

BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
MEETING MINUTES

July 25, 2002

Present:

Kate Pflaumer
Susan Golub
Sarah Neilson
Kathleen Warren

Excused:

Bruce Bentley
James Fearn, Jr.
O. Yale Lewis, Jr.

Staff:

Ken Bounds, Parks Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

Acting Chair Susan Golub called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Kate moved that the agenda consent items, minutes of the July 11 meeting, the acknowledgment of correspondence, and three revocable use permits (for Volunteer Park and Beacon Hill Playground, Myrtle Edwards Park, and Leschi - Lake Dell Natural Area) be approved. Sarah seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Oral Requests and Communications from the Audience:

Susan 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.

Cheasty Boulevard Briefing:

David Goldberg, Park Project Planner, came before the Board to give a verbal briefing on the Cheasty Boulevard Draft Concept Plan. He described the draft plan and issues that Parks staff, the community Project Advisory Team (PAT), and consultant J.A. Brennan Associates are working to resolve. Board members also received a written briefing. David displayed a diagram of the Boulevard and pointed out project areas. The Boulevard was originally laid out as part of the Olmsted boulevard system. It is 1.3 miles long and located near Jefferson Park, between Beacon Ave and Rainier Ave S and Martin Luther King Way. Unlike other boulevards in Seattle, Cheasty has not had an improvement plan since the turn of the century. In 1996 two neighborhood planning groups recommended a soft surface pathway on the Boulevard. During that time period, Parks Department began

discussions regarding encroachment on Parks property and, in 1996, developed a series of policies on non-park usage of Parks land. The Boulevard is Parks property that happens to have a street running across it. The project is being coordinated with Sound Transit's design of the nearby McClellan light rail station. Parks proposed to spend \$1 million of the Pro Parks levy funds to improve Cheasty Boulevard. The main issues that Parks staff, the Project Advisory Team, and consultant J.A. Brennan Associates are encroachment, drainage, illegal activities, and light rail.

Project Scope

This project includes planning, design and construction phases. It is funded through \$1.0 million in Pro Parks funds and a small grant from the Department of Neighborhoods. Parks has worked with a Project Advisory Team (PAT) and consultant (J.A. Brennan Assoc.) over the past nine months to develop a Draft Conceptual Plan for enhancement and preservation of Cheasty Boulevard. The project is also being coordinated with Sound Transit's design of the McClellan light rail station. Parks and Recreation has begun restoration of Cheasty Boulevard in accordance with The Policy on Non-Parks Uses of City Park Lands (City Council Resolution #29457, Oct. 1996). This resolution directs that City-owned park land be available for public use and enjoyment. The Draft Concept Plan addresses a wide range of issues from drainage and slope stabilization, to amenities, security, and aesthetics. The final Boulevard Plan will be completed fall of 2002. High priority improvements will be implemented as the budget allows. Restoration of the Boulevard will be guided by the Boulevard Plan.

Parks Board Action Requested

Review Draft Conceptual Plan. This early review focuses on the vision and community issues concerning the Draft Conceptual Plan for improvements to Cheasty Boulevard. The Draft Conceptual Plan was reviewed at a workshop on June 13, 2002. The Draft Final Plan will be presented at a workshop at the end of summer 2002. A public hearing before the Park Board is planned for September or October 2002 and, if the plan is approved, construction will begin in summer 2003.

Vision and Draft Concept Plan

Draft Vision Statement

Cheasty Boulevard should be a quiet, calm, and scenic historic parkway within an informal natural landscape and residential neighborhood. It should be identifiable as a public space and element of the Olmsted Boulevard system. The Boulevard should be a gracefully flowing parkway, with slow traffic, which invites safe recreational enjoyment such as walking, biking, wildlife viewing, and educational walks. New plantings should harmonize with the existing wild growths, to create a healthy ecosystem that supports wildlife, while creating continuity through the planting of boulevard trees. The Boulevard design should be compatible with the residential properties adjacent to the boulevard. Natural drainage courses and ditches should be enhanced to improve control of stormwater, enhance habitat value, to provide possible scenic and education experiences, and to protect adjacent properties. Infrastructure within the corridor should be unobtrusive but functional.

