



## MYRTLE RESERVOIR PARK DEVELOPMENT Public Process Overview January 2008

### **History of the Projects**

#### **Genesis of the Myrtle Reservoir project:**

- The Morgan Junction Neighborhood Plan recommended:
  - When the open reservoir at 35<sup>th</sup> Ave SW and SW Myrtle St. is covered, move the security fencing closer to the reservoir and create usable open space for family-oriented activities.
- Seattle Public Utilities is replacing its open reservoirs with underground structures that will improve quality and security of our water supply. The new water facility will be operational in early 2008, with final rough grading and grass seeding completed in spring of 2008. This sets the stage for park development.
- The CIP states,
  - Myrtle Reservoir - “This project, part of the 2000 Parks Levy, develops usable open space for family-oriented activities once the reservoir is lidded. The scope of work for this project will be developed through a community process, working within the budget identified below and other non-levy fund sources that become available. The project will be implemented in coordination with Seattle Public Utilities’ Reservoir Covering.”
- During the development of the Citywide Skatepark Plan, community members nominated the Myrtle Reservoir and High Point Playfield sites as a possible location for a district skatepark. See skate plan website:  
<http://www.seattle.gov/parks/projects/Skatepark.htm>
- Project Web Site <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/proparks/projects/myrtle.htm>

#### **Elements open/not open to public comment, and why:**

- Projects are governed by the City’s Land Use Code. As a City agency, Parks is required to follow the Code.
- Parks has many policies, design standards and technical specifications for construction that are in place to ensure safety and durability.
- SPU and Parks have an MOA concerning *Reservoir Burying Projects and Above Ground Recreational Improvements*. The MOA addresses concerns such as preventative measures designed to protect the City’s drinking water from contamination and criteria for the maximum loads on the reservoir lids. The MOA for Myrtle reservoir designates passive use. Additionally, playfields that would require fertilization to maintain turf and dogs off-leash areas would not be allowed on top of the reservoir.

- Public process conducted on the project to date:
  - Parks held a public meeting in March 2007 to develop project scope.
  - This is the second of four public meetings.
- Who Parks notified about the meeting and the sources of the list:
  - Parks sent meeting notification to carrier routes within ¼ mile from the project site.
  - Park posted a notice at the site.
  - Parks sent a press release to Seattle Time and Post Intelligencer, West Seattle Herald and other city newspapers.
  - Meetings are posted on the Project Web site.
- Milestone and decisions made to date, if any:
  - Design program approved June 2007. The following themes are to be considered in design;
    - Views – Nearly everyone supports developing public opportunity to use the reservoir lid as a viewpoint.
    - Green – Most expressed a strong desire to maximize the green space
    - Concern about a skateboard facility: many community members perceive that skateboard facilities generate excessive noise and result in increased criminal activity.
  - Consultant Nakano Associates hired. The Nakano design scope and budget do not include a skatepark but the design team has been directed to consider a skatepark element among other options in the overall site layout.

### ***Explanation of how decisions are made.***

- How Parks uses input from the public
  - Public input will be used to define the general design of the parks.
- What impact that input has on a project
  - Public input will be used to define the general design of the parks.
- How “majority” opinions will figure in decisions:
  - If a majority of meeting attendees indicates a preference, this may be used to define or confirm the design direction, subject to the following reviews.
  - In instances where a “majority” opinion conflicts with previous “majority” opinions, the conflict will be considered by Parks internal review committees that may include ProView or ProView Tech
  - In all cases, opinions are advisory to the Parks decision making process that includes internal technical review (ProView and ProView Tech) where Park policies, procedures and standards are considered.
  - Project designs will be reviewed by SPU to ensure adherence to the applicable design criteria.
  - Additionally, this project may be reviewed by the Seattle Design Commission that may provide project direction.
  - The Board of Park Commissioners may hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to the Parks Superintendent. The Parks Superintendent has the final decision on this project.

**Factors that may have an impact on the outcome, including:**

- Safety Issues – Safety issues are considered by the consultant, project manager and Parks technical review committees during design.
- Mayoral priorities – None known
- City Council Actions –No Council action is expected.
- Voter approval – Not Applicable
- The City of Seattle Citywide Skatepark Plan was adopted by City Council in June 2007. The plan considered and evaluated Highpoint Playfield and Myrtle Reservoir regarding suitability for a potential skate facility. Both sites were evaluated as having the capacity to accommodate a district or smaller sized facility. The Park Board's recommended that **"there would only be one facility sited between the two locations,"** conveying that two large district sized facilities would not be needed two blocks apart from each other. The Myrtle reservoir planning will consider if a district skatepark is desired and/or physically feasible. The planning process may also consider including a skatedots, which is generally not considered a “facility” and therefore would not conflict with locating a skatepark facility at Highpoint.
- Budget limitations – All costs for design, construction and project management must be paid from project funds. ProParks Levy provides \$1,068,000 for Myrtle Reservoir. Decisions on the scope of the project and materials may be limited by the budget.
- Regional need – Not Applicable

**Budget source, and amount, impact on project scope**

- Budget limitations – All costs for design, construction and project management must be paid from project funds. ProParks Levy provides \$1,068,000 for Myrtle Reservoir with a construction budget of \$673, 533. Decisions on the scope of the project and materials may be limited by the budget.

**Timelines: upcoming steps in the process, points at which Parks will invite comment**

- Parks will hold two more public meetings to present the final Schematic Park Plan and Design Development Drawings.
- The Board of Park Commissioners may hold a hearing to take public testimony on the design, in which case they will then make a recommendation to the Superintendent on how to proceed.
- Construction is expected to begin in late 2008-early 2009.

**After the public involvement process is over, Parks will make a decision and proceed to implement it.**