

**BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
MEETING MINUTES
September 25, 2003**

Present:

Bruce Bentley, Chair
James Fearn
Sarah Neilson
Terry Holme

Excused:

Joanna Grist
Kate Pflaumer

Staff:

Ken Bounds, Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

Chair Bruce Bentley called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. Once a quorum was present, James moved and Sarah seconded that the agenda consent items be approved, including the September 25 agenda, September 11 minutes, and the acknowledgment of correspondence. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Superintendent's Report

Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds reported on the following:

Wildlife in Our Parks: In today's Seattle P-I "Getaways", several Seattle parks are the focus of an article on sighting wildlife in nearby parks.

Green Lake Alum: Mayor Nickels announced last week that he will include \$1 million in his proposed budget for the treatment of Green Lake's water with alum. The Department will implement this treatment if the funding is approved by City Council. In the meantime, Green Lake remains closed because of elevated levels of blue-green algae toxins.

Northgate Community Center and Park: The Department recently convened a Project Advisory Team (PAT) for the Northgate Community Center and Park project. The PAT is comprised of key stakeholders from the community who act in an advisory capacity to the Parks Department.

Madrona Playfield Project Completed: The new entrance at Madrona Playfield has just been completed. The new large stairs and ramp can be seen from the small business district across the street from the park. This was the second of two phases.

Youth Community Gardens: This summer, Central Environmental Stewardship staff piloted "Kids Gardens" at five community centers so youth could directly connect with nature without having to leave community center grounds. These projects were very successful, as they supported environmental stewardship, citizenship ethics, and complemented the health and fitness goals of our day camps. The gardens also improved the landscape.

Teen Life Center: Youth at the Teen Life Center continue their work on the September 29 City Council Candidates Forum. The Forum is a collaboration of the Vera Project, Seattle Youth Involvement, and Seattle Young People Project. It links young people in the community to civic affairs and positive public involvement activities.

Alki Beach Fire Policy: The Alki Community Council has requested that Parks review the hours that fires are allowed at Alki for next year. The neighborhood believes the fires attract unwanted behavior. The Community Council has proposed that beach fires not be allowed after 9:00 p.m. Department staff will work with the Community Council to review the policy and plan for 2004. There were far fewer complaints and problems associated with beach fires this year.

Yesler's Computer Staff Honored: Asfaha Lemlen, coordinator of the Yesler Terrace Community Computer and Learning Center, is a winner of the Congressional Black Caucus' First Annual ET3 TEC Champion award for Outstanding Community Technology Leaders. Asfaha, along with City of Seattle staff Ti Locke and David Keyes, will be honored at a ceremony in Washington, D.C.

Sarah asked that the Board send a letter of congratulation to Asfaha.

Volunteer Park Lily Pond Dedication: The dedication of the restored Lily Pond will be held at 5:30 p.m., Tuesday, September 30. The Parks Department and Seattle Parks Foundation are hosting this celebration. Ken visited the site on Wednesday and it looks great.

Bradner Gardens: Bruce attended the Gardens' dedication on Tuesday, with a large crowd in attendance. He was particularly interested in the sustainable technology used in the new building.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

Bruce explained that the general public comment portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had or are not scheduled for a public hearing. Testimony is limited to three minutes per speaker. No one signed up to give testimony.

Recommendation to Make the Northacres Park and Jose Rizal Off-Leash Pilot Areas Permanent Elements Public Hearing

At its September 11 meeting, Parks Department strategic advisor Jack Robinson came before the Board to give a briefing on this recommendation. Tonight Jack gave an additional review of the process, as follows:

The Board authorized the creation of pilot off-leash sites at Northacres Park and Jose Rizal Park in 1997. That authorization was endorsed by City Council Resolution 29628 and included various conditions: community process, fencing, stewardship agreement with Citizens for Off Leash Areas, and an evaluation to be completed after 18 months of operation.

