

**BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 12, 2001**

Present: Bruce Bentley, Chair
Karen Daubert
James Fearn
O. Yale Lewis, Jr.
Michael Shiosaki
Kathleen Warren

Excused: Susan Golub

Staff: Ken Bounds, Superintendent
Michele Daly, Park Board Coordinator

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bruce Bentley at 7:00 p.m. Consent items including the April 12, 2001 Agenda, Minutes of March 22, 2001, Revocable Use Permit for a water service line from a meter in Thorndyke Avenue West to 1740 Magnolia Way West, a Revocable Use Permit for King County to install and maintain communication system equipment at Madrona Park Dance Studio Bathhouse and the correspondence list were approved.

Oral Requests & Communications from the Audience

Peter Staten, Arboretum Park Preservation Coalition, asked the Board to consider development guidelines and design review of projects in the Washington Park Arboretum and distributed suggested language to be made part of the final Master Plan. "Construction of any element of this Master Plan shall take place only after City Council adoption of Procedures for review and approval of such construction. The Superintendent of Parks and Recreation is hereby directed to submit a proposed draft of such Procedures for City Council action, following public review and comment." Mr. Staten suggested the Procedures include: an affirmative statement assuring continued affordable public access to Washington Park and the Arboretum; a statement recognizing the Park and Arboretum are a significant element in Seattle's legacy of Olmsted Brothers parks and boulevards, a definition of substantial development including parking, landscape features and exhibits; requirement for administrative review and approval, following public notice and comment for Substantial Development in the Arboretum; provisions for public notice, administrative review and approval, following public notice and comment of departures from this Master Plan, or from these Procedures; design criteria to be satisfied prior to approval of Substantial Development, governing the compatibility of that development with the landscape objectives and public purposes of Washington Park, this Master and with the Olmsted Brothers Plans; provisions for appeals of administrative determinations, including provision for appeals in contested cases to be heard by the Seattle City Council, as well as provision for judicial appeals and the Procedures may in addition to identification of responsible officials, provide for referrals to qualified advisory bodies,

either existing or created by these Procedures.

Bob Newhouse reminded the Board that in view of the Inspector General's report where he was criticizing plans and not having identification of money, we are still \$40 million short out of \$44 million.

Randy Williams, President of the Marker Buoy Club, Friends of Seacrest member, spoke against the closure of Seacrest Park for the water taxi project. He urged the Board to take a look at the laws and ordinances as they apply. He does not want to see the area closed to divers. Seacrest is a recreational park and should not be used as a transportation hub.

Jill Janow, Chair of the Pike-Pine Urban Neighborhood Council submitted a letter urging the Park Board to defend the view of Four Columns Park. Four Columns is a designated viewpoint and is protected by SEPA. The view has changed since the mid-80's and thus far no effort has been made to protect the entire view. There is a movement afoot to eradicate the entire view and replace it with a solid wall of very tall buildings. The Boren Pike/Pine Reconstruction Committee has just completed a renovation plan with the aid of a Small & Simple grant. There are Pro Parks and Convention Center mitigation funds that will be put into the park to help turn it in to a beautiful oasis in the middle of downtown Seattle. The Board will place this item on a future agenda.

Jack Connick, Secretary of the Marker Buoy Dive Club, spoke about zoning, ordinances and laws regarding the use of Seacrest Park for a water taxi. The project has been tried three times in the past. Only 16% use the taxi for commuter purposes and 45% use it as a Harbor Tour. The divers cannot understand why this project is being allowed in the park. He wrote a letter to the Superintendent/Board asking that this issue be placed on the Park Board agenda. The Board has had briefings on the water taxi project and will not be placing the taxi issue on their next agendas. The diving club and Friends of Seacrest may submit petitions to the Park Board.

The Superintendent is committed to the use of Seacrest for recreational purposes. In the interest of interagency cooperation he has offered tentative support to the project with conditions. He realizes there will be impacts on the divers and is supportive of an amendment to the Harbor Code that would allow for a smaller buffer zone as the water taxi is not a full-size ferry. He has directed staff to write to the Seattle Police Department Harbor Patrol to propose such an amendment to the Harbor Code. The smaller 150' buffer zone would allow some diving to continue in the area during the water taxi demonstration project.

