

**CITY OF BELLEVUE
PARKS & COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday
November 6, 2019
6:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-113
Bellevue, Washington

BOARDMEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Trescases, Vice-Chair Hamilton, Boardmembers Clark, Heath¹, Kumar, Synn², Unger

PARKS STAFF PRESENT: Shelley Brittingham, Nancy Harvey, Glenn Kost, Shelley McVein, Camron Parker, Scott Vander Hyden

OTHERS PRESENT: Ann Brashear, Julie Chopra, Heidi Dean, Ellen Henneman, Mary Ellen Hundley, Jeanie Marquardson, Warren Marquardson, Anna Newton, Susan Pappalardo, David Plummer, Jonathan Schmidt, John Southern, Michele Tower

MINUTES TAKER: Michelle Cash

1. **CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Trescases at 6:00 p.m.

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Motion by Boardmember Unger and second by Boardmember Clark to approve the meeting agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously (5-0).

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion by Boardmember Kumar and second by Boardmember Clark to approve the September 10, 2019 meeting minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously (5-0).

Motion by Boardmember Unger and second by Vice-Chair Hamilton to approve the October 8, 2019 Special Retreat meeting minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously (5-0).

¹ Arrived at 6:12 p.m.

² Arrived at 6:06 p.m.

4. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS/PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

David Plummer

14414 NE 14th Pl., Bellevue, WA

Mr. Plummer explained that the City's contractor is currently approaching completion of the Bellevue Aquatic Center Feasibility Study. Three aquatic facility options in varying size are being evaluated. Based upon the presentation given by the Parks Department to the City Council on October 21, 2019, the preliminary acquisition costs for the three options are \$70 million for Option 1; \$89 million for Option 2; and \$110 million for Option 3. In addition, the annual operating costs are respectively \$5 million, \$5.5 million, and \$6.4 million. Mr. Plummer noted that all three options will require annual subsidies of approximately \$1.3 million, \$1.1 million, and \$1.6 million. He added that neither the contractor nor the staff has provided life cycle cost estimates for the three options, but a rough life cycle cost estimate for Option 2 is \$341 million for a facility that has a 35-year economic life. Mr. Plummer distributed additional information on the cost estimates.

Mr. Plummer stated that staff has not yet released information on the financial plan for the facility, especially the plan and method of acquisition cost-recovery, perhaps as a component of user fees. He explained that this would be similar to the Utilities Department recovery of acquisition costs for the new water meter system in water and sewer rates.

Ellen Henneman

5635 118th Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA

Ms. Henneman encouraged Boardmembers to ensure that the needs of the Newport Hills community are addressed proportionally, when evaluating the park designs and developing the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park.

Jonathan Schmidt

4950 126th Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA

Mr. Schmidt feels that splitting the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park evenly between an off-leash area (OLA) and general use is a disservice and underserves the dog community who already has limited options for parks. Although the park is not an official dog park, it is used as such. Mr. Schmidt thinks that this speaks to the unmet need in Bellevue for more dog parks.

When evaluating designs for the park, Mr. Schmidt suggested that the agility equipment be carefully considered to determine if this is money well spent. He also encouraged Boardmembers to evaluate the general use area placement because the current proposal has less visibility and the area may not be utilized.

John Suthern

5761 110th Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA

Mr. Suthern requested that the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park include the 1.75 acre OLA that was originally discussed. Mr. Suthern called attention to the many housing

developments under construction, results in more people and dogs. He noted that the space will not be wasted if it is allocated to dogs and will be used year-round. If the OLA is too small, it will cause challenges amongst the dogs.

Michele Tower

6019 125th Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA

Ms. Tower called attention to the lack of OLAs in the community and encouraged Boardmembers to approve the proposed OLA at Newport Hills Neighborhood Park.

Julie Chopra

6325 125th Pl. SE, Bellevue, WA

Ms. Chopra favors the natural state at Newport Hills Neighborhood Park and encouraged Boardmembers to keep the park undeveloped/natural.

