

Meeting Notes

Lowman Beach Park Seawall Removal and Shoreline Restoration Public Meeting

February 28, 2019

6:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Location: The Kenney

Attendees: 46 individuals signed the sign-in sheet

Project Manager: David Graves, Strategic Advisor, Seattle Parks and Recreation

Design Team: Environmental Science Associates - Pablo Quiroga, Sona Greenberg, Paul Schlenger, and Spencer Easton

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Title: Lowman Beach Park Seawall Removal and Shoreline Restoration

Address: 7017 Beach Drive SW, 98136

Total Project Budget: \$1,320,000

Construction Budget: \$890,000

Planning: Q3 2016 – Q2 2018

Design: Q3 2018 – Q4 2019

Construction: Q3 2020

Scope: The Lowman Beach Park seawall is failing and needs to be removed. Seattle Parks and Recreation's goal is to remove the remaining seawall and continue the shoreline restoration work that began when the south half of the seawall failed in the mid-1990s. Seattle Parks and Recreation hired Environmental Science Associates as the design consultant, as a follow-up to the 2017 feasibility study, to continue the design process that began with the feasibility study. The design will take into consideration both the habitat benefits of the seawall removal and the coastal engineering ramifications of that seawall removal. Given the design constraints of the project, the existing tennis court will be removed. A remnant of Pelly Creek that currently flows under the seawall will be daylighted as part of the project. At this meeting the preliminary design was presented, and community input was gathered.

Meeting outline:

- Purpose of the Meeting
- Summary of the Project History
- Design Alternatives Evaluated
- Factors that Influence the Design
- Proposed Design
- Benefits
- Q&A

Questions, Concerns, and Input:

- Positive public response – “The way you have presented this is very convincing.”
- Saving the salmon – one commenter commended us for “making hard choices,” and another asked “why can’t we have both?” (meaning keep the tennis court as well). Project presents a unique opportunity to restore the beach and park, including tennis court, restroom, benches, and picnic tables.
- In daylighting creek, consider meandering further south so less steep slope and also consider daylighting further to east.
- How realistic is grass to beach vision? Commenter expects the beach to look like area to the south where large logs block that type of transition.
- Neighbors to the north worry about the erosion of their bulkheads. Would like to see more proof that it will not affect their houses. Commenter believes the erosion experienced by landowners to the north is because of the earlier park restoration in mid-1990s.
- Design adds more material to beach. Is that a one-time event for periodic replacement of material? What will beach look like in 10 years?
- Is there a budget for contingencies if beach changes after construction?
- Swing set – people asked, and we let them know that it was staying.
- ADA – there was concern about the gravel medium of the pathways.
- Park or treatment facility across the street should provide toilets for park users. It is a problem now for park users. People concerned that there are missing facilities in the park, such as bathrooms and places to sit and have gatherings.
- Tennis court – it hasn’t had maintenance since the 1950s, according to one neighbor. Commenter added that none of the areas tennis courts are maintained
- Relocating the tennis court – a few commenters liked the “win-win” strategy of building a new tennis court (and possibly pickleball?) in the SE corner of the park while enhancing environmental benefits. Once commenter added that 1.5 or 2 courts would be even more desirable.
- The tennis court group could be divided into two groups. One group is ok with removing the existing tennis court as long a new one is built or restored in the area. A smaller group had a sentimental attachment to the existing court/seawall and would like to keep it.
- More tennis court worries – one commenter felt like his preference for a tennis court was not being heard.
- Remnant pieces of the old tennis court in new park design – some commenters like this touch while one was offended by it.
- Neighborhood Matching Fund, a grant funding source by Seattle Department of Neighborhoods, may be a funding source for relocating tennis court.
- Commenter recommended redoing the 2016 questionnaire because not enough options were provided to indicate “no use” of the tennis court.
- Educational signs – one commenter would like to see educational/interpretive signage in/around the park explaining about wildlife and habitat (e.g. chinook, smelt, etc.)