indoor courts immediately to the east, across Sportsfield Drive. In March 2001, an Athletic Facilities Configuration was adopted by City Council Resolution 30293 and amended Resolution 30063. Specific details were also given for the center ³/₄ that it would include six indoor courts, four courts to have a seasonal temporary cover, and four all-year outdoor courts.

The Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan 2000 is an update of the 1993 Comprehensive Plan. In the development of park and recreation facilities, the plan identifies several primary roles and responsibilities. The distribution guidelines for facilities states that "one 8-10 court indoor tennis complex is desirable in north and south Seattle." It further states that four to six 6-court outdoor tennis complexes are desirable, distributed throughout the city. Relative to the Sand Point Magnuson Park, a park development goal TC4 states: "Replace the outdoor tennis courts at Magnuson Park per the 1999 Magnuson Park Concept Design."

Design Program and Process

The design process for the Sand Point Magnuson Park tennis center has been guided by various forms of participation by the public and City review organizations.

In January 2001, a group of interested citizens formed a Sand Point Tennis Advisory Committee. Later that month, a public meeting was held at the Meadowbrook Community Center to gauge interest for a tennis center. Following the work of the citizen's group, Seattle Parks and Recreation issued a request for qualifications in September 2001 for developing a conceptual design and cost estimate. By having this information, the group could then proceed with forming a non-profit organization and to raise funds for construction.

In February and March 2002, a design subcommittee composed of tennis advisory committee members along with Parks Department staff met regularly. Initial meetings focused on the design program and overall site layout that would accommodate both indoor and outdoor courts. Significant discussion went into court spacing and the realignment of Sportsfield Drive to allow increased spacing. At monthly Tennis Advisory Committee meetings the subcommittee reported on progress of the design and feedback from other committee members.

From these meetings new items were added to the architectural program:

- In the seasonal covered courts, the ability to have a "center court" where special tournament play could occur. Adjacent court nets could be removed to allow temporary seating for up to 1,000 spectators.
- Development of a lounge area that had more of a "club" feel for trophy storage, instruction, etc.
- An outdoor hitting wall.
- An outdoor second floor deck with views over the outdoor tennis courts.
- To create a more defined entry from the east parking lot, a raised east-west spine would be constructed between the two sets of outdoor courts.

On March 30, 2002, the Sand Point Tennis Advisory Committee held a public meeting in conjunction with the Sand Point Magnuson Park Annual Design Open House. At this meeting, preliminary conceptual designs were presented to the approximately 75-100 people in attendance.

The design team made a presentation to the Seattle Design commission on May 16, 2002, on the preliminary conceptual design. Overall the commissioners gave positive marks on how the design will fit into the community campus. A presentation/briefing was made to the Seattle Sports Advisory Council on June 13, 2002.

In July 2002, the design was submitted for initial historic review, as the site is located within the Sand Point Historic District. Several recommendations were made related to orientation and access, and facades and fenestration.

Conceptual Design

Per the work scope, a conceptual design and a cost estimate was developed for the tennis center. This would permit the Sand Point Tennis Advisory Committee to raise funding for

further design and construction. The final conceptual design has striven to include all desired program elements of the advisory committee.

Major elements of the design include eight outdoor courts with a seasonal cover for inclement weather months, a central raised walkway between the outdoor courts, six indoor courts with support facilities and overhead viewing, and a façade that reflects the building's location within the Sand Point Historic District. The tennis center will contain 55,200 square feet on 3.42 acres.

The eight outdoor courts have spacing that will allow amateur tournament play. The courts are separated into two pods of four courts each. The northern pod has slightly different spacing that will allow temporary setup of "center court" for special tournament play. A hitting wall will also be located on the north side of this pod. The outdoor courts would be enclosed by fencing and entrances would be oriented towards the main indoor courts building entrance. This will allow maximum security over court access. All of the outdoor courts will be lighted.

The main entrance to the tennis center is on the east side of the building. This main entrance is also connected to the central raised walkway. A majority of the site parking is located to the east and will be shared with the proposed 11-field sports complex. The central walkway is conceived to be a major social space where players and spectators can watch ongoing matches. A key feature of the walkway is that it is raised seven feet above the grade level of the tennis courts. This allows a solid, opaque background for the players and a clear view of the courts. During inclement weather months, the four courts located to the north of this walkway will be under a seasonal air-supported structure. Initial study of this indicates that it would be a fabric bubble. Storage of the bubble would be in another building on the Sand Point Magnuson Park site.

Six indoor courts are also oriented into north and south pods with three courts in each pod. A service spine comprised of a check-in desk, locker rooms, restrooms, and meeting and viewing spaces separates the pods. The ground floor contains the locker and restrooms and administrative offices. The second floor primarily contains the meeting and viewing spaces. Access to the court pods will be from this spine. Maintenance access to the pods will be through roll-up doors located on the exterior north and south walls. An outdoor viewing deck will be located on the east end of the second floor and will allow players and coaches to view matches. This is also seen as another social space. Stairwells to the east and west ends of the spine provide access. In addition, an elevator will be located on the east end.

Four concepts were developed for exterior wall treatments that would reflect the historic location of the tennis center. The selected western wall treatment includes brick and concrete bands that reflect design elements of buildings located to the north and south. Treatments on the other walls will likely be of metal sheeting and painted using colors recommended in the Sand Point Design Guidelines Manual.

An initial construction cost estimate for the project was \$5.3 million. This reflected the "best guesses" at the time before the design program was fully completed. Final

construction cost for the center ranges from \$7.2 to \$8.1 million. When including items such as permit fees, architectural/engineering design fees for developing construction documents, etc., and design contingency multipliers the total project cost is \$11.9 to \$13.4 million.

Kevin said that the citizen planning committee is now rethinking the daunting task of raising \$11-13 million for the tennis complex. Kevin and Eric Friedli, Sand Point Magnuson Park Director, will soon meet with Sarah Welch, Park's Department Finance Director, to discuss possible funding sources.

Board Discussion

- Bruce asked if the citizen planning committee is set up as a non-profit with the Associated Recreation Council and recommended that if it isn't already, it look into this possibility. Kevin said that the group has not yet formed a non-profit.
- Sarah asked whether, given the controversy of lights at other parts of the sports complex, if the tennis center project will add more lights to the area. Kevin answered yes, that a portion of the courts are outdoor and lighted, but the light standards are much lower than those proposed for the nearby ballfields. The tennis court lights will be somewhat hidden from the street by nearby buildings.
- Sarah asked about the removable "green bubble" and whether, given that the Northwest generally has 10 months of rain yearly, if it isn't more practical to make this a hard cover. Ken commented that the design team and citizens came up with a "desired" facility, but wondered if it is affordable.
- Susan asked if this project can be built in stages. Kevin answered that this will definitely be looked at by the design team.

Bruce thanked Kevin for the presentation to the Board.

Park Board Business:

- Susan will be absent from the September 26 Board meeting.
- The Board asked for an update on the recent illegal cutting of a number of trees at Colman Park. The case has been referred to the King County prosecutor, who has handled similar cases.
- The Board remarked that the recent trimming at Kerry Viewpoint is wonderful. Ken commented that the view at Hamilton Viewpoint has also been greatly improved by recent trimming.
- Bruce commented that the written Tree Policy update was an excellent, informative report.

Other Business:

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

APPROVED: _____ DATE _____
Bruce Bentley, Chair