During 1997, a number of criterions were used to evaluate and select off-leash sites. The Park Department and Board of Park Commissioners has used those criteria in subsequent discussions regarding off-leash sites. Those same criteria were used to evaluate these two sites. The criteria are:

- Utilization
- Conformance with Off-leash Adopt-A-Park Agreement during pilot project
- Site stewardship involvement and support for the site
- Deterioration or destruction of vegetation at the site during the pilot project
- Environmental concerns regarding water, dust, air, or noise pollution
- Distance from wildlife habitats
- Distance/buffer from nearby residences
- Availability of parking
- Public safety issues at the pilot site
- Possible offset of illegal activities
- Animal Control experience at the site
- Absence or interference with other Department-sponsored activities
- Distance from children's play areas
- Spillover impacts as a result of this pilot project

In performing the evaluation, Department file materials were reviewed, information was gathered from Parks' crew chiefs, geographic managers, and the Department's Senior Urban Forester, staff at Seattle Animal Control, and North and South Precinct police officers. Multiple site visits were made at different times of the day and on different days and "users" were interviewed. Once the research and the draft reports were completed, copies were made available to people and organizations known to have an interest in the subject. The COLA Board received copies electronically, as well as hard copies during a briefing at its September 3 meeting. Over 2,200 notices were mailed to the mail routes adjacent to each of these two off-leash areas and to the appropriate community councils with notification of tonight's presentation and public hearing before the Park Board.

As a result of the evaluation process and findings, the staff recommendation to the Board is that the Northacres Park Off-leash Area and the Jose Rizal Park Off-leash Area be added as permanent elements of those parks and that they be added to the network of off-leash areas administered by the Seattle Parks and Recreation Department in partnership with the Citizens for Off-leash Areas.

Board Questions & Answers

Terry asked which of the off-leash areas are permanent sites and which are pilots. Ken answered that all other current sites are permanent. Two new pilot sites are planned: the new I-5 park and Regrade Park. Terry asked if designating a pilot off-leash site as "permanent" increase the maintenance, in other words, does volunteer stewardship decrease once a site is no longer a pilot. Ken said that stewardship levels vary from site to site, but the energy level at each site does not decrease when a site is designated as permanent.

Terry asked who wrote the February 2003 document that was distributed to the Board. Jack answered that Mark Mead, Senior Urban Forester for the Parks Department, was the author. Terry said it is helpful to the Board to know the source of information it is given to read and requested that all reports given to the Board contain information on the author.

Public Hearing

The floor was opened for public testimony. Bruce reminded speakers that testimony is limited to three minutes each. Seven people signed up to testify.

Katashi Oita: He has lived on the corner of Judkins and 12th for 33 years. He was a dog owner when he was younger and supports the off-leash areas. Jose Rizal Park has had a history of use by transients. Two weeks ago the Parks Department (and other agencies) cut down undergrowth and now the Park has a very beautiful view. Katashi brought several enlarged photos and displayed to the audience and to the Board. He encouraged non-dog owners to visit this park.

Mark Voigtz: He is excited about the Northacres site becoming permanent. He believes that the off-leash area has helped decrease illicit behavior in this park and he does not believe that the dogs have destroyed the habitat.

Amie Patao: She spoke for Chris Bailey, off-leash steward at Jose Rizal Park, who was delayed in traffic. She is the North Beacon Hill Council Chair. The Council sent the Board a letter of support for the off-leash area. She thinks this is a perfect site for an off-leash area and believes that the site curtails criminal activity in the park. It took about a year to "chase" the illegal campers in Jose Rizal Park outside of the off-leash area. The increased use of the area by dog owners deters illegal behavior. Loss of the off-leash area would increase criminal activity in this park and would be a loss to the community.

Amy Tsai: She has been the steward at the 1-1/4 acre Northacres off-leash site for the 2-1/2 years it has been open. Both the users and volunteers have proven that this site is a success and are very supportive of the site becoming permanent. She presented the Board a complete copy of the report that Northacres volunteers compiled which contains user comments, e-mails of support, and a petition of support signed by 85 people. Volunteers

have worked over 800 hours at this site, which has averaged an estimated 27,000 visits yearly by humans (not counting the dogs!) per year.