Fritz Merkel, Marker Buoy Dive Club and Friends of Seacrest, distributed copies of statements taken from the Elliott Bay Water Taxi Business Plan prepared for Metro Transit Division King County which states "continue to use the Seacrest facility for near term, seasonal operation (next three years)." Average load increase projected is 15 to 17. He also distributed a Friends of Seacrest, "Keep Seacrest Park Open" statement. The use of the this location for commercial transportation violates Ordinance 108760 designating this as "a permanent open space for recreational and scenic purposes." The three years of

prior trials have not shown the taxi to be a cost effective alternative to existing mass transit. Recreation is a primary function of Seacrest. It would appear that some land use and zoning concerns, rules and approval/review procedures are not being adequately addressed. Since the taxi demonstration projects have begun, a dedicated express bus lane between West Seattle and downtown has been added. Seacrest coves 1 & 2 and the waters surrounding them should remain open to scuba divers as well as other recreational users. These shoreline and waters can and should be enhanced to promote safety, recreation, shoreline management and appreciation of the natural beauty of Puget Sound.

Superintendent's Report

- Park Board Commissioner Resignation - Michael Shiosaki is resigning from the Board of Park Commissioners as a result of being hired by the Department of Parks and Recreation. He will be heading the Pro Parks implementation team. Michael has enjoyed working with the Park Board and looks forward to starting his new position. Michael will be participating in the Arboretum Master Plan discussion but will not be voting this evening. Michael has been representing the Park Board on the Arboretum Botanical Garden Committee.
- Water Conservation – There will be brown grass in the parks this summer, fountains will not be flowing (except for water features, including Judkins, Pratt and Miller), Park vehicles will not be washed and wading pools will be filled a little lower to help conserve water.
- Pro Parks Oversight Committee – has been meeting under the expert leadership of Karen Daubert. The Superintendent distributed a copy of a Maintenance and Programming Schedule. The schedule outlines the target dates for enhanced maintenance, environmental stewardship and recreation activities.
- Sand Point/Magnuson Park – The City Council unanimously adopted a resolution of the sportsfields and courts configuration. The Department will develop a public process for the overall development of the park. The Berger Partnership has been selected as the design firm for the athletic fields and wetlands project.
- Aquarium – The Council's Culture, Arts and Parks Committee approved the resolution adopting the 2001 Work Program with the Seattle Aquarium Society. This will authorize development of a conceptual plan for an aquarium on the southern portion of the site and open space on the north.
- South Lake Union – The Neptune Building has been removed and work is progressing on the open space area.
- Zoo Takes Precautions – Zoo management is taking precautions against the potential introduction of the dreaded hoof and mouth disease. Visitors will be asked not to visit the Contact Area if they have been abroad.

- Upcoming Events – Spring egg hunts this weekend, Interbay Golf celebration April 20, Earth Day weekend April 21-22.
- Personnel – Pat Maluy, Elephant Keeper, has taken a position at Disney’s Animal Kingdom in Orlando.

Items of Interest to the Board:

Seacrest Water Taxi Issue – Karen Daubert stated she does not think the opportunity is correct now for the Park Board to convey a message that the water taxi at Seacrest is not an appropriate long term use but it may be appropriate when King County issues a quarterly or six-month report.

Tree Policy – Karen Daubert reminded the Board that it wants to review the Tree Policy. Karen referenced a letter from Bonnie Miller regarding Bryant Park vegetation management.

Ivy in Trees - Karen Daubert referenced a feature article authored by Ann Lovejoy regarding ivy in trees. The Superintendent stated the Department organizes volunteers to remove ivy and there will be more ivy removal this spring.

