

**PURPOSE OF THE MEETING**

The meeting was held to explain the history and background of the project to the public, explain the process, describe the site, review the preliminary program thus far, and listen to and document the attendees' needs and concerns.

**DISCUSSION**

Tom Teigen explained the project history and goals. Tom also explained the proposed improvements to occur on 240<sup>th</sup> St. Bruce followed by explaining the master plan process for the project, as well as the project schedule and dates of expected milestones. Bruce shared information on the site's physical features, as well as the preliminary program that has been developed thus far by the ad hoc committee. Bruce then opened up the meeting to comment from the public, asking each person present about their needs and concerns.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

At the suggestion of neighborhood attendees, some community field proponents/users did not offer comments to allow more time for neighbors to speak. There were 146 recorded comments including:

**Traffic Issues** (31 comments) including:

- Current traffic on 240<sup>th</sup> St SE – a lot of traffic, people speed, road is dangerous
- 75<sup>th</sup> Street is dangerous for both pedestrians and cyclists – no safe place to walk
- Traffic has increased in the last few years – observe traffic on Saturdays
- Traffic calming strategies are needed along 240<sup>th</sup> St SE
- Consider alternate access to the sports complex
- Close 240<sup>th</sup> St. SE - Open access to the site from both sides of the park
- Consider movement of people across 240<sup>th</sup> St SE (safety and affect on traffic)
- Traffic and road conditions in winter are poor (especially on 71<sup>st</sup> Drive)
- Do not close 240<sup>th</sup> St, it is very useful to the community
- Consider privacy on the roads
- Traffic signal at the bottom of the hill is ignored
- Safety of bicyclists and pedestrians is an issue
- Park facility will increase the traffic risks
- Maximize sidewalks and bike lanes from all directions
- Encourage alternative ways to access site instead of car
- There is no east-west connector – reason why 240<sup>th</sup> is so busy
- Keep parking as far west as possible

**Sports Fields** (26 comments) including:

- More sports fields are needed in the community
- Fields provide a safe place for kids to practice and learn
- Great multiuse opportunity for kids, parents, and coaches
- Facility is needed for both youths and adults
- Currently there is limited synthetic availability in the community
- Fields need to be maximized with multiuse
- Accommodate 90' base paths for baseball
- Include football fields in program
- Park fields would provide alternate to school district fields
- Sports complex is better use of land than a high density development
- What need will the indoor sports facility serve?
- Many of the current fields are in poor shape
- Sports fields serve many different age groups

- Both nature and athletic fields can be enjoyed
- Sports fields may not fit in this venue

**Environment and/or Preserving the Site** (25 comments) including:

- Consider impact on wildlife (deer, eagles, hawks)
- Save trees and wetlands
- Better to have trails and nature than sports fields
- Maintain current character
- Enhance ecosystem
- Incorporate nature trails
- Keep existing golf course
- Both nature and athletic fields can be enjoyed
- Incorporate a greenbelt around the park
- Consider reforestation possibilities
- How many buildings will there be?

**Safety and Security** (7 comments) including:

- Fencing needed to control access
- Pedestrians and cyclists on or along roadways (especially on 75<sup>th</sup>)
- Mail theft and break-ins has been an issue. Are locked mailboxes a possibility?
- Consider extra patrols at park after hours
- Incorporate safety elements in design (ie cameras)

**Sports Field Lighting** (6 comments) including:

- Prevent light spillover to neighborhoods
- Time/scheduling of lights going off

**Stormwater** (6 comments) including:

- Manage stormwater issues at south end of site
- Create a better vegetation buffer for stormwater
- Prevent runoff and erosion
- Drainage concerns into Little Bear Creek

**Noise from Park Facility** (4 comments) including:

- Noise pollution from traffic and sports

**Other Comments**

- Garbage and littering in area has been a problem
- Maintain views and vistas – Consider height of structures
- Take advantage of site contours
- Contours may be a limiting factor
- Consider uses for all ages at the park
- Consider the site's proximity to King County and other nearby facilities
- Provide but control access from neighborhood park
- Park is an opportunity to correct current issues
- Balance passive and active uses
- Schedule is too quick for needs and concerns and planning
- Too many activities/elements for a 100 acres site
- How will sewer and septic be used?
- What will be the mitigation for construction impact?
- Neighborhood has been under-involved
- Neighborhood interest needs to be paramount in design

- Talk to all neighbors before design
- Do not degrade the neighborhood
- Schedule and manage the park to accommodate neighbors
- Park should speak to all users in the community
- Make park accessible to people of community, not just leagues
- Incorporate a small golf course related component into the design
- Incorporate a playground area like at Maltby
- Incorporate basketball courts
- Incorporate a dog park area
- Incorporate an official running track around the facility

*These are the minutes, as we understand them. If there area any additions or corrections, please contact Bruce Dees & Associates immediately.*