Draft Concept Plan

The following nine items highlight proposed improvements and issues that Parks staff are working to resolve:

1. **Pedestrian Circulation:** There is currently an informal path along portions of the boulevard, but it is not a safe walkway. Both the North Beacon Hill and North Rainier neighborhood plans recommended construction of a soft-surface walkway along the boulevard. The North Beacon Hill plan recommendation to build a trail around Jefferson Golf Course is currently being implemented and would connect with the Cheasty walkway.

Proposal: Construct a soft surface walkway alternating on either side of the Boulevard. Municipal Golf has agreed to move portions of the fence along the south edge of Jefferson Golf Course to better accommodate the trail.

- Create a trail along the Boulevard, alternating sides
- Install retaining walls as required
- Extend Hanford Stairway across Cheasty to 27th Ave
- Add potential community connection trails and overlooks as funding allows and safety concerns are met

Issues: Most of the general community supports this proposal, however, there are several residents on Cheasty Boulevard who do not. There is significant concern from the residents about connections to surrounding areas.

2. **Drainage:** There are numerous drainage problems and several unstable slopes in the Cheasty Green Space and Boulevard area. Drainage is currently handled by a system of drainage ditches.

Proposal: The project planner and consultant are recommending corrective measures for only those situations that create problems for the Boulevard and associated improvements for the adjacent residences.

- Enhance drainage swales and create landscaped detention ponds
- Create a wetland pond for storm water and seep storage

Issues: Many residents strongly believe that the proposed priorities do not go far enough. The consultant is continuing to work with the PAT to identify specific problems with the proposal. Fully addressing all potential concerns would likely consume the entire budget.

Kate asked if there would be more runoff due to the project plan. David answered that there will be some more impervious surface created by the proposed soft-surface paths. The proposed grass-lined swales will be used to slow down the water and some additional small detention ponds will handle the additional runoff. There are larger drainage problems relating to run-off from the wet hillside. It is expected that the planned drainage improvements for the Boulevard will do a better job of handling the drainage.

3. **Landscape character:** There is a mix of landscapes that range from wild areas to residential ones with shrubs and ornamental plantings that are not in keeping with Boulevard Policies. There are also considerable areas where invasive plants impact the health of the Boulevard's green space.

Proposal: The plan proposes a series of landscape character designations within an overall natural theme appropriate to the context.

- Add informal landscaping to fill in gaps primarily on the west side of the Boulevard, with a large variety of primarily native trees and shrubs, using a mixture of flowering, evergreen, and deciduous trees
- Transition landscaping is made adjacent to residences moving from ornamental plantings to more native plantings
- Use a row of street trees, comprised of a variety of species and add native shrubs where possible

Issues: There is strong support for aggressive maintenance of boulevard and greenspace areas.

4. **Traffic calming:** Cheasty Boulevard is an attractive route for through-traffic with several straight sections where residents have observed excessive speeds. The proposed walkway will cross the boulevard at two locations.

Proposal: The plan proposes to install unobtrusive but effective traffic calming and pedestrian safety measures.

- Add street trees which help slow speed of drivers
- Textured and/or raised crossings and curb bulbs to facilitate safe pedestrian crossing and to slow traffic along straight-aways. The design will be subtle and effective
- Add traffic calming with a potential traffic island or stop sign at South Della St.

Issues: There is general agreement that traffic calming is needed and it is hoped that an agreement can be reached with SDOT on the design.

5. **Hardscape elements:** Cheasty Boulevard is currently not identifiable as a park and component of the Seattle Olmsted Boulevard system. The existing character is very natural and informal.

Proposal: Install physical elements that identify and unify the Boulevard without imposing an overly formal design.

- Accent both ends of Cheasty with stone gravel markers
- Install rustic/plain bollards along the east side of the roadway
- Maintain current spacing and light intensity, but install rustic/historic character light poles
- Consider a limited number of interpretive signs

Issues: No significant community issues. Planning and Development is considering working with Seattle City Light to develop a system-wide Olmsted street light specification.

6. **On-street parking:** There is currently informal and illegal parking along the Boulevard. On-street parking is used by residents but is also used in some areas by people stopping and engaging in illegal activities.