Arboretum Master Plan – Board Discussion and Recommendation

Background

On January 4, the Department of Parks and Recreation released the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the proposed Arboretum Master Plan. The plan, “Renewing the Washington Park Arboretum,” is proposed by the Arboretum and Botanical Gardening Committee (ABGC) to replace the 1978 Master Plan. The ABGC, which governs the Arboretum, is composed of the City of Seattle, the University of Washington, and the Arboretum Foundation. Under the terms of an agreement dating to 1934, the City and UW jointly own and manage the Washington Park Arboretum. The City owns and maintains the land, except part of Foster Island, while the University owns and maintains the plant collections.

Planning for the Master Plan began in 1994 with the beginning of a scoping study, which was published in 1995. The ABGC published “The Arboretum Plan, A Greenprint for the Future, in 1997. After controversy about some elements of the Greenprint plan, the Board of Park Commissioners convened a series of public workshops in late 1998. A summary of public comments was published in 1999. A final scoping report and a new ABGC alternative Master Plan were published in 1999, and served as the basis for the DRAFT EIS, published in mid-2000.

The Master Plan proposed by the ABGC is included in the Final EIS.

A joint Council Culture, Arts and Parks/Park Board public hearing was held on March 28 in the City Council Chambers. A telephone and e-mail hearing was held from 5 to 5:30 p.m. Copies of the 48 e-mails were distributed to the Park Board Commissioners. The public hearing began at 5:30 p.m. 78 people signed up to speak. The hearing was

broadcast live on TV-Sea. Staff briefed the Board on April 5. The Board scheduled their discussion and recommendation on their April 12th agenda. The CAP will be discussing the Master Plan on April 25 and a full Council vote is expected on April 30.

Correspondence received since the public hearing has been distributed to the Park Board members.

Kathleen Warren stated we have come a very long way and the Plan addresses a lot of the issues. She would like to see the Implementation Guidelines adopted, recognition of the Olmstedian heritage and character of the park included and she likes the language that stresses the park function as well as Arboretum function is recognized. She is okay with the road change as it is proposed. She is concerned about the south end buildings and south parking lot. She is concerned about the Education Center Building and thinks it is too big and does not think five education shelters are necessary. She would like at least two more roadside parking areas installed and marked in such a way to encourage disabled and elderly parking. Kathleen does not understand why money is being spent to put in a bike trail that cannot be used by all bikers.

Michael Shiosaki agrees that the Implementation Guidelines should be attached to the Master Plan. He agrees with the issue of the whole Olmstedian nature of the park and believes the landscaping and buildings can be blended together. He prefers the locations of the buildings remain as proposed. In terms of the proposed road alignment, he thinks it is important to move the roadway to the east side. He does not know if it makes a lot of sense to spend a lot of money on moving the small parking lots. It is important for pedestrians and recreation bike riders to be able to get off the roadway. Making sure the signs are modest and unobtrusive in appearance is important.

James Fearn stated we have come a long way in development of this plan. There are a lot of the details of the Plan he has problems with on many levels. The Plan is a concept plan and he thinks years from now people will be pleased with the Plan. The Implementation Guidelines are very good and will give us an opportunity to deal with a lot of things that are being discussed now. He likes the idea of getting rid of some of the marginal parking areas on Arboretum Drive and having that space be open space but he agrees with what Kathleen stated about having parking for disabled and elderly. He is willing to leave that to the people making the decisions. He would like to move forward with the concept and deal with issues during implementation.

Karen Daubert thinks the Plan is excellent. The emphasis on the plant collection and the uniqueness of the Arboretum part is superb. Karen purposed language changes to Page 2, "Purpose and Need." "The Washington Park Arboretum is an integral part of Seattle's entire park system. It is a defining feature of Washington Park, and as such, serves as an important link in Seattle's historic Olmsted park and boulevard system. The City of Seattle owns the Arboretum's land and buildings. Seattle Parks and Recreation maintains the park functions and the University of Washington maintains and manages the plant collections. Both the Department of Parks and Recreation and the University of Washington manage the Arboretum cooperatively. Development of the Arboretum Master Plan will not alter this relationship.

