

Revised Aubrey Davis Park Master Plan

List of Revisions

Updated: November 12, 2019

N.B. – this list details revisions that represent substantive changes. Changes to text are reflected in the graphic portion of the plan as well. Other revisions for clarity and readability are show in red in the plan but are not listed here.

#	Section	Revision process or purpose	Revision
	Vegetation Management, Reduced Water Use Strategies, Page 37	Recommended by staff, supported by Council at 11/4 Study Session, with additional clarification based on councilmember questions.	Added: “Both of these options will be implemented on a limited basis as pilot projects, locations to be determined by the city. Smaller areas (approximately a ¼ acre) that are accessible and conducive to public engagement will be selected, while high usage areas, such as places where people run their dogs, would likely not be impacted. To identify these pilot projects to the public, signage informing the intent and potential cost savings of each treatment will be displayed. The public will be able to comment on these alternatives and inform whether these strategies will be more widely deployed. Replacing soils and revising the planting palette for more drought tolerant species is also part of the program and will be used as a priority treatment where applicable.”
	Vegetation Management, Landscape Character, Page 37	Recommended by staff, supported by Council at 11/4 Study Session	Added: “The Northwest Feel character was selected as the primary feel for the park, with Ornamental and Sensory palettes included for specific purposes such as accent plantings and art/placemaking opportunities. These would likely be part of an individual project that would be subject to public input, and feedback on the landscaping would be solicited prior to implementation.”
	Trail Improvements, Page 39	Added for clarity by staff based on councilmember questions and comments.	Added: “Trail cross sections only apply to the main Mountains to Sound trail on Mercer Island (shown as a red line on the plan graphics). Secondary trails will remain their existing widths.”
	Trail Improvements, Page 39	Recommended by staff, supported by Council at 11/4 Study Session	Trail cross section diagram titled Trail Section Through the Lid Park: width changed from “current width” (as shown in pre-plan documents) to “12’ Paved Trail”
	Trail Improvements, Page 41	Revision supported by Council at 11/4 Study Session	Section on Optional Informal Soft Surface Trails and all subsequent references removed.
	ADA Accessibility, Page 41	New section added at councilmember request. Similar text was previously included in AB 5622 Exhibit 1.	The ADMP proposes several new trails that would comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) through the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) standards that have been adopted for outdoor recreation facilities. Neither the City nor WSDOT is required to bring existing facilities up to these standards as they currently exist.

			Normal maintenance and minor repairs do not prompt ADA compliance. However, work that generates City building permits or WSDOT review will necessitate ADA review. At that time, the extent of the work will determine the requirement for ADA accommodations. For example, a project that continues to keep the facility for the same use at the same location will likely result in ADA improvements limited to that facility only (e.g. changing restroom fixtures with any upgrades to the existing restroom structure, or installing an ADA ramp with ADA accessible playground elements when the playground equipment needs to be replaced). A project that changes the use of the facility or results in a substantially new facility could trigger a more comprehensive set of ADA accommodations, like including accessible routes from designated ADA parking stalls with a redesign of the tennis court or basketball court areas. These types of improvements have been included in the ADMP, but the ADMP does not constitute a comprehensive ADA analysis of accessibility needs in the park.
	Trail Lighting, Page 41	New section added by staff based on councilmember question. Similar text was previously included in AB 5622 Exhibit 1.	Added: "The section of the Mountains to Sound Trail between the Luther Lid and Shorewood Drive is shaded by high retaining walls to the south. It is dark in the winter. Pedestrians use this trail as the most direct route between Shorewood and Town Center. Staff have had requests for lighting that section of trail to improve visibility for both pedestrians and cyclists. While there have been no design concepts discussed for this improvement, the most likely solution would be overhead lights on poles. Bollard lighting is an additional option for wayfinding in the dark, but does not provide adequate illumination for trail users."
	New Restroom, Page 45	Recommended by staff, supported by Council at 11/4 Study Session	Both potential restroom locations are shown. Added: "The graphic to the left shows the approximate areas proposed for the new restrooms in orange."
	Dog Off Leash Area, Page 45	Clarification added by staff based on the recommendation by staff that was supported by Council at 11/4 Study Session	Added: "As such, a dog off-leash area will be further explored in the early design phase with extensive public input."
	Arts, Culture and Placemaking, Page 48	Additional clarification by staff based on questions from councilmembers and input from the Arts Council ad hoc committee on Aubrey Davis Park	Added: "Since its creation, Aubrey Davis Park has been a primary location for community members to engage with arts and culture. (Learn more about this history in Appendix I.) Building on this history, the Mercer Island Arts Council has identified an updated vision for..."
	Arts, Culture and	Additional clarification by staff based on questions from councilmembers and	Added: "The city's public art process is guided by existing policies that will be followed to make decisions on future arts and culture projects in the park."

	Placemaking, Page 48	input from the Arts Council ad hoc committee on Aubrey Davis Park	
	Project Implementation, Prioritization, Page 52	Recommended by staff, supported by Council at 11/4 Study Session	<p>Added safety criteria to highest priority, as follows: “Criteria for prioritization of the projects included in this master plan mirrors the criteria used in the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The prioritization is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highest Priority – Projects that are critical to be done right away in order to maintain existing infrastructure and projects that address urgent safety issues. Postponing this project would require a higher level of effort and would be at an overall greater cost to the City in future years. 2. Second Level of Priority – If funding is available, it is recommended that this project be done in the biennium. However, it is not critical and could be postponed to a later year if need be. 3. Third Level of Priority – Projects for which there is strong support from the City Council or a group of citizens. However, the project is not critical to the maintenance of the City’s infrastructure.
	Project Implementation, Prioritization, Page 52	Recommended by staff, supported by Council at 11/4 Study Session	<p>Added: “As individual projects included in this plan start moving forward, the following approach will be used to determine the level of project engagement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Projects that generally keep the existing character and function of the park do not need additional public input and decisions would be made at the director level once Council has approved the budget for them (e.g. landscape renovation, field drainage projects). 2. Projects that maintain or enhance existing functions (e.g intersection improvements, improved shoreline access, water conservation) would have one round of outreach and input in early design with updates posted on social media and Let’s Talk. Decisions would be made at the City Manager level after Council approves the budget for them. 3. Projects that involve extensive design or are new facilities (e.g. dog off-leash area, restroom conflict zone trail reconfiguration) would provide the public multiple chances for input with a Let’s Talk page and full social media coverage. City Manager would advise Council of project progress and ask for input at critical stages.
	Project Implementation,	Clarification added by staff based on questions from councilmembers	A rough order of magnitude cost estimate was generated for Aubrey Davis Park master plan to get an understanding of high level costs associated with proposed

	Cost Estimating and Funding, Page 53		<p>improvements. This is a one-time snapshot of rough costs and more detailed cost estimates need to be developed for each individual project during design phase. Including a project in this master plan does not imply that the City will fund that project or give it special priority. Capital projects in the plan will be considered for funding as part of the biennial budget process. The exception to this would be opportunities for external funding that would be dedicated specifically to the park or a specific project in the master plan. Donations or grants could be received outside of the biennial budget process with City Council approval.</p>
--	--------------------------------------	--	---