

**Draft Aubrey Davis Park Master Plan**  
**City Council Consolidated List of Questions & Comments**

Updated: October 29, 2019, 10am

#	Section	City Council Question or Comment	Response/Revision
1	General	What does ADA require for the projects proposed in the plan? It might be useful to include a discussion of this in the plan.	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.
2	Public Engagement Pages 32-33	There has been minimal public involvement in this phase of the plan development.	Since the planning process kicked off in 2018, community input has been solicited through four (4) public forums, three (3) open houses, four (4) surveys, four (4) City Council study sessions, various park pop-ups, and numerous meetings with a variety of community groups. In addition, the online component of Let’s Talk and email correspondence to staff throughout the process has provided significant opportunities for community input on the Plan.”

			<p><b>PRIOR COUNCIL REVIEW</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• November 21, 2017: Discussed the scope and process of the ADMP (see <a href="#">AB 5357</a>).</li> <li>• October 23, 2018: Reviewed preliminary trail sections for the portion of the Mountains to Sound Trail affected by the King County North Mercer Sewer Interceptor Project (see <a href="#">AB 5489</a>).</li> <li>• January 15, 2019: Previewed the preliminary site analysis, draft planning goals, and a summary of community input, which involved the first Online Survey, prior to Open House #1 (see <a href="#">AB 5525</a>).</li> <li>• July 16, 2019: Provided staff direction on preferred alternatives to be included in the draft ADMP (See <a href="#">AB 5563</a>).</li> </ul> <p><b>DRAFT ADMP SUBMITTED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preliminary draft master plan was first available to the public on 9/9/19 when it was posted for SEPA review and linked on the City’s Let’s Talk webpage.</li> <li>• The draft plan was presented to the public at Open House #3 on 9/23/19. Over 50 people attended and 41 survey cards were received. The same plan and information were made available in an online survey format from 9/23/19-10/1/19. Thirty-one people responded to the survey.</li> <li>• The complete draft plan has been available on Let’s Talk since 10/9/19. Two City Council study sessions are providing additional opportunity for review of the details of the draft plan prior to Council adopting the plan.</li> </ul>
3	Vegetation Page 37	<p>The three characters/styles are shown on page 37 – (i) <i>Northwest Feel</i>, (ii) <i>Ornamental</i> and (iii) <i>Sensory</i>. When does a decision on which character to adopt need to be made? Who is the ultimate decision-maker on which character?</p>	<p>In the current agenda bill staff is proposing that the <i>Northwest Feel</i> character be primary for the park and that the other palettes be included for specific purposes such as accent plantings and art/placemaking opportunities.</p> <p>Using <i>Northwest Feel</i> palette would not require any additional input. Using the other palettes 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.</p>

4	Vegetation Page 37	<p>Three options are laid out on page 37, but in the Agenda Bill it says that there are only two recommended options. Which of the three options that are laid out is <u>not</u> recommended and why not?</p> <p>Did the community voice a preference for one option over others?</p> <p>When does a decision on which option to adopt need to be made?</p> <p>Can the final Plan have one or more options to be selected later?</p>	<p>This discrepancy is an error. The plan offers three options for managing “non-active recreational” grass. The agenda bill also refers to two water conservation options.</p> <p>All three options for managing “non-active recreational” grasses are recommended for the plan. The meadow option was the strong preference in the feedback we received. It should be noted that this is also a higher cost option.</p> <p>Regarding the two water conservation options, staff’s recommendation is to include both options in the final plan and solicit feedback from the public before these options are deployed more widely. Council would be informed of the results and outcomes of the pilot projects before a larger implementation. Larger implementation would likely impact the level of service for the park and would be a policy decision for the Council.</p>
5	Vegetation Page 37	<p>Of the Non-active Recreational Areas that might be used on a trial basis for water conservation, i.e., brown out, what criteria will the staff used for selecting one or more Non-active Recreational Areas? Visibility by users? Usage?</p>	<p>For a trial basis, smaller areas (approx. ¼ acre) that were accessible and conducive to public engagement would be selected. High usage areas (such as places where people run their dogs) would likely not be impacted for the trial/pilot project areas.</p>
6	Trail Page 39	<p>What happens if the current width of the trails on MI do not meet the WSDOT standards, e.g. east corridor? Do the WSDOT standards provide exceptions that cover the east corridor and the physical constraints?</p>	<p>WSDOT is able to provide exceptions to its standards. The agency is not obligated to upgrade trails that met trail standards at the time of their construction until the trail is rebuilt in some way. The King County sewer project will be restoring the trail to existing widths in some areas due to site constraints, as approved by WSDOT.</p>
7	Trail Page 39	<p>What happens if WSDOT adopts the AASHTO width requirements in the future? Will the Plan have to be amended upon that adoption? Or, should the Plan state that the trail widths will be the width required by WSDOT, as amended?</p>	<p>The draft plan states: <i>Master Plan projects that involve WSDOT property and/or facilities shall be designed to WSDOT standards that are current at the time of the project’s design.</i> Pages 39, 42-44. No further amendments are needed.</p>
8	Trail Page 39	<p>What is a 2’ clear zone (Lid Park section versus a 2’ shoulder (East Corridor section)?</p>	<p>The edges of the multi-use trail must have 2’ clear zones on either side per WSDOT standards. The edge surface material must provide structural support for the trail edge as well as be clear of overhanging vegetation.</p>