The Washington Park Arboretum is at once a collection of woody plants of international significance and a public park, treasured by residents of Seattle and the surrounding area. The brilliance of the Washington Park Arboretum lies in the rare blending of these two qualities. It is the overriding and explicit intent of this master plan to preserve and foster both of these qualities into the future. This master plan seeks to improve the care, expand the content and increase the accessibility of the collection, while at the same time maintaining undiminished, the natural, informal ambience of the park. To the extent that the plan is successful a visitor so inclined will be able to gain information more easily than has been possible heretofore, while other visitors will be able to relax, stroll, and play.”

Karen stated the first 24 pages of the Plan are fine. She would like to see the Implementation Guidelines as a part of the Plan and has concerns about the built environment part of the Plan. She has concerns regarding the location of the buildings, square footage, and the number of buildings. In regard to the roadside parking she thinks the Department’s response is sufficient. She hopes the signage language can be incorporated in the Plan. In regard to parking at Foster Island, she agrees with the Department’s response. She thinks the north pedestrian overpass is a problem, which can be addressed in the implementation guidelines. She would like the Plan to open the option to extend Arboretum Drive.

Yale Lewis thinks the Implementation Guidelines should be included in the Plan. The staff’s response to the signage is satisfactory and the suggested language to be incorporated into the overall policy language seems good. The alignment roads are okay and he would defer to staff regarding parking along the roadway. He is satisfied that the plantings, terrain and natural features of the landscape will get priority but would be in favor of additional language that would emphasize what money can be used for first. Yale is concerned about the potential expansion of the south end parking. He would like to see language that did not include doubling the parking lot now and set up some triggering mechanism for reviewing it later. He defers to the staff if there should be a new structure in the south end. Yale has concerns about buses in the parking lot. He would like the buses to park at MOHAI. He does not think parking lots should be built in the middle of the Arboretum for large vehicles. He questioned why a 3000 s.f. building needs to be constructed for an education facility as MOHAI is available. If the building is allowed then it needs to be constricted as much as possible so it does not spread easily. He thinks it is a fine Plan and a great job has been done.

Bruce Bentley stated the Plan is good. He suggests an oversight committee might be established which would include community members. A Park Board member serves on the Arboretum Botanical Garden Committee. He likes the idea of having Arboretum Drive moved to the east side and not have it mingle with pedestrians. He would like to see more parking areas along Arboretum Drive. He thinks 14 packing spaces along the south side of Foster Island Drive is a good idea. He has some reservations about the south parking lot and likes the Department’s language. He would like to retain as much green space as possible. He thinks the education center in the south end would be a good thing

and would help support the Japanese Garden facility. He wants to emphasize the partnership of the University of Washington, Arboretum Foundation and the Department. The Master Plan has to be approved by the Board of Regents. The UW manages the collection with the support of the Foundation and the City and the Department essentially manages the park infrastructure.

The Superintendent stated the Board had a previous question regarding how much area is being paved under this Plan. There is some asphalt coming out and some going in. The Portico Group was asked to do some calculations, which Donald Harris distributed, to the Board members. The total acreage loss would be approximately 1-3/4 acre, including the bike pathway (1-1/2 acre). Another question the Board had was the location of the education center north of the Graham Visitors Center and how far does it go past the west edge of the current Arboretum Drive. The two wings and the Educational Gateway structure sit 1/2 in the old roadbed and 1/2 in green space.

Yale suggested the Board could move to strongly recommend the adoption of the Plan with exceptions. James is not certain about including exceptions, as the Plan is a concept plan, not a master development plan. There will be no more development than presented on the Plan and there could be less development. The Plan will be done, in theory, consistent with the Implementation Guidelines. There will be a public process. He would personally pass the Plan and the Implementation Guidelines. Karen thinks the Board should try to come to a consensus, as the Board is advisory to the City Council on this issue and will be providing them more guidance.

