



Dahl Playfield Skatepark  
Public Meeting #2  
Tuesday, July 21, 2009  
6:30 – 8:00 p.m. Dahl Field

**Attendees:**

Timothy Gallagher, Seattle Parks & Recreation Superintendent  
Kevin Stoops, Seattle Parks & Recreation Planning and Development Director  
Linda Hubert, Seattle Parks & Recreation Major Maintenance Manager  
Kelly Davidson, Seattle Parks & Recreation  
Karen O'Connor, Seattle Parks & Recreation  
56 Community Members

**Notes and summary**

Timothy Gallagher started off the meeting, thanked everyone for attending, acknowledged and apologized for the error in Parks process.

Kelly Davidson gave a brief summary of the project to date and explained the design changes generated in response to the priority concerns raised at the July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

**Primary Concerns:**

- Lack of communication and public input
  - On design and site change
  - General updates on project status
- New location
  - Too close to homes
  - Not visible from 25<sup>th</sup>
  - Encroaches on Green Space
- Size
  - Is not what was originally represented
  - Take up more space because of layout
- Generation of increased noise and crime

The revised design has been moved approximately 80 feet north and bent so that it fits more into the originally planned location next to the basketball court and North East of the comfort station. The revised design reduces the amount of space that encroaches into the green space, is further away from the wading pool, adjacent residences, and sits within the best line of sight for SPD.

The design revisions shown can be accomplished while keeping within the current project scope and allowing for the existing bid to move forward. Dramatic changes to the design will require funding for a re-design of the project including a new public process and internal design reviews.

**Comments and Questions:**

**Q.** Can we drop one ramp end down to three feet?

**A.** The current height of the ramps is safer for beginners because a skater does not have to navigate the top of the ramp. They can turn back into the park at any time or roll back down.

**Comment:** An objection was raised about the amount of park space the site takes up. The site is double the size of the site shown at the 2006 community meetings. Now the footprint is much larger – three times as large. Scale to old size. Design to full square footage of one basketball court.

**Reply:** A rectangular site would not allow for safe traffic flow. This change at this time would require a full re-design of the project.

**Q.** Can we keep one of the wings and the “knuckle” and eliminate the other wing?

**A.** This would change the scope of the project and reduce the skateability of the site.

**Comment:** The size of the skatespot has changed from the original plan, Borders with park started with 2500sq feet, Parks documents show 3600 sq feet. Overall footprint is too large.

**Reply:** When the design development was started again, the square footage was based on the original schematic design that was 3,948 sq ft. The design contract was to create a 4,000 sq ft site.

**Comment:** The 8/2005 process included a presentation to Parks Board. Visibility to street was essential. Guidelines: need site lines – moved from sight lines – says to community guidelines not important. The original site was a good space because of its visibility.

**Reply:** The revised design has been moved to be placed as much as possible in the original location that was agreed to have good visibility.

**Comment:** A space closer to street (25<sup>th</sup>) for small skatespot, would be a better location. Why can't we look at different spaces between the natural area and parking? This site was the priority in the first public meeting.

**Reply:** Moving to the street location would involve a full re-design of the project. A pros and cons list was generated with all of the sites including the location along 25<sup>th</sup>. At the end of the three public meetings in 2006, the location to the NE of the comfort station next to the basketball court was prioritized by the community as the best location.

**Q.** The Seattle Center skatepark in the parking area created problems – will those come here?

**A.** Seattle Center just opened a new larger skatepark. The old skatepark was removed because the property was purchased by the Gates Foundation.

**Comment:** Plantings in the natural/wetland area will eventually grow tall and affects line of sight. The shrubs will not allow for “pruning up” in order to keep sight lines open.

**Reply:** This will be an overall visibility issue with or without the skatespot. Parks will look into how this issue is being resolved at other parks with natural landscapes and committed to maintain the line of sight at this location.

**Comment:** The non-programmed open green space is very important and widely used by the community. Unstructured play area – beauty of this space – accommodates a lot of uses.