Sharon Levine: Several years ago, she instigated the off-leash process for both Jose Rizal and Northacres Parks by going door-to-door and talking with neighbors of the parks. This process helped determine that both these sites were correct choices for off-leash areas. She complimented Parks Director Christopher Williams for his role in working with the community and Citizens for Off-leash Areas she said he did a wonderful job.

Edward Caffee: He lives near Northacres Park and wasn't even aware of the off-leash area until he became a dog owner. He believes this is a compliment, as the site isn't detrimental to the neighborhood. Taking his dog there has been a great opportunity to get to know his neighbors. He supports the site becoming permanent.

Lynn Ferguson: She is co-chair of the Urban Habitat of Seattle Audubon, which opposes making these two off-leash sites permanent elements of the parks. She came before the Board to give the "rest of the story" on off-leash areas. Since 1995, 30 acres of City parks have been designated as off-leash areas, affecting nine parks. Both Jose Rizal and Northacres are in environmentally critical areas, one a second year forest and the other a steep slope. Seattle Audubon supports the protection of bird and other wildlife habitat and opposes the placement of off-leash areas in natural areas. Seattle Audubon opposes placement of off-leash areas in Seattle parks and supports, as an alternative, sites on private or public land with no habitat value. Lynn continued reading a two-page letter listing Seattle Audubon's concerns and opposition to the off-leash sites and gave the Board a copy of the letter.

The public hearing was closed and Bruce thanked all those who testified. He asked Board members if they were comfortable in discussing and making a recommendation tonight. Sarah wants to visit both sites before voting on the recommendation. Bruce has visited Jose Rizal but hasn't yet visited Northacres. The discussion and recommendation will be scheduled for the October 9 meeting.

Sand Point Magnuson Park Drainage, Wetland/Habitat Complex and Sports Fields/Courts Project Discussion/Recommendation

Background

Eric Friedli, Director of Sand Point Magnuson Park, came before the Board for tonight's discussion and possible recommendation on this project. He introduced project manager Guy Michaelsen and Jeff Girvin from the landscape architecture firm, The Berger Partnership. He also introduced Diane Sheldon of Sheldon and Associates; an environmental consulting firm that specializes in wetland analysis and restoration, and Patti Petesch, Parks Department Ballfield Manager. Several large maps of the proposed project were displayed.

For its September 11, 2003, meeting the Board received a written update briefing and a short verbal briefing from Eric. For the sake of clarity, the written briefing is included in these minutes:

Written Briefing

Staff and consultants presented a report to you on the subject project at your June 12, 2003, meeting. During the public comment time at that meeting several citizens also spoke about the proposal. Minutes from that meeting are attached (Attachment 1) for your reference. The briefing memo for that meeting included minutes from previous Board meetings and public hearings where Sand Point Magnuson Park was discussed. On July 2, 2003, several Board members took a tour of the site. In addition, all Board members were provided a preliminary copy of an addendum to the EIS reviewing possible changes to the proposal as were outlined during the June 12 presentation to the Board.

Subsequent to the June 12 meeting, the adequacy of the Department's Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) was appealed to the City Hearing Examiner. The adequacy hearing was held on August 11. On August 28 the Hearing Examiner issued her ruling affirming the adequacy of the SEIS.

The Board is now being asked to provide its final recommendations on this project. Staff has worked with the consultant team to prepare the revised proposal based on the findings of the environmental review and following additional input from the community. The changes to the proposal analyzed in the EIS and presented to the Park Board in 2002 are highlighted below. This information was presented to the Board on June 12, 2003. Attachment 2 shows the revised proposal.