Karen Daubert moved the Board recommend to accept the Implementation Guidelines, the signage language the Department has prepared new paragraphs in the "Purpose" as prepared by Karen and the reduction of parking along Foster Island Drive. Yale Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Staff proposed new language for the second paragraph of the Master Plan, section 2.4, which was read by Donald Harris: "Consolidated parking at the Graham Visitors Center and Madrona Terrace should be constructed before the small lots they are replacing are removed, so there is no time in which the parking availability is unreasonably reduced. Parking expansion at the south entry (between the Japanese Garden and Washington Park Playfield) will be timed to relate to the demand created by development and renovation of collections, interpretive trails and trailheads, and construction of new facilities in that vicinity."

Yale Lewis moved the south entry parking language be changed as follows: "Parking expansion at the South Entry (between the Japanese Garden and Washington Park Playfield) will not be expanded unless expansion is necessary for implementation of other parts of the Plan and any necessary expansion will be timed to relate to the demand created by development and renovation of collections, interpretive trails and trailheads, and construction of new facilities in that vicinity." The motion was seconded by James Fearn. Kathleen Warren stated parking at the south entry is not desirable. The wording in some respects allows expansion. James Fearn stated the wording allows for expansion if

it is needed. Cars will not be kept away by not having the parking lot. Karen Daubert stated the other issue is bus parking. Kathleen does not want to see the parking lot expanded until absolutely necessary. Michael stated people will start parking in the neighborhood if there is not adequate Arboretum parking . Yale suggested adding the word “strictly” to the above statement . Karen Daubert moved to friendly amend Yale’s above motion to include the word “strictly”necessary... The motion carried with one vote in opposition. Bruce Bentley stated he would like to retain as much green space as possible.

The Board discussed bus parking. It is Yale Lewis’ instinct to delete references to buses and bus parking and leave that for some later point or discourage bus parking and not leave areas designated for buses. Yale further suggested adding language “to the greatest extent possible buses will not be parked within these areas but will be parked at MOHAI or other areas. James Fearn stated buses will come and you cannot keep them away. If they are directed to MOHAI the buses would have to drive through the Arboretum and surrounding neighborhood. There would be complications of sending buses to MOHAI. Kathleen suggested the possibility buses could be coordinated and not arrive at the same time. Karen Daubert made a motion that buses be kept out of the Arboretum to the greatest extent possible. No second to the motion. Kathleen Warren moved the bus parking spaces be limited in the Park. No second to the motion. Yale Lewis stated there are a number of buses now using the Park and more buses may be expected in the future. The easiest way from a management perspective is simply to accommodate the buses. The Superintendent stated the Department can review ways to manage the buses. The Park Board does not want a lot of buses parked in the park. This can be addressed in the implementation guidelines. It is a traffic management issue. Karen Daubert made a motion to limit bus parking to the extent possible. Yale seconded the motion. The motion carried with one vote in opposition.

The Board reviewed the Education Center issue. Karen Daubert referenced the letters the Board received including a letter from the Audubon Society which talked about the education shelters, the construction of buildings and the whole issue of the Arboretum being used as an education facility. Karen reviewed the Department’s Comp Plan. She reviewed the Fundamental Responsibilities including 1) Listen to citizens and 2) Strengthen our city’s unique relationship with the natural environment, the land and the water, by conserving, restoring and maintaining substantial open space, natural areas, shorelines and wildlife. None of the Fundamental Responsibilities focus on education. The Comp Plan does not talk about the Arboretum as an educational facility. Karen questions the singling out a large building for education. The actual structure of the educational facility does not have to be on site as MOHAI can be used. In the Plan there are 5 educational shelters totaling 1,200 s.f. and there is 5,400 s.f. of new greenhouses and education could be tied into that facility. Even if the rest of the Board feels strongly about that she thinks it enhances the Arboretum experience for the greater public to have it focused and moved into the core of the current building site, east of the existing road. Karen provided schematics as an idea of how that can be accomplished. She agrees that some of this can be addressed the Implementation Guidelines when it comes to the design.