**Reply:** Site was moved further out of the green space in response to this comment from the previous meeting.

**Q.** Is the Ballard site smaller?

**A.** It is around 3000 sq ft – deep advanced bowl.

**Q.** Will all of the concrete be impervious?

**A.** Yes

**Q.** How are you dealing with ponding?

**A.** The site is flat and will drain to the back of the skatespot and into a grass swale that will feed into the other drainage on site.

**Q.** What will Parks do when it sinks?

**A.** We know that the site is on peat and the overall project is designed to settle as one so that it does not have sections that settle leaving un-even cracks.

**Q.** How do skateboarders access park? Will they come in through the play area where small kids are playing? This could be dangerous. Does Parks have other skateparks near children's play areas? Compatibility with playground – important issue – need some reassurance.

**A.** As part of the Citywide Skatepark Plan, numerous other skateparks were observed and most of them were at locations that had multiple uses for all ages. Overall these facilities functioned very well. Good examples – Woodinville, Shoreline, Ballard Corners

**Q.** Will video cameras be installed?

**A.** No

**Comment:** Appreciate re-design

**Q.** Is there more that can be done?

**A.** Further changes to the design will require a re-design that would need to be funded and would include a new public process, but Parks will look at other minor changes to address concerns.

**Q.** Are there perimeters or boundaries?

**A.** Site will be built just above grade a few inches and will not have borders on the edge where it meets the grass.

**Q.** How big is footprint of berm near basketball court ?

**A.** Bern will not take up too much space, may still need to make some minor adjustments to resolve new site.

**Q.** Will field be returned to status quo – repair any damage?

**A.** Yes, contractor is required to repair site condition.

**Comment:** The area between the ball fields and comfort station is a high traffic area with people walking back and forth to the restrooms. Will there be a path?

**Reply:** This is an excellent idea and Parks will look into creating a path over the berm.

**Q.** Can we pull in arms for less use of space – could do in a rectangular shape?

**A.** This would be a larger re-design costing additional funds.

**Q.** How big is Seattle Center?

**A.** 10,000 sq ft

**Comment:** There are parking problems already on 26<sup>th</sup>

**Comment:** Maybe Parks could relocate this design at another park so the funds are not lost.

**Q.** What is Parks prepared to do if there are problems?

**A.** Typically the users police themselves and create a community providing stewardship. SPAC helps with positive activities and interaction.

**Comment:** Leadership – need to see that design and leaders work together.

**Reply:** Parks has integrated projects and departments to provide better outcomes.

**Q.** How many skaters can use the space at one time?

**A.** 15-20 active users, skaters usually take turns so the capacity is higher and the use is safe. Seattle Center – 100 at a time

**Q.** The project is sited close to homes. What is noise report? What is noise study?

**A.** Noise report is available in the Citywide Skatepark Plan posted on the Parks web site.

**Q.** Is it ok to put it in bog? How much core testing was done? Are the site conditions going to create a safety issue in the future if it settles? Are we wasting money if it will not be usable because of the site conditions? How will the drainage work?

**A.** Core samples were taken and full geotechnical report was produced. The design consultants, landscape architects and Parks engineers have reviewed the plans. The project is designed to stay in one piece. Settling is inevitable, but it will settle as one and will not create lifted breaks that would be a safety hazard.

**Q.** Could we get tinted concrete?

**A.** This is not included in the current scope of work for this project, but Parks can investigate.

**Q.** Are the trees in the drawing going to be planted?

**A.** No, there is no budget for them.

**Q.** How will Parks respond to tagging?

**A.** Parks has maintenance staff that respond to tagging if it is called in. Please contact the department to notify them if you see tagging.

**Q.** Can Parks limit the hours of use? Concern that Ballard has 24 hour use.

**A.** The use would be the same hours of the park. Parks cannot enforce this at all times, SPD must be called by neighbors if there is illegal activity in Parks.

Parks will look at installing sensor lights right away since it has been raised that there is an existing issue of vandals and late night activity in the park.

**NEXT STEPS:**

Tim and Kevin will review the comments collected at this meeting. Tim responded that he is tempted to move forward with the revised design shown but that he will take a few days to contemplate the comments collected before making a final decision.

Parks stated they will work with the community to address the vandalism issues that are currently a problem at the park and to monitor the situation once the skatespot is operational.