Proposal: Generally prohibit parking to deter illegal activities, to protect landscape improvements, and to remove encroachments

- Establish small designated parking areas in the north and south ends of the Boulevard to provide parking for Boulevard visitors and residents

Issues: There are differing opinions on parking. PAT members have suggested that the spaces be limited to use by residents.

7. **Maintenance:**

Proposal:

- The consultant is recommending "new" swale technologies that have been used by Seattle Public Utilities. These require non-standard maintenance techniques, but are designed to require less maintenance overall.
- Bollards and street trees will be added to discourage dumping.
- The plan will consider devoting a portion of the funds to initiate a landscape restoration/ivy removal partnership, which would require a Parks/community partnership.
- The plan will also identify opportunities for partnerships including Earth Corp. and Friends of Cheasty Boulevard.
- Some ongoing maintenance funding has been identified with the Pro Parks Levy

Issues: The community has high expectations for Parks' maintenance. This will be especially problematic in Boulevard areas that residents have maintained as private yards. The area is also natural and characterized by dense vegetation, steep slopes, and wet areas that are difficult to maintain using traditional techniques.

8. **Restoration of non-park uses:** Parks and Recreation has begun the restoration of Cheasty Boulevard in accordance with The Policy on Non-Parks Uses of City Park Lands (City Council Resolution #29475, October 1996). This resolution directs that City-owned park land be available for public use and enjoyment.

Proposal:

- The Boulevard plan identifies improvements and the desired character of the various sections of Cheasty. This will guide restoration.
- Property markers will be installed at key locations to clearly mark Park's property.
- No restoration actions will be taken by Parks or required of park neighbors until the planning process is complete.

Issues: This is a key issue that affects a number of people. An ongoing effort will be needed to resolve encroachments.

9. **Winthrop/Sound Transit's McClellan Station:** Sound Transit is required to improve the Winthrop portion of Cheasty Boulevard.

Proposals: The design for this portion of the Boulevard will reflect the design of Mount Baker Boulevard in order to be compatible with the area's urban character and to provide a connection to that segment of the Olmsted system.

- Parks has general agreement with SDOT on the configuration of Winthrop, but is working to resolve details. The design will incorporate a median, sidewalks, lighting, and substantial landscaped areas.
- Parks is also working with property owners, including the UW, to address access that is in conformance with the Boulevard Guidelines.
 - UW will be requesting a Revocable Use Permit for its access at the Park Board's August 22 meeting.

Issues: Reaching agreement with Seattle Transportation on a street design that fits with the Boulevard character has been difficult.

The Board asked if nearby property owners have been notified of encroachments on to Parks land. David answered that 20-30 homeowners were notified one-and-one-half years ago.

Ken said that a few years ago the Queen Anne Boulevard came before the Board after Parks had adopted its encroachment policy. There was a great deal of controversy that had to be dealt with, property by property. A positive aspect of the Cheasty Boulevard plan is that the property owners whose front yards are encroaching on the park are engaged in the current redevelopment plan that will stress the linear feel of the Boulevard. He believes David is doing a good job in involving the community and that this project will not have the amount of controversy that the Queen Anne Boulevard redevelopment did. David will come back before the Board with the final plan in September/October 2002.

Jefferson Park Site Plan Discussion/Recommendation:

Don Bullard, Parks Project Manager, briefed the Board on the Jefferson Site Park Plan at its July 11 meeting. A public hearing followed the briefing.

Don came before the Board at this meeting to ask for a recommendation on the site plan. The Board asked about the proposed parking lots. Don pointed out several small parking lots, which were designed to spread the parking out into several areas, rather than into one big area.

Kathleen moved that the Board approve the Jefferson Park Site Plan as presented. Kate seconded the motion. Discussion: Susan commended the citizens and Parks staff for their hard work on this project. She recollected that when she and Kathleen went to Jefferson Park several years ago there was lots of controversy related to the future of the park. She said that the plan shows a wonderful approach to the site that will be a great asset to the neighborhood.