Jeanie Marquardson

11808 SE 49th Pl., Bellevue, WA

Ms. Marquardson explained that development of the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park is an opportunity to develop a community, not a dog park. She commended the City for their visions in developing other parks but feels that the non-dog owners are being ignored. Ms. Marquardson would like the entire community served by the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park, not just dog owners. She urged Boardmembers to consider broader use for the park for the community to gather and congregate in an open space.

Anna Newton

11628 SE 46th St., Bellevue, WA

Ms. Newton stressed that if the OLA at Newport Hills Neighborhood Park is too small, it will cause conflicts between the dogs.

Warren Marquardson

11898 SE 49th Pl, Bellevue, WA

Mr. Marquardson stated that the community was promised many items when Bellevue took over unincorporated King County (e.g., Bellevue Police services, less expensive utilities, and additional parks). The Newport Hills community is still waiting for less expensive utilities and additional parks. Mr. Marquardson would like a park with open space, grass, trees, and picnic tables that aren't secondary to dogs.

Heidi Dean

11661 SE 56th Street, Bellevue WA

Ms. Dean referenced an email she sent to the Parks Department on October 7, 2019. She also asked Boardmembers to honor the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park designation for the park as a 'neighborhood park.' The primary purpose of the park is to serve the recreational wants and needs of the neighborhood, not the community. Ms. Dean requested that the OLA be downsized to 1 acre in size to be reflected as an amenity, not a primary purpose of the park. She also asked that people amenities and community spaces be added back into the plans. Lastly, Ms. Dean requested that the play equipment be visible from the street and not hidden.

5. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS:**

No report.

6. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

Ms. McVein reported that the recruitment process for the Parks Director is currently underway. She also announced Glenn Kost's retirement and thanked him for his years of service. Boardmembers expressed their appreciation as well.

7. **BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:**

Boardmember Unger visited the following parks:

- Surrey Downs Park
- Crossroads Park

Boardmember Unger asked about the policy regarding closing park restrooms seasonally, having had the question asked of her in regard to Surrey Downs Park. Ms. McVein discussed the bathroom locking protocol for lower use parks during the winter season. She added that there are budgetary constraints for the restrooms as well.

Boardmember Clark visited the following parks:

- Downtown Park, including the area for the NE Gateway project
- McCormick Park
- Ashwood Park
- Newport Hills Neighborhood Park.

Boardmember Clark requested that signs be posted at Newport Hills Neighborhood Park reminding dog owners that dogs should be on a leash at all times.

Boardmember Synn and Vice-Chair Hamilton expressed their appreciation to Mr. Kost for the impact he has made in shaping Bellevue.

Boardmember Kumar has enjoyed many parks with her dog walking business.

Chair Trescases suggested that a porta-potty be considered at Surrey Downs Park. She also provided highlights from a recent trip she took to Dallas, Texas with the Bellevue Downtown Association. The trip included a visit to Clyde Warren Park to view the transformation the park has made for Dallas. The park has become a large economic engine for Dallas. Chair Trescases

explained that Dallas' Downtown Association maintains all of the parks in Dallas. It is a wonderful example of a public/private partnership.

8. **CHAIR COMMUNICATION & DISCUSSION:**

Reported above.

9. **BOARDMEMBER/COMMITTEE/LIAISON REPORTS:**

No reports.

10. **DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:**

A. **Newport Hills Neighborhood Park – Preferred Plan**

Mr. Kost reminded Boardmembers that at the September 10, 2019 Parks Board meeting, staff reviewed the site and project history, community outreach, and three alternative site plans presented at the July 23, 2019 public meeting, and the feedback received from that meeting. The proposed space allocations were compared for the off-leash area (OLA) and general park area to existing spaces within Bellevue's park system to demonstrate how these areas can achieve their intended purposes.

