

PRAB Edgewater Master Plan Public Meeting Feb 6th, 2024 Public Comment:

Enforcement/ Safety Comments:

- Concerned regarding safety and lack of lighting
- Concerned lighting will draw unwanted activities after park hours (pros & cons with lighting)
- There should be cameras included in the plans
- Not convinced the added parking will work- more use will block the road and add debris to the neighborhood
- This is a neighborhood park- these improvements will draw too many people to a small area/park
- Launch signage is required by City code
- There are more people moving to Lakewood and the City hasn't expanded open space to account for more use

Traffic Revisions Comments:

- Mail delivery or trash service- will one-way conversion impact services?
- Where would mail delivery & trash be located w/ revisions?
- One-way conversions allow least impact to existing trees
- Concerns about widening road & impact to trees
- Spread out the parking
- Move parking on Foster to north side of street
- One-way traffic on Edgewater should be northbound
- Why wasn't one-way southbound on Edgewater continued south of Foster?
- There should be speed bumps to slow traffic on Edgewater
- There are 2 lanes now- if converting to one way with parallel parking why do these roads need expanded into the ROW?
- Traffic from Steilacoom Blvd along Edgewater southbound speeds through the neighborhood- if traffic was one way northbound that traffic would need to bypass the park on another road (pro)
- Woonerf (option 3) not desired as rollerblading and bikers block traffic

Parking Comments:

- Like the off-street parking in southern expansion area (away from the park)
- Too much parking in a consolidated area
- A gate and fencing should be included in the parking lot or launch option
- Fishing in the AM would take up parking
- South expansion parking for fishing would consolidate impact to neighbors
- Load/Unload Area off launch on Edgewater Dr. not feasible
- Where would boats/ trailers park after south lot full? (option 3)
- Concerned about the function of the south parking area (option 3)

Launch Comments

- Concerned more people using the launch will back up traffic
- How would cross traffic be managed with maintaining the launch location on Edgewater while someone is backing up?
- Could we shift the alignment slightly of the launch off Foster- were there other locations to relocate the launch?
- We need more signs for launch and lake rules at the park
- The one-way entry & exit (option 3) for the launch weren't clear and would need clear signage to support proper use
- Improvements to the launch will mean more use- we should move the launch
- The fishing area on option 3 is too close to the launch
- The launch needs to be longer to be more functional
- Concerned about lake depth for the relocation area (option 3)
- Concerned about the stumps in the lake for boaters and swimming- 54 stumps in the lake were surveyed in 1977 & the County did not want to pay for removal so we assume they all remain
- Please mark the stumps if they are to remain so they're visible
- Is removing the stumps permissible?
- Can the City dredge the lake or create a bulkhead along the shoreline- the launch is too shallow to be functional
- Can the City create more shoreline
- There should be a fee to launch boats- boaters need to pay their fair share
- There should be signs in the lake for speed and direction of boat traffic in the cove

Swim Area Comments

- There should be signs for a 'no wake zone' in the cove so boaters slow down
- Options 1&2- this swim area is a stagnant area of the lake that collects garbage and debris due to prevailing winds and water quality is a safety concern for the public
- The current launch area is a better location for a swim area
- Options 1&2- it's not easy to see this area and supervise children/ youth
- A spray park somewhere else in the City will be a more appropriate solution to water access
- Algae blooms in the lake are not safe for families to have a designated swim area
- Will the City pay to manage the algae blooms and lake water quality management?
- An increase in launch use could endanger swimmers in the cove at private residences

Landscape Comments

- Could there be other edible plants incorporated into the design for urban foraging since we're removing the blackberries?
- Is there irrigation included in the plan for the lawn areas?
- There is too much lawn in these options if we are to include native plantings in the restoration

- The majority of the existing landscape features (trees / rocks / logs) should be maintained and disturbance to vegetation should be minimized
- The shoreline should not be altered or expanded
- Concerned that increased maintenance or boat use would pollute the lake
- Concerned about the impervious surface cap on shoreline improvements & the scope of this project

Amenity / Program Comments

- We need a restroom- boaters and park users are going in the lake and on private property currently

Other Comments

- The City should spend resources on a youth center instead of these park improvements
- The City should spend resources for water access on other lakes- ie Gravelly Lake which has no public access
- Has the City considered the equity for the homeowners on the lake and near the park?
- The lake water quality is expensive to manage via homeowners- Does/ Can the City pay more?
- Concerned these improvements won't work
- Public land is for the public- there are other users around the City that appreciate these improvements and value lake access
- The City should take only what they need and develop this park conservatively/ in phases / slowly
- These plans should be simplified and development phased- who is paying for these improvements?
- Are there other properties the City can purchase in the neighborhood to expand parking?
- Opposed to expansion of the park

Comments via email

- There is a lot of wildlife at the lake including ducks- will the plans account for duck habitat?
- Lakewood has plenty of other lakes to improve for water access- lake Steilacoom has limited capacity to support additional use
- Road improvements / widening / parking expansion will require extra resources to retain the existing slopes/ expansion will cause significant expense to the City
- The park abuts a small cove which is not part of the main lake. Development at the park would concentrate use on this cove and impact residents on the cove negatively
- The lake / cove is too shallow to support increased use
- Additional or expanded park use will require additional neighborhood business (food, public restrooms etc) and park amenities (showers, restrooms)
- Development, increased use and boat activity will cause pollution and there are concerns for adequate maintenance resources for these improvements