Kathleen said she appreciates the need for soccer fields in Jefferson Park. With passage of the Joint Athletic Field Development Plan, help is on the way for neighborhoods like Beacon Hill, which need more fields. She believes that every regional park should include open spaces and these are very limited at Jefferson. She noted that most of Jefferson Park is dedicated to golf, so she believes it is appropriate for the site plan to include some open space in the form of meadows. Kathleen expressed interest in ensuring that Jefferson Field is shared by Samoan Cricket and other field sports and she thanked those who have worked hard for the past four years on this plan. **The vote was taken and approved unanimously.**

Sand Point Magnuson Park Project Briefing/Public Hearing:

Eric Friedli, Sand Point Magnuson Park Director, came before the Board to give a verbal briefing on the park's Drainage, Wetland/Habitat Complex and Sports Fields/Courts Project. The Board also received a written briefing (included in these minutes.) Since January 2002, Parks staff issued a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), received and reviewed comments from the public, various agencies and organizations, and on July 12, published the Final EIS (FEIS).

Jeff Girvin, of The Berger Partnership (lead consulting firm for the project team), and Eric presented drawings of the preferred plan from the FEIS and described the planning process to date. Jeff discussed how the drainage systems and sports fields were synergistic elements. In this case, the wetlands will provide soil for raising the height of the sports fields, and the sports fields will provide storm water to the wetlands. Jeff also described the wetland habitat areas, how the bioswale system will drain water from the athletic fields, and that the wetlands will contain seasonal wetland areas, open water wetlands, beaches, bunker ponds, and an 8' deep lagoon. Within the project area there will be three restrooms, with the current sports meadow restroom remaining as it is. He described circulation through the park, including pedestrian pathways, a bike lane, perimeter trail, interior trails, and automobile circulation. There will be five parking areas (including three new ones) to accommodate 1,000 vehicles.

Work on this project will be done in five phases: 1.) redevelopment of the existing sportsfields; 2.) five athletic fields and the southern area of the wetlands; 3.) the ponds and eastern side of the wetlands; 4.) the southern athletic fields; and 5.) the existing parking lots and vegetation. Sustainable construction techniques will be used in the overall development.

Kate asked if the sports meadows (existing sports fields in the northern part of the project area) could be pesticide free? Jeff answered that it is a possibility - it will depend on the management policy that is developed. Kate also asked Jeff to point out the off-leash area (located along the northern boundary of the project area). Sarah asked if the off-leash area will be fenced and Jeff confirmed that it would.

General Project Background

This project is focused on the development of an athletic field complex and the wetland/habitat complex at Sand Point Magnuson Park. It does not include other elements of development at the park. The primary components of the proposal include the development of a 65-acre wetland/habitat complex and the development of a 15-field athletic complex (11 lit fields with synthetic surfaces and 4 unlit with natural grass) on 37 acres. In addition, the project includes trails, restrooms, an education pavilion, lawns, and parking on a total of 153 acres (compared with total park area at 320 acres). This plan is the result of a multi-year public planning process. Since June 2001, the Department has held a public forum on the wetland design, focus group meetings with the wetland proponents and athletic field proponents, four public meetings, a public hearing, a design workshop, and monthly project advisory team meetings. This is in addition to many presentations to individual community councils and groups.

A design team, led by The Berger Partnership, has been working for over a year to develop the detailed schematic design and to prepare the environmental analysis for this project. This design was developed consistent with the guidance outlined in City Council Resolutions 30063 (November 1999) and 30293 (April 2001) which approved and amended an overall concept design for all of Sand Point Magnuson Park. Those resolutions were the result of lengthy public processes. This project is one component of the overall Sand Point Magnuson Park development.

Next Steps

The Final EIS on this project was published on July 12. Following this briefing, the Park Board is scheduled to make a recommendation at its August 22 meeting. The schedule beyond that is dependent on whether adequacy of the FEIS is appealed by local groups or citizens. As prescribed in the rules for the City Hearing Examiner, citizens have up to 15 days to submit an appeal. This period started on the day after the FEIS was issued and will end on July 29. If there were an appeal, the Hearing Examiner would set a hearing date in the fall. The City Council would not take any action prior to any appeals being resolved.

