



**Northgate Urban Center Park
PAT Member Meeting #6
September 10, 2008
Northgate Community Center**

Present: Parks Staff:

Kim Baldwin, Project Manager
Jacqueline D. Tabor, Project Managers Assistant
Patti Maxwell, Community Center Manager

Design Consultant:

Karen Janosky, Project Manager, Mithun

Project Advisory Team Members:

Sue Geving, Velva Maye, Brad Manson, Chuck Dolan, Shawn Olesen

Purpose: Project Update

What has happened since the last meeting?

- The project was presented at the Design Commission and at Parks internal Proview which consists of designers, maintenance and operations folks. We will have drafts of the Geotechnical report and are still doing some monitoring on site. The draft report will be placed on line and a final report will be available in early fall after all the monitoring is complete. The report indicates that it's likely there's still groundwater flowing in the area the Hubbard family remembers the spring.
- Parks presented the project to the Washington Wildlife and Recreation, RCO division, as part of an application for a grant. The project ranked in the middle of the list and since funding is predicted to be tight this year, odds are the project won't receive grant money.
- SDOT agreed to partner with Parks on the street improvements along 3rd. Ave. NE and we're still pursuing that.
- SPU is still considering partnering with Parks but hasn't committed. We're contacting them regularly and haven't given up.

Project design update by Karen Janovsky, Mithun:

First, Karen recapped the comments from community meeting #3. This information is documented in the summary report prepared by Mithun which can be found on the Parks website.

Second, Karen reviewed the comments presented at the design commission and at the Parks Proview meeting. The full design commission meeting minutes can be found on their website. Here are some general comments. Note that there was a lot of consistency between the design commission comments and Proview.

- complete the pathways if possible or at least a loop
- complete as much earthwork as possible so there's less disturbance in a later phase
- allow for police and maintenance access in phase one
- allow for 'eyes on the park' and defensible space; speak with SPD
- there was a lot of support for Haddad/Drugan's vision
- supported partnering with other departments

Third, Karen reviewed some of the latest ideas from the artists. She noted that one new idea has arisen since the community meeting. They are considering a gateway element at 112th & 5th which may include pedestrian lighting. This feature is currently just an idea and doesn't have a form.

Last, we are pursuing a very sustainable design.

Schedule and next steps:

Parks has proposed a budget which is being reviewed by the mayor. Once the mayor reviews the entire city's budget, he will present his recommendations to City Council. In mid-November the Council will put forth budget decisions for the 2009 fiscal year. If funding for the park is secured, we will move forward diligently with the goal of starting construction after the final acquisition in April 2009. It's a fast time line considering the need for permitting.

Group Discussion:

- Construction prices will vary due the ever changing economy
- Paul Fischburg met with Chuck Dolan and had a few comments Chuck wanted to share. Paul noted that the budget situation this year is going to include cuts. Chuck stated facts about budgets at other government levels and our need to be prepared to work with less than we may hope for.
- There was a long discussion on how the grading worked along 112th regarding slope, fill, wall condition and ADA compliance. Phase one will most likely not touch the wall.
- Crushed gravel for walking path?
- There was a discussion regarding the geotechnical conditions of the site and the drainage that exists.
- Sue Geving spoke to Sally Clark to tell her she was disappointed with the direction the park is taking. Sue feels the park isn't active enough and that it doesn't meet the 1993 Comprehensive Plan requirements. There was a lot of good discussion back and forth; however, this discussion had already occurred at an earlier meeting. The current design process takes the current situation into consideration and addresses the current needs based on the most recent understanding of development. The design is also perceived as being active by many but not inclusive of programmed sports. It was noted that the PAT is not in agreement with Sue and that she is the only one with the perception she presents.

Everyone was thanked for their participation. Project updates will be posted on the web.