- **WETLAND HABITAT COMPLEX:** There are no proposed changes in the 65-acre wetland/habitat complex.
- **SPORTS MEADOW:** There are no proposed changes to the 15-acre sports meadow. It is proposed to be grass surface with no lights.
- **SPORTS FIELD COMPLEX:**
 - **Configuration:** The most substantial proposed change is in the configuration of the 11 sports fields proposed to have synthetic surface and be lighted. The proposed reconfiguration is in response to issues highlighted in the EIS pertaining to potential noise and light impacts on close-by existing residential buildings. The primary concern was the proximity of the full size baseball diamonds to the transitional homeless housing building to the west. The housing is operated by the Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI). LIHI originally appealed the EIS but after working with the Department on the proposed reconfiguration they withdrew their appeal and have agreed to support the new configuration.

In the revised configuration

- the five baseball/softball diamonds are moved to the south end of the site

- the four soccer and one rugby field are moved to the north end of the site
- the parking lot across the street from the housing is moved north across from the recreation center parking lot
- a more neighborhood-park like area is created immediately east of the residential area that will include the youth soccer field, the basketball and volley ball courts and other park amenities such as benches and picnic tables
- the pedestrian circulation is modified to fit the new configuration
- a stronger connection is created between the existing children's playground and the wetland/habitat complex
- the parking lot immediately across the street from the transitional homeless housing area has been moved north so it would be across from the community recreation center.

Hours of Operation: The proposal recommended for analysis in the EIS left unresolved the hours of operation. The analysis conducted in the EIS assumed that all 11 fields could potentially be lighted until 11:00 p.m. with no restrictions as to seasons of play or days of week. As a result of the EIS analysis and working with LIHI, the following revised proposal for hours of operation was developed.

The hours of operation revised proposal:

- The lights on the youth soccer field (#10) will be turned off no later than 9 p.m. year round
- Lights on the 10 remaining fields may be on until 10 p.m.
- Lights on 5 fields only may be on until 11 p.m.
- Lights on the soccer (#7) and the little league field (#11) closest to the residential area would be the last ones to have lights on
- Minimal security lighting would remain on for 15 minutes after the main fields light are off
- ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The Department has prepared a preliminary addendum to the EIS that provides a summary of the differences in the environmental impacts between the proposal as analyzed in the FEIS and the revised proposal. As documented in the preliminary addendum, the revised proposal results in similar or less potential environmental impacts. Following the recommendations of the Board a final proposal will be prepared and the addendum will be updated and issued in final form prior to its transmittal to the City Council for their final review.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board may make any recommendations it so chooses. Following is an outline of key decision components to assist the Board in its discussion and decision making process. The decisions are split into three major categories reflecting broad areas for discussion.

1. Recommend the wetland/habitat complex as proposed.

The wetland/habitat component of the project has not generated organized opposition nor has it generated significant organized support. Some people have raised concerns about the ability to create successful 'engineered' wetlands. Our consultants are confident that the wetland/habitat system as designed can be successful.

2. Recommend the athletic field layout as revised

As documented in the preliminary addendum to the FEIS the revised field alternative is expected to reduce the most significant impacts of noise and lighting on the Sand Point Community Housing Association Building 224 (Santos Place). By relocating fields farther away and in a different orientation from Santos Place the predicted maximum noise level is substantially reduced (Page 2-24). The addendum however does identify an area south of 65th Street potentially having periods of play when Seattle noise limits may be exceeded. In addition, while the revised proposal decreases the amount of spill light south of 65th Street there is still some spill light that crosses onto adjacent residential property. The addendum also makes the point that some off site glare impacts are shifted from the areas west of the site to areas south of the site. That area is planned for future transitional homeless housing. Conceptual designs have been developed for the transitional homeless housing but not finalized and no funding is currently available for their construction.

Alternate Recommendations

- 2. a. Rotate Field 11 so that home plate is at the northeast corner of the field.*
-This would reduce the potential for noise impacts on the area south of 65th Street.
- b. Utilize a hybrid system for lighting field 11. Use shielded conventional lighting technology for lights along 65th Street*
-This would reduce spill light to residential property south of 65th Street.
- c. Proactively monitor noise levels at selected locations to ensure compliance with Noise Ordinance*
-This would ensure that concerns about exceeding noise ordinance limits are resolved quickly.