Mr. Kost summarized that the Board's comments generally favored the Alternative C option, though some felt that the smaller (1 acre) OLA was a more appropriate size for this park, expressing concern that a large OLA would become a destination park that would exceed the park's capacity, and that the common area would benefit with a larger space. Other Boardmembers supported Alternative C with the larger (1.6-1.75 acre) OLA. Mr. Kost added that the Board also commented at the last meeting that there was a perception from some in the neighborhood that the process, as well as the process conducted in 2011, did not reflect the views of the neighborhood. Staff noted that the outreach in 2011 was conducted by the Newport Hills Community Club, so the City could not verify the sources of that feedback. Staff also noted that while verifying online survey sources from the recent outreach effort was not possible, they assured the Board that the feedback received was representative of the neighborhood. A "heat map" was shown that demonstrated community attendance and feedback from the public meetings and concentration levels in the neighborhood of the feedback.

Based upon all of the feedback provided, Mr. Vander Hyden reviewed the preferred plan that was developed to reflect both the interests of the neighbors and concerns of the Parks Board. He clarified that approximately 75 percent of the park will remain natural open space with development limited to soft-surface trails and a ravine overlook. The remaining area will provide park visitors with a variety of recreation opportunities, including:

- Picnic shelter and landscaped lawn (approximately 1.5 acres)

- Adventure play area with hillside mound
- Fenced OLA with shelter, gated entries, water, kiosk, grass surface with drainage improvements and small dog area (approximately 1.5 acres)
- Loop trail systems and connections with overlooks
- Street frontage improvements and crosswalk
- Paved entry drive, parking, restroom and security lighting

Mr. Vander Hyden discussed the following next steps for the project timeline:

- City Council meeting – review Parks Board recommendation; request authority to proceed with design and construction
- Design and permitting (thru Spring 2020)
- Public bid (late Spring 2020)
- Construction (complete in 2020)

Boardmember Kumar would like to see restrooms open at the park year-round with a porta-potty considered for the off-season. She also asked if the adult exercise equipment will be included in the park designs. Mr. Kost explained that there wasn't a lot of interest for this equipment so it was removed from the list of park features. Boardmember Kumar requested clarification on when did the Parks Board approved the Off-Leash Study. Mr. Kost clarified that this was approved in 2010. Boardmember Kumar also asked if staff considered swapping the OLA with the general purpose area. Mr. Kost confirmed that this was considered but the proposed design was determined the better option.

Boardmember Hamilton stated that the Parks staff has done an amazing job of facilitating a robust process with all of the community outreach. Boardmember Hamilton is confident that the OLA should be included in the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park, particularly since the Newport Hills community has expressed support of this feature. In addition, the need for more OLAs was stressed 10 years ago in a study conducted by the City. Boardmember Hamilton added that currently, the city-wide demand is there but the supply is not.

Boardmember Hamilton recommends that the OLA be a feature of the park. A one-acre OLA at Newport Hills Neighborhood Park would represent almost 8 percent of the entire property or 30 percent of the developable park space. The OLA should be sized to meet the needs of the residents that are likely to use it.

Boardmember Hamilton noted that according to the 2010 OLA Study, it is best to have a minimum of 1 acre of space, when possible, and in some cases less than 1 acre is acceptable. Boardmember Hamilton explained that the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park is not a park for enthusiasts of any particular activity or for a certain type of park user. Including features such as an unstructured play area, common areas with picnic tables, a grass viewing/seating mound, a walking trail, adult exercise equipment, and an OLA will combine to make a wonderful, new park for the City and the Newport Hills neighborhood.

Based upon all of the feedback, Boardmember Clark is pleased that the final Newport Hills Neighborhood Park design elements did not decrease the OLA to 1 acre. Overall, Boardmember Clark supports the proposed plan. He also asked if it is feasible to keep the park open until later

in the evening, rather than dusk to dawn. Mr. Parker explained that there are City codes that dictate park operating hours. Mr. Kost noted that some parks include security lighting. There was also a brief discussion about the turf material and trash can placement proposed at the park.

Boardmember Synn asked if there is an easement along 116th. Mr. Vander Hyden clarified that the Bellevue School District has granted permission to renovate the existing connection. Boardmember Synn also asked if there is a set amount of space required for a dog to roam. Mr. Vander Hyden discussed some of the space requirements for dogs. Overall, Boardmember Synn expressed his support of the proposed plan.