Once any appeals have been resolved, Parks staff anticipate asking the City Council to reaffirm its commitment to the proposal. Specifically, the City Council has to waive or modify land use code development standards for the installation of light poles and fixtures. This is the same process Parks has undertaken at other fields such as Genesee and Lower Woodland. The Department would anticipate beginning that Council process soon after the FEIS process is complete - this fall if there are no appeals or spring 2003 if there are appeals.

Key Issues

The primary issues that have been raised concerning this project are related to the development of the athletic complex. Lights, noise, and traffic are the main concerns with the athletic field development.

Lighting

The proposal calls for 11 fields to be lit. There would be a total of 80 light poles with 640 luminaries spread over 22 acres. There would be 488 full cutoff luminaries on nine soccer, rugby, and little league fields and 152 shielded conventional luminaries on the two full-size baseball diamonds. This would provide level 4 lighting - the lowest level for safe recreational play - on all fields. People have expressed concern over the light glare on their homes and on the habitat areas. The project team environmental consultants have not found a scientific basis for claims that the lights will have a significant negative impact on the habitat areas.

There will be impacts from the lights on residential areas west and south of the Park. The most intense impacts will be on the transitional homeless housing located on the Sand Point campus. The View Ridge Community Council has formed a group to review the proposal with specific attention to the lights. The Sand Point Community Housing Association has also been active over the past several months by meeting with Department staff, City Council members, and Mayor's staff to provide comments concerning the lights. Generally, the same people that are concerned about the lights are also concerned about noise and traffic.

In the development of other lit athletic fields, such as at Genesee and Lower Woodland, the Department of Construction and Land Use (DCLU) has concluded that, with the appropriate mitigation measures there would not be significant environmental impacts caused by the field lighting. The environmental analysis concludes that, without mitigation, there could be significant impacts from the lights on some of the on-site residences. The primary mitigation measures suggested in the FEIS include using advanced technology lighting systems and altering the hours of operation. The proposal analyzed in the FEIS considers the lights being on until 11:00 p.m.

Noise

The FEIS also concludes that, without mitigation, there is a potential for significant noise impacts on some of the on-site residences. Noise is really an outgrowth of having lights as it allows play to continue into the evening hours. The FEIS presents extensive modeling of noise and it concludes that the baseball fields and the proximity of the dugouts to the close-by residents are the potential problem area. It is noted that View Ridge neighbors currently hear noise from the use of the existing fields and this will continue. The analysis indicates that the background neighborhood noise from traffic, airplanes, and other neighborhood sources have the same or higher decibel levels as the athletic fields will.

The mitigation measures proposed for this project include monitoring noise levels, changing the orientation of some of the fields to move the noise sources farther away from the residences, and limiting the hours of operation.

Traffic

The FEIS concludes that there will not be significant impacts on traffic. The standard traffic measurements are for the p.m. peak hour. The FEIS shows that the use of the fields will be spread over a several-hour period of time and that traffic levels would increase without this project due to general urban growth.

After the briefing, 54 citizens gave 2 hours and 20 minutes of oral testimony. Names and a very abbreviated re-cap of their statements follow:

Matt Parkinson: soccer player - spoke in favor of the plan

Aaron Kinion: soccer player - favors lighted fields with a compromise of turning lights off at 9:00 pm

Joel Molder: soccer player - supports the Joint Athletic Field Development Plan (JAFDP); appreciates the synthetic fields

Diana Russell: park neighbor - appalled with amount of lighting during the recent lighting demonstration (October, November 2001); too many lights and unfair to park neighbors

Sally Cope: park neighbor - wants fewer fields, lights turned off earlier

Fletcher Shives: park neighbor - incorrect information was mailed out by the Parks Department; park neighbors don't support this plan; more fields are needed, but balance with needs of neighborhoods

Lauren Braden: Seattle Audubon Society - plan is unbalanced and will adversely affect wildlife

Marilyn Sandall: Seattle Audubon Society/park neighbor - balance sports fields and sports use; add monitoring; turn lights off earlier

Janice Bragg: Seattle Audubon Society - voiced a list of her oppositions

Jean Alexander: park neighbor (View Ridge) - urged compromise in the plan

Derek Goldniga: soccer player/coach - supports 11 fields; use more softball fields for soccer (mixed-use fields); cited Summit K-12 Playfield #1 as a good example)

