

*Eddon Boat Ad Hoc Committee Public Meeting
Meeting Minutes*

City of Gig Harbor

May 3, 2006

5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Council Member Steve Ekberg, Ad Hoc Committee members John McMillan, Lita Dawn Stanton, Bob Winskill and Bill Coughlin were present. Parks Commission members Ken Malich and Peter Hampl were present. Mayor Chuck Hunter and staff members Steve Misiurak, Dave Brereton, Bud Whitaker and Terri Reed were present.

William Isaacs	3805 Harborview Drive
Joan Tenenbaum	11609 41 st Ave. Ct. NW
Michael Dillon	3802 Harborview Drive
Robyn Dupuis	9520 Randall Drive NW
Alan Anderson	3225 Shawnee Drive NW
Barb Malich	3515 Ross Avenue

WELCOME:

The Mayor thanked everyone for coming to the meeting. He stated that our goals are to keep the public informed and to take some public comment on this project. He said we are looking right now at the conceptual design for the park and that our goals are to meet the intent of Proposition 1 to provide a waterfront open space park. He said that we want to provide access to the water which makes our project compete better for grants. The Mayor thinks a couple of the plans are pretty spectacular. He mentioned we would like to present a plan that is similar to the one depicted in the Proposition but taking topography into account and that there is quite a bit of slope. He said that in order to make the park accessible, we have got to take the slope into account. He stated that we need to meet the requirements of the Department of Ecology (DOE) for aquatic and upland cleanup, which is a big factor driving a lot of what we have to do at this point in time. He added that we need to replace the existing wood bulkhead and part of the goal is to redesign a bulkhead so that people will be able to get down to the water. He stated that the existing home on the site is not on the table for discussion and we are not doing anything with that portion right now.

The Mayor introduced Gisselle Sasson and Peter Hummel, who are the architects from Anchor Environmental, and Dave Templeton who is their environmentalist and an expert on aquatic cleanup.

INTRODUCTION TO EDDON BOAT PROPERTY:

Steve Misuriak discussed a couple of issues with the conceptual design. One issue is the permitting process with the DOE. We are coming up to a threshold determination of which we have to present the proposed use of what the final product will be. Steve said that Dave Templeton is assisting the City with our environmental permitting with the DOE. Steve has invited Dave to discuss where we are in the procedure with DOE and Peter and Gisselle to talk about some concepts they have come up with for the park.

PROJECT UPDATE:

Dave Templeton explained some of the issues that they are faced with addressing. These include closure of upland and inwater contamination, historical practices, upland sampling, and the underground storage tank. They have done quite a bit of sampling and the underground storage tank has already been removed. They hope to have concurrence from the DOE in the next few months. They will integrate all these issues into the park design.

PARK DESIGN:

Review of Preliminary Program Elements and Design Criteria:

Peter Hummel, a landscape architect working in the Puget Sound region with Anchor Environmental, listed the three steps that will be taken for the conceptual design of the park:

- 1) Existing conditions and three options were developed for comment at tonight's meeting. This is the first effort to cover a broad range of ideas. Tonight's meeting is to look at the alternatives.
- 2) Next Wednesday, there will be another meeting to review one preliminary concept plan and a preliminary cost estimate. We are not going to be dealing with costs of the buildings or issues regarding the buildings, just the cost of the open space and removal of the bulkhead.
- 3) On May 24th, another meeting will take place to look at the final concept plan with costs and a phasing plan.

Peter stated that this is an open process to see and hear ideas. The preliminary program has been based on comments from the Ad Hoc Committee members about the important elements of the park. The plan includes things regarding the buildings, restrooms, open lawn with views of water, walkways with ADA access, places to sit and enjoy the view, removing the bulkhead, a place for canoes or kayaks to launch, preserving and protecting the natural shoreline, preserving a small area with salt marsh vegetation and preserving the existing mature trees on the site.

Peter explained that in order to create a conceptual plan they want to keep in mind the following: maximizing the site for pedestrians, not providing for off street parking, keeping the northwest portion of the park for historic structures and community programs, focusing on preserving and renovating those structures, keeping the salt marsh, keeping the east side open for passive recreation and views, providing access to the water's edge and respecting the residential nature of the adjacent neighborhood.

Peter asked for comments and questions on what he has presented so far.

Ken Malich wanted to know more about widening the sidewalk and if the electrical wiring could be moved underground as a part of the design. Peter said that they could take the electrical wire issue into consideration. He also mentioned that they are looking at moving the crosswalk to a different location.

Review and Discussion of Design Alternatives:

Peter began his presentation of the design alternatives. His slides illustrated the following:

- 1) Other similar projects that Anchor has worked on which include: North Shore Recreation Area in Seattle, Denny Blaine Park in Seattle, Thea's Park in Tacoma, Thea's Foss Esplanade in Tacoma and Dickman Mill in Tacoma.
- 2) Older aerial view of Eddon Boat Park.
- 3) Park Vision – Provide access to the water, open space, views and use of the site for boating.
- 4) Option A – Plan: This plan has three entrances to the site, a boardwalk along the edge of the water and stairs and a plaza area where the bulkhead has been removed.
- 5) Option A – Cross Section: This option has the least amount of earth moving and excavation. It does requires some moving and adding of material to the site.
- 6) Option B – Plan: This plan has the most green space, the least amount of paths, the least places to get into the site, one main area to walk in, disabled access, consistent slope, removes the pipe and daylights the stream, a bridge over the stream, benches, steps, a landing with a beach area, and all the existing trees are preserved.
- 7) Option B – Cross Section: The slope is considerably lower - 5:1.
- 8) Option C – Plan: This option has two entrances, moves the crosswalk to the east entrance of the site, a daylighted stream with shrubs around it, areas for public art and a wider sidewalk.
- 9) Option C – Cross Section: Has less excavation than the others.