Boardmember Heath does not want any trees removed during the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park development. He explained that the City routinely ignores the commitment and goal of tree canopy. He added that he does not condone the hypocrisy to increase tree canopy yet cut down trees. Boardmember Heath also called attention to the fence proposed in the park designs and some expressed objections. Mr. Vander Hyden clarified that the fence proposed at the top of the slope is a land use code requirement, which limits design options. Mr. Kost added that the loop trail is one of the most requested items at the park, which also requires the fence.

Boardmember Kumar asked if trees will be cut down during the park development. Mr. Vander Hyden clarified that there are some deteriorating trees that pose a safety risk, so these will be removed and replaced with additional trees.

Boardmember Heath expressed his appreciation for the process the City has undertaken to gain feedback about plans for the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park. He noted that there are many parks and open spaces being used illegally for OLAs. When people use a public facility illegally this creates an issue that divides the community. Boardmember Heath suggested that the Parks Board understand that the off-leash issues will not go away until the Parks Board realizes that the City is not following through with what the Parks Board recommended nine years ago. In addition, the City has chosen not to enforce the law in regards to OLAs. Boardmember Heath suggested that the Board identify the community needs and put forth a recommendation to City Council. He feels that the City has a lot of money that can be allocated for dog parks.

Chair Trescases expressed her full support of the proposed plan. She thinks it is important to have the option to open the OLA for a community event.

Boardmember Unger expressed her concern with Boardmember Heath's recommendation to identify community needs and then make a recommendation to City Council. Her understanding is that the Parks Board is supposed to take direction from City Council so she wants to make sure the proper process is followed.

Boardmember Kumar would like a pilot project conducted at the Newport Hills Neighborhood Park OLA to provide compostable bags and compost the dog waste.

Motion by Boardmember Clark and second by Boardmember Synn to approve and recommend to City Council the preferred park plan for Newport Hills Neighborhood Park as presented.

Vice-Chair Hamilton suggested that the OLA be no larger than 1 acre and staff can determine if a small dog area should be included. Boardmember Clark did not want to modify his motion, since he prefers the proposal as presented. Boardmember Unger suggested that the OLA be downsized to 1.4 acres. Mr. Vander Hyden clarified that the proposed OLA size may slightly vary due to permitting and topography. The park could be slightly under 1.5 acres or slightly above.

Motion by Vice-Chair Hamilton and second by Boardmember Heath to amend the main motion and change the proposed OLA at Newport Hills Neighborhood Park to no larger than 1 acre.

Based upon Boardmember Clark's observations at other dog parks, he does not support the recommendation to downsize the proposed OLA, since he feels this would be too small.

Boardmember Heath expressed his support of the proposed amendment. He would also like to recommend that another five acres be identified for a dog park in the next three years.

Boardmember Unger expressed her disapproval of the recommended amendment because she does not feel this is in alignment with the community feedback. Chair Trescases and Boardmember Synn were in agreement that they would like to keep the recommendation as proposed, without the amendment.

At the question, the amendment to the main motion failed (2-5).

At the question, motion carried unanimously (7-0) to approve the preferred park plan for Newport Hills Neighborhood Park as presented.

Motion by Boardmember Heath and second by Boardmember Clark to add a discussion item to the January 14, 2020 Parks Board meeting agenda revisiting the 2010 Off-Leash Area Recommendation to Council.

Chair Trescases noted that there is an overall work plan for agenda topics that need to be taken into consideration. Although she feels additional discussion about OLAs is important, she does not support the motion. Boardmember Unger agreed. Vice-Chair Hamilton agreed that the OLA should be discussed in further detail but does not agree with the January time constraint.

At the question, motion failed (1-6) to add a discussion item about the OLA plans to the January 14, 2020 Parks Board meeting agenda.

Boardmembers were in general agreement that a future Parks Board agenda item should include a discussion about the OLA plans for Bellevue.

B. Aquatic Center Feasibility Study

Motion by Boardmember Unger and second by Vice-Chair Hamilton to extend the meeting until 9:00 p.m. Motion carried (6-1).