3. Recommend the hours of operation as revised

The reduction in hours of operation of the sports fields lights included as part of the revised proposal mitigate the general impacts of noise, spill light, glare and sky glow. Suggestions have been made to further limit the hours of operation. Additional limits on hours of operation would further reduce potential impacts.

Verbal Briefing

Eric also gave a verbal review of this briefing paper and pointed out the ball fields and other project sites on the large maps.

Board Discussion

The Board discussed its voting process for this project. Members had e-mailed each other this week with concerns that only 2/3 of the Board would be present this evening. Some Board members are new and were not present for the previous briefings and testimony; only James and Bruce have been on the Board during all presentations, public hearings, and discussions. The Board decided to wait until its October 23, 2003, meeting when all six members are scheduled to be present to have a full discussion and make a recommendation. The Board also decided to begin its discussion this evening and the two absent members will read the minutes of this discussion.

The Board also agreed that it would discuss each section of the plan and vote on the project as a whole, not section by section, at its October 23 meeting.

Ken asked that the Board not delay making a recommendation beyond October 23. If a Board member is sick or called out of town on that date, he asked that the remainder of the Board vote on the recommendation. The other agenda item on October 23 is the Arboretum Master Plan. Parks staff will work out the logistics on the agenda to accommodate both these major projects. If the Board needs any additional information before that meeting, please let Parks staff know.

Wetland Complex

James said he has no issues with this part of the project. He believes it is well designed and is consistent with the plan's objectives and he would approve this.

Terry said he is both impressed and overwhelmed with the volume of correspondence received. Only 2-3 e-mails referred to the wetland part of the project. He thinks this part of the project is a good plan and is well linked to other parts.

Bruce stated that, due to the large volume of e-mails, that he had not yet had time to read all the correspondence, but would do so this weekend. He noted that this is unusual for him, as he usually is able to read all the correspondence on issues before the Board begins its discussion. He read 25-30 today and believes that wetlands were referred to in a large portion of these, stressing lighting impacts on wildlife habitat.

James thought this concern stemmed from the effects of the lights on the wetlands, not on the wetland design itself. Bruce said he read one e-mail that read that moving the wetlands is detrimental to the birds that are currently gravitating to the fields.

Diane Sheldon of Sheldon Associates stood to answer questions on the wetland complex. When the fields are built, there will be impacts on the wetland areas. The permitting agencies (City of Seattle and U.S. Army Corp of Engineers) require that wetland delineation be completed. This delineation includes tallying the acreage to determine

wetland impacts, wetland tides, and wetland functions, and a comparison and contrast of this information.

Diane next addressed correspondence referring to the failure of wetland restoration. Three studies have been completed since 1995 on wetland restoration. Determining that wetland mitigation or restoration is a failure is an extraordinarily complex endeavor. Diane said that what has been learned from the bad design, bad performance standards, and poor follow up of wetland restoration in the 1980s has led to improved wetland restoration. She stressed that the biggest failure is lack of follow up and maintenance. She believes citizens will watch this wetland closely to monitor its success. Due to this close observance, the opportunity to fail is greatly decreased. Often when development-associated wetland restoration fails, it is due to no one following up to ensure that maintenance is performed and funds are spent accordingly.

Sarah asked if a plan of stewardship is being prepared for that time when Diane's involvement with these wetlands ends. Diane said that the Sand Point Magnuson Park Vegetation Management Plan (VMP), which the Park Board voted approval of in 2001, deals with 75-90% of Sarah's concerns. The VMP was written for the Park as it looked in 2001, but much of the guidelines easily adapt to future needs. The VMP gives Parks' maintenance staff direction for dealing with invasive species, planting native species, and how to sequence removal of vegetation. Part of the plan came from suggestions from community members that as blackberry vines are removed, native species be replanted in those spaces. The VMP goes through a huge, complex table that identifies which of those actions are appropriate for City staff and only City staff to do and which are opportunities for community volunteers.