Public Questions and Comments:

The floor was opened for public questions and comments.

Ken Malich asked if there are ecological constraints on much fill we do, what type of material can be used, how much excavation can be done, and if the beach can be moved or extended outward. Peter answered that material is already being placed at

the site with a sand/gravel mix. This material will cover the contaminated materials. This material can also be used to build the beach. Peter said that on Options B and C, we are pulling the shoreline back which shows a net benefit for salmon. Bill Coughlin asked about filling. Peter answered that it is difficult to permit for filling. Ken Malich mentioned that it needs to be a reasonable slope to be as usable as possible and still get to the water. Peter stated that the DOE works under the Shoreline Management Act that encourages public access to the water.

Ken Malich said that we need to make it as usable as possible for a park. Peter said that eliminating the vertical wall would be beneficial overall and open it up more.

John McMillan asked which plan is the best environmentally. Peter said that in terms of eliminating the bulkhead, that both Option B and C are similar. He said that they can combine different options from the parts that people like the most. Environmentally, Option B has more vegetation along the shoreline and Option C has more vegetation along the stream. He said that daylighting the stream is also beneficial environmentally.

Lita Dawn Stanton likes that Plan C and asked about another access coming down the side to the water.

Michael Perrow likes Plan C because it creates a better flow but doesn't like the third entrance.

John McMillan asked if the walk could curve along the creek. Peter stated that to do this would take away the disabled access aspect of that path.

Bob Winskill asked how deep the proposed creek will be. Peter explained they need to know more about the depth of the pipe, which will be looked at during excavation, and then this will help figure out the depth and the cost. Peter Hampl asked if the water runs all year in the creek. Michael Dillon stated that it does flow all year long.

Michael Dillon also wanted to know that if the design is final in three weeks, why isn't there an option showing getting rid of the house. Peter answered that we are focusing on the open space and that none of the options depend on the house. Michael Dillon wanted to know when the house discussion will be on the agenda. Steve Ekberg stated that this meeting wasn't for discussing the house and the house issue will have to be dealt with at a different time. Peter mentioned that in the preliminary program it lists park houses and a need for restrooms on the site. He said that whether there is a house or not, restrooms will need to be addressed with a building of some sort. Michael Dillon asked when the house discussion will be on the agenda. Steve Ekberg said that the first meetings looked at addressing open spaces and the historical aspect of the Eddon Boat construction. He doesn't know an exact date that the house will be discussed.

Joan Tenenbaum said that she likes Option C and thinks that it has the best features. She likes the creek and the vegetation, the curved path in the middle of the park, the stairway, the beach, widening the sidewalk, and the area for public art.

Ken Malich would like the sidewalk widened because it is so close to the traffic. Joan Tenenbaum likes the interior path because of the traffic.

Peter Hampl also likes Option C and wanted to know where it ends on the west side and how far below sidewalk grade it is. Peter said that it is about three or four feet below.

Bob Winskill mentioned that they would have to go across the driveway and join the sidewalk back up.

Pete Hampl would like to see a dual level park, maybe make the trail turn more left and go back to the street.

Michael Dillon would like to see it terraced with rails for observation in two tiers. Joan Tenenbaum didn't want more levels because it would be less accessible.

Ken Malich thought that a pond would be nice for observing sea life and thought that if the stream is widened the water could be recirculated.

Steve Ekberg liked Option C but would like to eliminate the curb sidewalk and move it over. He also liked the stairs going down to the beach.

Bud Whitaker preferred Option C and said that a wide planter strip could be put between the road and the sidewalk.

Guy Hoppen was asked if there was originally a creek that ran through. He said that not during his time.

John McMillan preferred Option C and would like to avoid having a wall around the trees. Peter answered that they want to avoid a wall and that they could plant native vegetation from the trees down.

Robyn Dupuis said that Option C would be good so that the runners could continue on. She would like to see signs about fishing industry, liked widening the sidewalk and also the beach idea.

Bill Coughlin would like the park to be away from cars, likes the new view down Stinson, and wants to move the sidewalk away from the road. He mentioned that a berm could be created to separate the walk from the street.

John McMillan wants to encourage people to come into the park with a plaza. He said that the park is a bridge between downtown and the older part of the harbor. He wants a historical tie to Eddon Boat history and would like to keep the concrete foundations. Peter stated that the foundations will become more visible as relics when the bulkhead is removed and that to remove the foundations would be costly and they are part of the history of the site.

Michael Dillion would like to see some park side entrances and a deck over the roof of the Eddon Boat building.

John McMillan stated that we want to make it inviting to enter into the park.

Gisselle will write up the comments mentioned at the meeting and will send them back to Steve Misuriak and Bud Whitaker and redistribute them at the next meeting.

Bob Winskill mentioned that it is hard to see pedestrians in the crosswalk when driving from either way. Steve Misuriak said that with the buildings removed, that traffic would have better sight if the crosswalk was in a better location. Bud Whitaker mentioned that the park needs disabled parking and that the last spot along the street could be designated for that and could be next to the crosswalk.


Peter Hampl asked if the Douglas fir could be limbed up so that it possible to see underneath it coming down Stinson.

Michael Dillon asked about the plans for the area where the deck for the Eddon Boat building stops by the retaining wall. He mentioned that a observation deck/seating area could be built out.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Wednesday, May 10th at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURN: 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Terri Reed