Gordon Ruh: park neighbor (View Ridge) - re-evaluate the plan and compromise

Susan Libonati: University of Washington botanist - too many fields, too many lights turned on too late; nearby area is bowl-shaped and the noise and light glare will travel further than in a flat area

Kathy Beahn: Maple Leaf resident/soccer player - not enough soccer fields so soccer players have no choice except to play late games; adults want to have fields to play on

Marty Ehlers: CO-REC soccer - Seattle has 8 lighted soccer fields, and 27 lighted baseball fields which is an inequity; do more to bring balanced # of fields for these sports; she supports the plan

Vicki Schoettle: park neighbor - has voted for tax increases for 20 years to improve Seattle, but feels organized sports teams are controlling this plan and affecting park neighbors' quality of life; she will think long and hard about supporting another Parks levy

Lynn Ferguson: 25 year park neighbor and Pro Parks Committee member - sees two obstacles of excessive lighting near wetlands and an unbalanced development plan; urged balance in the plan between sports fields, wetlands, and shoreline

Susan Mesenbrink: park neighbor - urged a compromise on the plan with full cutoff lighted fixture and shielded lighting fixtures wherever possible; why is Parks allowing the maximum levels of lighting, rather than the minimum?

Alexander Stevens: park neighbor/retired physician - supports sports but is very concerned with the effects of the 11 lighted fields on people living in transitional housing in Magnuson Park; urged compromise

Peter Dahl: park neighbor - opposes the plan as it does nothing for children, everything for adults, and the neighbors are the ones who will pay; will cause glare, traffic, noise, and diminish the wetlands

Lane Gerber: park neighbor - consider the massive impact the lights will have on park neighbors; curtains/drapes won't block out the light and closed doors won't keep out the noise; urged a more moderate plan

Mark Bishop: CO-REC soccer assistant manager - explained soccer scheduling procedures; due to lack of fields 3,000 soccer games played outside of Seattle last year by Seattle teams; soccer players deserve to play in Seattle, same as the softball teams

Jim Beckley: soccer player - urged the Board to accept the plan as presented

Robert Kirby: supports soccer but is against for-profit use of the fields; suggested that the for-profit soccer teams rent fields from Seattle School District or build their own fields; asked Park Board to take no action on this plan and that an alternative be developed

Bob Lucas: park neighbor/past president of View Ridge Community Council - plan will have serious lighting, noise, and traffic impacts on the neighbors; consider effects on transitional housing; consider getting rid of softball/baseball fields for soccer fields

Curtis Fukushima: Seattle Little League treasurer - supports lighting and synthetic turf on all 11 fields; dirt and grass fields are unusable during rainy weather; during soccer season there aren't enough fields to play on and not enough fields for practices

Terry Holme: Seattle Youth Soccer Association (SYSA) - commends Parks Department and citizen efforts to get to where they are in the plan; Sand Point has been environmentally impacted by previous uses; SYSA endorses the plan and think it is balanced

Al Skaar: park neighbor - appreciates that sports are important, but peace and quiet are also aspects of a healthy life to recover from urban lifestyle; moderate this plan with fewer fields, reflective lights, and lights turned off by 9:00 pm

Eric Ogden: lives across ridge from park - sports enthusiast; don't let pro-sports groups influence conversion of Magnuson Park to a sports complex; park neighbors will be more impacted than sports teams who don't have fields to play on

Stanley Fields: View Ridge resident - one neighborhood shouldn't bear the burden of this complex; urged compromise to turn lighting off at 9:00 pm and keep the night sky dark

Tom Kelly: volunteered hundreds of hours at Magnuson Park; FEIS is misleading; not enough commitment in the plan to reduce/minimize the night glow from lights; use non-reflective field surfaces; have fairness in the plan so park users pay their own way and don't trespass on others

Mike Petrie: park neighbor/soccer player - urged a compromise; why not 8 fields and turn the lights off at 9:00 pm; it isn't right that Seattle teams to have to drive to Tukwila to play soccer; don't let this plan be a comedy of errors

George Carlin: Northeast Little League (NELL) board member - NELL is in favor of the plan; not enough fields in northeast Seattle area; had to take kids to Everett to play; important to have enough fields for kids to play on; sometimes have to accept things in your neighborhood that you don't want