			<p>In the East Corridor, the clear zone is specified as a gravel shoulder. In this section, there is no viable alternative pedestrian route to the trail. The gravel shoulder provides a walkable surface as a refuge for foot traffic. In the Lid Park section, the plan is less specific about the surfacing of the clear zone. Pedestrians have options for other places to walk. The clear zone in these areas can be constructed to support the growth of grass or other low walkable groundcover vegetation.</p> <p>In practice, the gravel shoulders in the East Corridor would eventually accumulate organic debris and support low groundcover vegetation.</p>
8	Trail	What part of the trail is <u>not</u> a WSDOT facility? (see last bullet on page 4 of the AB).	Most of the trail from 76 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE to Island Crest Way is in City-owned right-of-way.
9	Trail	Are there ADA considerations that can only be addressed with a trail that is wider than the WSDOT requirements?	Not to staff's knowledge. It is unknown at this time where it would exceed WSDOT's requirement for multi-use trails.
10	Trail	To address the concern about the speed of some cyclists on the Lid, what kind of additional signage and calming designs are being considered?	Appendix F, the 2016 Toole Design Group report on bollards outlines some examples of traffic control at intersections. Staff have discussed texture or paint surfaces, icons on the pavement, etc. These are design questions that are not addressed currently at this level of planning, but will be included as projects move forward with design.
11	Trail Page 40	Is the intent that the adopted final Plan only have one of the two options, or can the final Plan have both options? After the final Plan is adopted, is there a requirement that one of the options will be adopted?	Staff have proposed that both options advance to the pre-design/pre-conceptual stage for further analysis. Questions about cost and relocating the maintenance facility need to be fully vetted before a decision on the final option is made.
12	Trail Page 40	What happens if it the cost of moving the Maintenance Facility and the loss of operational efficiency is determined to be too high? Does that mean that the multimodal plaza is adopted, or does the community go back to the drawing board? Does the multimodal plaza currently require cyclists to dismount? If dismounting is not required, should it be?	If the cost of moving the maintenance facility is too high, it is likely the multimodal plaza will move forward to design as the most feasible option. There has been no talk of requiring cyclists to dismount. That could be considered. It is generally considered wise to only implement regulations that have a chance of being enforced. Requiring cyclists to dismount could be a challenge for compliance and enforcement which could create more confusion and conflict.
13	Trails Page 41	Soft Surface Trails. Does the ADA require one or both of these soft trail proposals if improvements to the ADP tennis courts are made?	There is no foreseeable requirement scenario for either of these trails. These are proposed to create a continuous pedestrian route through the central Lid Park. They make use of an ADA route that likely would be required for basketball court reconstruction. The primary purpose of

			these trails is to provide walkers an alternative to the main multi-use trail. The likely ADA accommodation from tennis court reconstruction would be an ADA path to parking on SE 22 <sup>nd</sup> Street.
14	Trail Page 44	I would like to understand the trail lighting concept more.	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. There have been no design concepts discussed for this improvement. The most likely solution would be overhead lights on poles. Bollard lighting is usually used for wayfinding in the dark. It does not provide adequate illumination of trail users.
15	Park Improvements Page 45	New Restroom. There are always safety concerns related to public restrooms. Are there any safety concerns particular to this proposed restroom?	Yes, public restrooms always have security and safety issues. Visibility is the primary factor to consider. We propose to employ CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design) principles and work with the Mercer Island Police Department to reduce this risk.
16	Arts Pages 48-49	How does the Arts and Culture Vision reconcile with the taking of part of Gretta Hackett Sculpture Gallery for the Tully's development?	The draft plan states: <i>"The master plan has not analyzed recreational needs and opportunities in the Town Center portion of the park. This area is currently subject to transportation planning efforts initiated by light rail. The result of this process shall be that the Town Center portion of the park provides equal or greater environmental, cultural and recreational functions as compared to what currently exists."</i> Pages 42 & 46.
17	Project Implementation Page 52	Project Implementation section (starting on page 52) should provide more information and clarity, e.g. projected costs are a snapshot that will be updated periodically and none of these projects are "mandatory."	Staff is not committing to updating all costs on an ongoing basis (annual), just the costs for projects that make it into the CIP six-year plan. Staff will clarify that in the plan revision. Staff will also clarify that including a project in the 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.
18	Project Implementation	I don't recall if there is language currently in the Plan that discusses the process by which parts of	There is not language in the plan that discusses what kind of project engagement there will be moving forward. We propose some here for

	Page 52	the Plan will be implemented and how many "touches" the public will have from the final Plan to actual implementation/installation of some of the Projects to weigh in. Again, there seems to be some misconception that once the Plan is adopted the Projects are approved. If there isn't a process section in the Plan then one should be considered.	<p>addition to the revised plan for November 19. Our recommendation is threefold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>2. Projects that are minor modifications to 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.</li> <li>3. Projects that are major modifications involving 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.</li> </ol> <p>These criteria can be added to the revised plan for November 19.</p>
19	Project Implementation Page 52	Add safety to the prioritization criteria.	A revision to the criteria is proposed in AB 5622. It adds the sentence: <u>"This includes projects that address urgent safety issues"</u> to the highest priority criteria.
20	SEPA checklist	In the supplemental sheet of the City's SEPA application (page 14 of the AB) in response to question 1 at the top of the page it says that if "all projects in the proposal are developed, a 0.8% increase in impervious surfaces will result." If the trails are widened to 14', do you know what the percentage increase might be?	There are a lot of variables behind this question that make answering it very difficult. Per your question, we used the trail width survey and calculated a rough additional square footage for all sections of trail to increase to 14' width (excluding 76 <sup>th</sup> to ICW). That number was 31,225 square feet. That represents an additional 0.8% increase in impervious surface, creating a total increase of 1.6% over current conditions.