Mr. Kost said that Bellevue's current aquatic center (Odlle Pool) is approximately 50 years old. Following the 2009 feasibility study, the City Council expressed support for the regional aquatic facility presented as Option D. In 2018, the Council funded an update to the 2009 study and identified a regional aquatic center as a priority in its 2018-2020 Council Vision. Mr. Kost noted that King County is conducting its own study to consider the creation of a regional aquatic facility.

Mr. Kost recalled that, during the April presentation to the Council, staff discussed the project history, partnership interests, and the scope of the feasibility study update. At that time, staff described dry side amenities that would complement the pool uses and generate revenue for the center. Mr. Kost said the Council previously expressed support for the overall work plan and scope of the feasibility study and for a bold regional project ("go big or go home") and a separate deep water tank. The Council also suggested a study of the impacts on neighborhood pools and potential options for the Odlle Pool.

Mr. Kost reported that the stakeholder outreach to date includes meetings with different groups, including aquatic center users and facility providers/operators. The key themes heard throughout those discussions highlighted the lack of pool space for competitive aquatic activities and support for keeping the Odlle Pool. The Bellevue School District supports competitive aquatics programs, and most local pool providers are interested in a new facility. The stakeholders expressed support for market rates for pool time and for offering a variety of aquatic and dry side amenities, including swimming lessons.

Mr. Kost said that City staff has discussed the concept of a regional aquatic facility with Bellevue College, which is currently conducting its own due diligence study of how a center could work within its campus. He said staff met a number of times with representatives of SPLASHForward, which is conducting a private fundraising campaign in support of a regional facility. King County's park levy includes funding for aquatics programs.

Mr. Kost described the potential program elements, with three options under each element. The first program element is a 50-meter competition pool with a connected or separate deep water tank. The second program element is seating capacity and the options range from the ability to accommodate 400 spectators and 150 athletes to 900 spectators and 720 athletes. The third program element is a 25-yard program pool, with options ranging from six lanes to 10 lanes. The fourth element is a 6,000 square foot to 8,000 square foot leisure and recreation pool area, which could ideally be located adjacent to party rooms and concession stands. The fifth program element is a wellness/therapy pool, and the options include whether to retain the therapy pool at Bellevue's Odlle Pool facility. The sixth program element is cardio/fitness facilities ranging from 5,000 square feet to 13,500 square feet. For comparison purposes, the Bellevue YMCA provides 12,100 square feet of cardio/fitness space, and the South Bellevue Community Center has 3,800

square feet of space for fitness activities. Mr. Kost noted that fitness facilities would be a desirable feature for an aquatic center at Bellevue College.

Mr. Kost highlighted a table showing the different ways that the program elements can be scaled and combined for the regional aquatic facility. The underlying assumptions are that the City will build and operate the facility, current aquatic center providers will remain the same, and that the revenues reflect current Puget Sound market conditions. The costs do not consider partner contributions or the remodeling or repurposing of the Odle Pool. Mr. Kost highlighted the building, site/parking, and soft costs for three facility options ranging from \$70 million (97,000 square feet) to \$110 million (164,000 square feet). Annual operating costs range from \$1.1 million to \$1.6 million and reflect a cost recovery rate of approximately 75 percent.

Mr. Kost said that three of the four sites currently under consideration were identified in the 2009 study: Marymoor Park, Bellevue College, and Airfield Park. The updated study identified Lincoln Center as a potential site. Mr. Kost presented the positive and negative aspects of each site. Lincoln Center is located centrally in Bellevue and has multimodal access and nearby amenities. However, the site is relatively small (4 acres) and would require a multilevel structure, including parking, or the acquisition of additional property. The Marymoor Park site covers 20 acres, provides convenient regional access, and offers the potential for partnerships with the City of Kirkland, City of Redmond, and King County. However, the distance from Bellevue and certain property complications (e.g., utilities, environmental analysis) make it a less desirable location. Airfield Park covers 27 acres and provides good regional access. However, the location requires remediation related to the landfill that was previously at the site, and the aquatic center use is not included in the park master plan. The Bellevue College option provides shared parking, high visibility, convenient access, and the potential for a partnership with the college. Challenges include the cost of structured parking and large event management.