James thinks that a significant part of the discussion is: are we going to commit this area to a wetland, not whether it will work as a wetland. No assurance can be given that this plan will work. Diane said that part of what she hears from the public is the need for a financial commitment from the City to help ensure success.

Terry said the plan referred to the roadway being permeable to allow water to flush through the roadbed. This is a new concept to him and he asked how long this will be permeable and not become plugged. Diane described the Snoqualmie Ridge Parkway roadbed (referred to as a "burrito"). It was installed in 1992-93 and it continues to flush the water through this 75' wide right-of-way. Diane said that a cause of plugging could be from silt, if something isn't installed properly. Vegetation that is flushed through the roadbed will decay over time and should not plug the system.

Sports Meadow

James said he likes this plan. Sarah stated there hasn't been much public comment on this aspect of the plan and Terry agreed. He stated that the Department is anxious to get going on this and the design team is far along in the plans. Eric agreed with this and said that this has been on the Major Maintenance plan for six-seven years.

Bruce asked where most of the asphalt is currently located. His understanding is that this was formerly a runway that was buried. Eric pointed to the large map to show where asphalt would be removed.

Terry asked what is the interim storm water runoff plan. Eric pointed to the large map to point out where the runoff would run.

Configuration of Lit Synthetic Surface Fields

Ken asked Eric to also display a map of the previous version of the plan so the Park Board could visually see the changes in the latest plan. Eric pointed out the changes (listed in the written briefing above.) James said he thought the new configuration is better in every respect and asked if any environmental impacts are greater from this new configuration. Eric said some impacts are the same and perhaps some are less.

Terry said he started going to meetings related to these fields approximately 1997 and began seeing the plans then. An interesting aspect of the community meetings was that the citizen's Blue Ribbon committee assigned the designated acreage for these fields. The designers then had the opportunity to make any number of cutouts fit in the space. This was a significant challenge. He has seen eight versions of the field layout. He gave credit to Eric and the designers that each new version has been an improvement over the last. Each one solved problems, with a consciousness to try to make the general impacts on the park more desirable. He believes that it will be a benefit to turn the field at the southwest field and described the benefits of doing this.

Lighting

Terry said that his experience with ballfield lighting is that the closer a project gets to the building phase, the more it is fine-tuned so the lighting will make the least impact. He believes that the Board shouldn't try to get too specific in its recommendation on the lighting system. The project is still in the design phase and the designers will use the best technology to cause the least impact when the fields are built.

The Board could make a general recommendation. If it alleviates some anxiety on the neighbors, the Board should do whatever it can now but it should be understood that lighting designers definitely try to have the least impact on the neighbors.

Ken said that last year the Park Board went through a fairly extensive process on lighting policies. One standard of what was adopted is providing the lowest level of light for safe recreational play. Other policies that were adopted deal with exactly what Terry said, with respect to mitigating spill, mitigating glare, and mitigating skyglow. The combination of the policies and the layout give the designer lots of direction to follow. Terry said he would support rotating the field and would support that micro managing of the fields be left to the designers.

Sarah asked about the timeline for installing the lights. Eric said construction is dependent on which phase a field is to be built. Currently, there isn't funding to build all the fields slated for Phase 2. Construction on Phase 2 will begin in 2006, with the final

lighting design being done in 2005. Eric pointed to fields that are in Phase 3; it may be 2008-2010 before these are built. Eric agreed with earlier statements that lighting technology could change dramatically by the time these fields are built.

Sarah asked about the timeline for installation of the soccer fields. Eric said that, most likely, Phase 2 would include one rugby, one soccer, and one little league field. Guy pointed out the location of these fields on the map. Fields to be built in Phase 3 remain funding dependent.