Acquilla Cranshaw: lives in transitional housing in the Park - her son has seizures, which can be triggered by bright lights; traffic and noise dangerous for children; requested compromise on number of lights

Erika Ferrari: Friends of Youth member - concerned with safety for children who live in transitional housing, due to increased traffic; concerned with affects lights have on residents who are prone to seizures and are adversely affected by bright lights

Bob Rench: Director, Sand Point Community Housing Association, read letter from a resident of Building 224 (Sand Point Magnuson transitional housing); noise and lighting could trigger seizures in the resident; thinks traffic and lighting will cause adverse conditions; urged that alternatives be developed

Bruce Firestone: park neighbor - asked Board to search its conscience and do what's right for the Park; when he voted for ProParks he envisioned the green park described by

Parks project manager, but due to lights and noise it won't look like the description; do more research

Renee Barton: has been researching affects of lighting for several years; lights and wildlife don't mix; neither of the light styles can prevent night glow; restrict lights

Cor Van Niel: park neighbor (View Ridge resident)/sports enthusiast - concerned about the impact on the environment and impact of lights; compromise

Marina Skumanich: Seattle Audubon Society - lives in Wedgwood and isn't affected but is sympathetic to neighbors; soccer players should play more of their games on weekends when fields are often empty; plan is imbalanced and impacts wildlife

Bernadette Noonan: 27-year volunteer in Washington State Women's Soccer Association - previously lived on Capitol Hill which was the "dumping ground" for what other neighborhoods didn't want, then it became the South End, now it is the North End's turn to take community facilities; urged go ahead with the plan

Susanne Keller: 28-year park neighbor - concerned with lights and number of fields; learned even more tonight to object to; wants a quiet area to walk in; neighbors already in airline flyway; she isn't concerned with adults who need to exercise after 9:00 pm

Judith Shepherd: lives in Ravenna area - appreciates the mix of passive and active uses of the park; choose action that will consider the water quality and aquatic habitat at the park

Gwen Arp: park neighbor - don't turn the neighborhood into a lighted sports complex; during the lighting demonstration it felt like car lights were shining directly into her windows; remember that Marymoor Park, unlike Magnuson, isn't in a residential neighborhood; protests the plan - too many fields and lights on too late; scale back lights and reduce hours lights are on

Richard Elgin: University of Washington biologist; Seattle's native birds and mature tree canopy are already in decline; difficult to have wetland mitigation; rock concerts wouldn't be allowed in a wildlife area, but soccer is; don't light all the fields and don't put in all synthetic fields

Robbie Morris: soccer enthusiast - realizes there are flaws in plan but more soccer fields are needed to accommodate all those who want to play; better utilize existing fields and build more fields

Denise Trabono: soccer supporter - is also hearing neighbors' concerns; there is an inequity of baseball/soccer facilities - do a 50/50 split to put fields to better use and make some of the fields mixed use

Vance Thompson: former soccer coach/lives in Hawthorne Hills - neighborhoods didn't get anything in the DEIS; invited Parks staff to do a complete lighted field demonstration and invited the Board to stay with people in the neighborhood to witness the lights' effects; wants a compromise plan

Mark Perkins: soccer coach - supports plan but asked that lights be turned off earlier to lessen impact on neighbors

Janet Way: Thornton Creek Legal Defense - greatest use of this park is passive, not sports-oriented; waste of money; there should be no net loss of wetlands in this plan; reject the plan

Benedict Dugger: soccer play - believes this is a good step in developing Sand Point Magnuson; implement sports fields complex while keeping impact down on people who live near the park

Adam Motzer: believes this is a good plan that could be adjusted to address concerns of neighbors; why aren't adults playing soccer on weekends when fields aren't full

Rob Foxcurran: believes this is a superb plan; adults need fields to play on

Peter Lucavich: urged Board to adopt and approve plan as presented; believes there has been incredible representation from the community; transitional housing's former board approved of the plan presented tonight

Testimony concluded. The Acting Chair thanked those who attended. Due to the length of the meeting, the Superintendent's Report and further business was cancelled. The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 pm.

APPROVED: _____ DATE _____
Bruce Bentley, Chair