Mr. Kost said staff will share the final results of the feasibility study update and seek Council direction regarding the project scope and options in Spring 2020.

Boardmember Unger asked if all of the sites under consideration could accommodate all of the proposed options. Although Option 1 could present some challenges, Mr. Kost confirmed that all of the sites could accommodate all of the options.

Boardmember Synn asked if the Lincoln Center option will impact other proposed programs and plans. Mr. Kost confirmed that there are opportunity losses involved with this site.

Boardmember Kumar asked if the aquatic facility will be a Bellevue-owned facility or a partnership. Mr. Kost explained that Council needs to determine if the project is feasible—if so, a plan will be created.

Vice-Chair Hamilton asked how extensive the Odle Pool remodel would be. Mr. Kost discussed some of the improvements that could be done at Odle Pool that would complement a new facility.

Boardmember Clark asked if the dry facility in an aquatic center is necessary. Mr. Kost provided examples of successful programs in other community centers that could be offered at the aquatic facility.

11. **NEW BUSINESS:**

None.

12. **PROPOSED AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING:**

13. **OTHER COMMUNICATIONS:**

A. CIP Project Status Report

B. List of upcoming Parks special events

14. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS/PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Susan Pappalardo

320 7th Ave. W, Kirkland, WA

On behalf of SPLASHForward, Ms. Pappalardo expressed her appreciation to the Parks Board for their openness in understanding the swelling demand for aquatics programming for all ages and abilities and to address the large gap in public aquatics facilities in Bellevue.

Ms. Pappalardo noted that it has been 10 years since Bellevue identified the need and scale for a regional sized aquatics facility. It has been 50 years since the last public aquatics center was built.

SPLASHForward thinks that there are missed opportunities for youth and adults in the community to connect, stay healthy and have a public place where they belong no matter their age, ability and background.

Ms. Pappalardo stated that the presentation provided by Mr. Kost gave Boardmembers greater detail to understand what 'going big' means and what a 'right sized' aquatic center entails.

SPLASHForward has been working diligently alongside Parks staff and the ARC feasibility update team. The ongoing work has been shared. There is a shared goal of defining what is the 'right sized' regional aquatic center for Bellevue. SPLASHForward has spent time listening to aquatics stakeholders and assembling a detailed analysis of their needs, hopes, and dreams. In addition, comparative operational data has been

gathered from local and national facilities to inform operational projections for each facility component.

Ms. Pappalardo noted that SPLASHForward has shared, with Parks staff and Council, a set of documents that better defines what ‘regional scale’ means from who is being served to the scale and scope of each facility component and how the community is served through programming.

SPLASHForward is performing a financial operational analysis, including a detailed event and economic impact analysis, behind what they believe is ‘right-sized.’ This information is being shared with the City of Bellevue.

Ms. Pappalardo stated that SPLASHForward believes the scaling factor from serving local needs to regional needs is incremental and will allow the greatest range of programming today and allow for adaptability and growth in future years.

Ms. Pappalardo called attention to the three facility design options presented earlier in the meeting agenda by Mr. Kost. She encouraged Boardmembers to evaluate the individual aquatic components to determine what is the best for the community now and into the future. She urged Boardmembers to ask the following questions:

- Will it serve the broadest set of the community?
- Does it allow for the broadest programming and partnership opportunities and potentially generate revenue for ongoing operational sustainability?
- Will it meet not only today’s needs, but those of the next 50 years?

Ms. Pappalardo stated that SPLASHForward is committed to building private partnerships and leading a private funding campaign to bring local, regional, state and national resources through individuals, corporations, grants and foundations. SPLASHForward’s next step is to begin a fundraising feasibility study to answer how much private funding can be realized.

15. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Trescases announced that the December 10, 2019 Parks Board meeting has been canceled in lieu of the December 3, 2019 Holiday Party. The next regularly scheduled Board meeting will be held January 14, 2020.

Motion by Boardmember Unger and second by Boardmember Kumar to adjourn the meeting at 8:57 p.m. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).