Kathleen Warren made a motion that no education building be allowed by the Graham Visitors Center as proposed and reduce the covered shelters. Karen Daubert seconded the motion. Michael Shiosaki stated there has been a lot of compromise in developing the Master Plan. He thinks education inside is a part of taking a look at the plants outside. The shelters are for group gathering, picnic shelters and recreational purposes. MOHAI is too far away for education facility. It would be difficult to transfer kids from MOHAI to the Arboretum and back. The education center is not a large building and it is important to the function of the Arboretum. A vast majority of the building will sit in the roadway. James Fearn stated plant collections would not be sacrificed for the building. He is willing to make the trade off of a little open space for the education building. The Superintendent stated there is an educational demand in other parks and is expanding the facilities in Carkeek Park and the Audubon is proposing an educational center at Seward Park. Michael asked why the Arboretum was not in the Parks Comp Plan as an environmental education center. It was an omission. Karen noted the city is spending a lot of money on open space acquisition. Kathleen asked what if she revised her motion to state the Board desires a smaller education building and would like fewer covered shelters. The Superintendent stated you have to have space for approximately 28 children, plus a restroom. A multi-purpose room is proposed that can be split into two classrooms. The motion failed with 2 in favor and 3 opposed.

Karen Daubert moved to the greatest extent possible locate all of the proposed buildings that are located around the Graham Visitors Center to the east of the existing road. No second to the motion.

Kathleen Warren moved the Board has a concern for square footage and building space and as the buildings get closer to being built the Board revisit the demand and demographic issues. No second to the motion.

Yale Lewis inquired if someone wanted to double the education center size would the Master Plan have to be revised. It would require a revision to the Plan.

Kathleen Warren suggested Board members could write individual letters to the Council expressing personal concerns.

Karen Daubert moved to adopt the clarification language regarding the roadway parking that is included in the Park Department letter. Yale Lewis seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The issue regarding an oversight committee was discussed. The ABGC is created by ordinance and is comprised of University of Washington, City, Park Board, Arboretum Foundation and community representatives. The Department's public involvement policies have been reviewed and updated. To create an additional advisory committee for a 20 year plan raises some questions. The governance of the ABGC can be reviewed as there have been concerns expressed on how it is comprised. Kathleen Warren would like more community involvement included in the ABGC. James Fearn stated there has been

no lack of oversight during this public process.

Kathleen Warren moved the Board revisit the structure of the ABGC with a particular focus to determine if the immediate neighborhood is adequately represented as they only have one person on the Committee. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Karen Daubert moved the Board highlight the four issues the Board is concerned about including construction of buildings northeast of the Graham Visitors Center, increase the outdoor shelters, construction of the new education building near the south parking lot and the parking spaces at the south parking lot (4.4, 4.5, 4.8 and 3.7). Kathleen Warren seconded the motion. The motion was taken off the table.

Yale Lewis moved the Board recommend to the City Council the Master Plan as presented and revised this evening by the Board of Park Commissioners. Kathleen Warren seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

The Superintendent informed the Board that Department staff will capture the Board's decisions in a draft letter to the City Council and have the Board members review it prior to the Chair's signature. The CAP Committee will be discussing the issue on April 25.

Revised Policy on the Placement and Maintenance of Visual Arts Work on Park Property and the Draft Arts & Culture Plan Briefings

Wendy Ceccherelli, Strategic Arts Advisor, stated she could brief the Board this evening on the two arts issues but due to the length of the Arboretum Master Plan discussion she offered to return in two weeks to brief the Board just prior to the public hearings. The hearings have been publicly advertised. The Board thanked Wendy and requested she return to brief the Board on April 26 as she suggested. The Board has been given briefing materials to review.

Old Business: none

New Business: Kathleen Warren stated she does not think it is fair to let people speak during the Oral Requests and Communications section on an issue when there was a public hearing opportunity and a two week written comment period. The Board can announce that no more public testimony will be received on a particular issue. It was noted it is an open public time for people to speak to the Board and generally there has not been a problem when people come to speak on various issues. The three-minute per speaker is enforced. There was concern expressed that the agenda could get into trouble if a whole group of people desire to speak at 3 minutes each. If there is a group pertaining to one issue, perhaps one person can be encouraged to speak on behalf of the group.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

APPROVED: _____ DATE: _____
Bruce Bentley, Chair