James stated that, according to the documents the Board received, there would not be much light spillage into the residential neighborhood, as currently proposed in the plan. The real problem is glare and glow and this has to do with the number of fields. Guy said that it is more an action of the lighting technology that is chosen. There is a tradeoff between spill light. Eric said that the Board may remember that some years ago two lighting demonstrations were held, with vendors demonstrating the full cutoff and shielded conventional systems. People in the neighborhood looked at the field with the lights set up. By far, people preferred the full cutoff lights to the shielded conventional because it had the least glow.

Ken said that, in trying to mitigate the impact on the houses to the south, the technology that might be used there is slightly different from other areas. The rest of the lights used may be those that will minimize skyglow, where the glare and skyglow would be less of an impact. This is a large site and it is important to keep in mind the distance between the on-site (transitional) housing and the site where you would first see the ballfield lights. Because of the distance, there will not be enough spill to actually impact the houses.

Bruce asked if the overall goal is to minimize glare and Eric agreed. Bruce said this is a concern of not only those living in transitional housing on site and neighbors of Sand Point Magnuson Park, but also the Eastside Friends of Lake Washington (Kirkland). Bruce asked Patti Petesch how often all the fields would be lit at one time. Won't this be a rare occurrence? Patti said that, due to mitigation for when the lights are to be turned off, all lights would not be on at the same time after 9:00 pm.

Patti said that lighting needs are different for soccer and baseball fields. Lighting is more critical for baseball games, as the ball travels higher, and the shielded conventional is the preferred type of lighting. In soccer, the ball is nearer the ground.

Eric said the plan has gone through a lot of process to get to this point. The initial plan proposed a mix of class 3 and class 4 level lighting (level 4 is the lowest level of light for safe recreational play and class 3 the next level up.) As mitigation, it was decided that all fields would go with the lowest level of lighting (class 4.) Staff considered the shielded conventional lights for the three little league fields as well. They came to the conclusion that, although full cutoff lights are not the optimal lighting system for little league, that is the type to be used to mitigate some of the potential glare.

Parking was another concern and Eric said that parking spaces in the athletic field area were made tighter to address some of those concerns.

Ken stated that the type of lights and level of lighting is geared for the minimal safe recreation play level. Everything else (height of the poles, how many poles, shielded conventional, or full cutoff lights) is dependent on mitigating impacts. Lighting levels cannot be reduced any further and still have safe play. If lighting impacts are further reduced, the choices are eliminating lit fields or reducing even more the hours that lights can be on.

James asked if this configuration has the lowest minimum lighting impacts of all the plans seen by the Board. Eric answered yes. Would rotating the fields have any impact on the lighting other than in the south area. James said he personally thinks the lighting impacts are the most significant and least desirable aspect of this sports complex plan. Lighted fields, wherever they are, become a beacon. However, he does not want to eliminate fields and believes that operational aspects can be dealt with in the future. Terry said he looks at Bellevue High School from his home and its lights are very noticeable. He believes that the lighting industry has responded to needs and continually improves its technology. He has visited a number of athletic fields and the lights of one field near Sea-Tac are only noticeable from ½ block away.

Hours

Eric again stated that the lights on the small fields are to be turned off at 9:00 pm; five fields turned off at 10:00 pm; and the other five turned off at 11:00 pm. The two fields nearest transitional homeless housing will be the last two to be turned on (all other fields must be in use, and lit, for these lights to be on.)

Sarah asked about the sequencing of games. Patti said that two soccer games could be played on a field from 7:00-11:00 pm and one baseball game could be played. Fields would be scheduled according to which sport is being played.

Ken added that in baseball season the two large baseball diamonds would be lit until 11:00 p.m. James asked if baseball is played year round on the fields. Patti said that it can be played year round, but here in Seattle the fields are used for soccer in the fall. Parks' staff anticipates some fall baseball games, which may be scheduled at the dedicated baseball fields at Lower Woodland.

James commented that baseball is usually played during the sunny summer months. Terry believes that if the outfields are used during early evening for kids' soccer practice, the kids will leave early to go home. It is unlikely these fields will run into late use.

Correspondence

Terry listed some concerns that have been received in correspondence. One of the general concerns, that he wanted to get on the record, is that Audubon doesn't want to see the ball fields built and not have wetlands. Eric said that, from a regulatory point of view, if there are any wetland impacts in a phase they must be mitigated within that phase. If wetland

delineation is done in Phase two and it is determined that a half acre of wetlands would be impacted, that would have to be mitigated within Phase two. The second point is the funding that is available, which is Pro Parks Levy funds of \$9 million for athletic fields and \$3 million for wetland habitat area. The project must achieve some relative balance that is respectful of the funding source. Ken said that a third point is that, from the very beginning, the concept of the plan is that the fields need to be "up" and the wetlands need to be "down". There is a relationship between the two just in terms of the site. Eric agreed and said the hydrology must work for each phase, independent of future phases.

Terry said another benefit that may have been overlooked is the potential benefit to the residents of the low-income housing, in the form of programming that might be offered at the new athletic facilities. There is a willingness from youth soccer to make programs available and he asked if the Parks Department has programs to incorporate programmatic benefits for the low-income residents. Eric answered yes, that 11 different summer day camps were held at the park over the last several years. Parks staff worked closely with the housing association and camp service providers applied for funds and were able to offer scholarships to any of the housing residents who wanted to participate in the summer camps. He expects this policy to continue and expand for both the sports elements and also for environmental learning opportunities.

Terry said many of the e-mails referred to City Council Resolution 30530. Terry explained that at the end of the Joint Athletic Field Development Program, rather than passing the JAFDP as recommended by the Mayor, City Council passed this resolution. The resolution requested information from the Parks Department regarding several items. He asked if a copy of the Park Department's response could be distributed to all Park Board members. Patti had copies and distributed to the Board members in attendance. A copy will be mailed to the two Board members who were not present.

Terry said a number of e-mails were concerned that there is not a demand now, or in the future, for this many new fields. He has worked with John Bates, who is the field scheduler for the Parks Department, and said that John has an enormous task in providing schedulable space for sports teams. Terry thinks that it is important in the adoption process of this project to have good evidence that there is, indeed, a need for these fields.

Ken said that the Board would see some of that evidence in the report Patti distributed. Terry said he had read the report and didn't see that it contained as direct an answer as the Department could give. Patti said in the report to City Council there is reference to the City Auditors' report on ballfield scheduling. The Auditors' report indicates that there isn't much unscheduled space. There is space in the middle of the afternoon, but during the peak use hours of 3:00-11:00 pm, there is very little unscheduled time. On any given day, both weekdays and weekends, the north end fields are filled in fall, spring, summer, and early winter. Parks staff is researching a more sophisticated software system. With the current software system, it is difficult for Parks staff to come up with the information in a quick manner. The Department does have lots of hard compilations and can do more research with this information.

Eric said another question in many of the e-mails is why are 11 fields being built at Sand Point Magnuson Park. He described the ongoing process and recommendations for re-use of this site. The citizen's Blue Ribbon Committee recommended that the site be re-used in a balanced way. James said that he has heard at several Park Board public hearings that more fields are needed.

Terry thinks that the Parks Department's revised recommendations are a reflection of very serious listening to the community and a serious attempt to mitigate the community's needs. This compromise means a somewhat diminished level of capacity of the fields. James agreed with Terry and also said the hours of operation can be changed in the future.

Written testimony may be submitted to the Board until its recommendation at the October 23 meeting. The Board thanked Eric and the others for the presentation and for the very good discussion. The Board will contact Eric if it has questions.

Park Board Business

- After a brief discussion, Terry agreed to serve on the Pro Parks Oversight Committee as the Park Board representative.
- Bruce and Terry are interested in attending the WRPA conference on October 4. The Parks Department will pay the \$55 registration fee.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

APPROVED _____ DATE _____
Bruce Bentley, Chair