

BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 10, 2002

Present:

Bruce Bentley
Susan Golub
Sarah Neilson
Kate Pflaumer
Kathleen Warren

Excused:

James Fearn
Absent: Yale Lewis
Staff: Ken Bounds, Superintendent
Michele Daly, Park Board Coordinator

Chair Bruce Bentley called the meeting to order at 7:09 p.m. The consent agenda items were deferred until a quorum was present.

Oral Requests and Communications from the Audience

Renee Barton, Seattle Residents for Fair Field Lighting, stated her organization seeks to ensure that public playfields managed by Parks and Schools are designed to work for all citizens, especially neighbors of fields. Parks and School planners must involve adversely impacted neighbors in the pre-planning, pre-funding stages to mitigate impacts of increased noise, parking and traffic and lights. Light trespass should be limited to the greatest extent possible. Light closer to the field. Do not allow soccer and softball to be played at same field. On many football and soccer fields, lighting engineers believe they can now contain light trespass to 0.1-foot candles from any plane across private property lines. When light trespass cannot be so limited it must be demonstrated why not. A point-by-point readout of vertical foot candle levels of a 100-foot wall around the perimeter of the lighted area should be used to measure whether light trespass levels from any angle is within recommended limits. Prioritize investment in more fields on a part with investments in more lights so more leagues can play on weekends rather than weeknights – “turf more, light less.” Improve bad lighting before lighting new fields. Schedule with neighbors in mind by limiting round the clock use. Turn off lights before 11 p.m. when community so desires. To avoid visual clutter, strive for least number of luminaries on fewest number of poles, with thinnest poles possible. Park and School lighting engineers should meet the highest possible standard for containing light trespass and flare in residential areas. Brightness and glare should be contained with aiming angles and shielding and hooding of luminaries such that the brightness from any luminaries is not objectionable off site. No lights should be placed where wildlife habitat can be harmed.

Perry Jones, park neighbor and caretaker, stated it would be a shame to see the little urban forest at Kerry Park go away on the south side of the hill. His primary concern is

that the canopy trees be maintained. The time element is the most important thing in seeing this park transfer over, if needed, to a lower canopy than the existing one. Mr. Jones supports the Queen Anne Community Council's recommendation.

Tom Doyle, Athletic Director, Seattle Prep, speaking also on behalf of O'Dea High School athletic director, expressed concerns about West Seattle Stadium being dedicated as a track and field facility. Historic use of this site has included West Seattle High School football home field but also a football field for Prep and O'Dea since 1950's. The private high schools do not have access to public school facilities. The football season is opposite to track and field. On page 24 of the Joint Athletic Facility Development Program (JAFDP) states "The Pro Parks Levy includes funding to improve the facility for a variety of track and field uses." The actual Levy stated "include funding for improved facility for a variety of athletic uses, including track and field." Seattle voters approved the levy thinking the stadium would be improved for a variety of athletic uses including track and field not making the stadium exclusionary for track and field.

Denise Derr, Queen Anne resident, stated the Parks Department has failed to provide any Complan polices to support their decision to pursue athletic field lighting at the Queen Anne Bowl through the JAFDP. Neighbors surrounding the Queen Anne Bowl have a legitimate concern about the negative impacts of noise that nighttime adult sport league use would generate. Instead of applying the facts of this particular development to existing park policy, Parks has merely stated the obvious, that Parks wants to light more fields. They have dismissed neighbors concerns. Parks justification for lighting the Bowl is based on the existence of lit athletic fields in other neighborhoods. This justification does not address the actual impacts to this particular neighborhood. Furthermore, Parks summarily concludes that the impacts are not unreasonable because there are other lit athletic fields where the residential homes are in closer proximity. Not only does this argument ignore policy, it defies common sense. Proximity alone is not a controlling determinate of what is reasonable. Parks must examine the actual impacts of the development considering the intensity, quality, direction and the continuousness of the sound on day-by-day basis. If Parks were to uphold their responsibility to apply park policy to the installation of field lighting, they would consider the following facts: The Queen Anne Bowl does not have a history of active nighttime use. The Bowl is not adjacent to any other nighttime sports facility. There are no other light and noise generating sources in the surrounding neighborhood. Neighbors are not in full support of this development. The Queen Anne Community Council has requested that paid scheduled use be capped at 1200 hours in order to preserve the facility as an asset to the neighborhood. The field is non-regulation sized. There are two existing lit athletic fields within $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of the Queen Anne Bowl. The field is capable of providing more scheduled uses without expenditure for lighting. There are higher priorities for playfield improvements in the neighborhood, which would directly benefit children (Old John Hay playfield). The JAFDP must not become a contract to privatize our public playfields. The exchange of dollars, which guarantee exclusive use of playfields by organized leagues, must not corrupt park stewardship for the public at large. Free drop-in use is mandated and must not be sold. To safeguard the public, the City Council should have redistribution authority over revenues generated by field rental. Between school and park

levies, the cumulative reserve sub-fund and various grants and donations, \$95 million dollars has already been allocated to improve playfields. With the addition of the unfunded projects in the JAFDP, over \$136 million will be ultimately spend. This enormous expenditure necessitates citizen oversight. We must not find ourselves in a situation where only children who join leagues have access to public playfields. Not all children can pay membership dues, make a large commitment of time or embrace a competitive ethic. The public trusts the Parks Department to equitably serve us all so we must work together to assure success.

Sharon LeVine, Queen Anne resident, asked the Department to check the master calendar and for instance not schedule important community meetings the same evening as the Park Board meetings. She distributed copies of letters from the Queen Anne Community Council regarding Queen Anne Bowl and Kerry Park. Ms. LeVine referenced a letter that Don Harper, Chair of the Queen Anne Community Council's Parks Committee, stating the main difference between the Department of Parks plan and the plan proposed by the Queen Anne Community Council for Kerry Park is the timing. The QACC feels the community has lost and continues to lose many of its heritage trees such as at the boulevard, Kinnear Park, Rogers Park and the west side of the hill above Magnolia bridge. Trees are being removed and in many cases are not being replaced. The Community Council asks the Parks Department to slowly remove and replace trees in Kerry Park in order to assure there remains now and into the future a small urban forest.

Ms. LeVine concurs with Denise Derr's comments regarding the Queen Anne Bowl and referenced a letter from Ellen Monrad, Chair of the Queen Anne Community Council ... "we respectfully request that no additional hours of use be scheduled at the Queen Anne Bowl beyond the current 1,200. This will allow both the residential community and the sports community to have clear, common expectations about the use of the Bowl, and will alleviate any fears in the residential community that the increase to 1,200 is just the second of many more increase to come." Ms. LeVine stated in the Queen Anne plan it was specifically written to ensure that the Bowl would not be lit and would not become a regional facility. Parks Department athletic officials have felt the Bowl would be an appropriate place to light and somehow when the Queen Anne plan was submitted that element of plan was removed and the wording was changed to enable Parks to implement the JAFDP. The Bowl is natural and sound is amplified into the neighborhood. The community agrees that 1,200 hours is the maximum hours that should be scheduled at the Queen Anne Bowl.

Doug Jackson, Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks (FSOP), distributed a letter dated January 8 addressed to Jack Lane, Mt. Baker Boating Advisory Council, regarding the proposed rowing and sailing center expansion. They are supportive of having the program at Sayres Park and think with some careful design this can be done in a manner that would not intrude as significantly into the Boulevard viewshed and would be more compatible with the goal of protecting the character of the Olmsted legacy. The FSOP feel there are other approaches worth exploring, including reconfiguring the existing sailing building, placing shower rooms at the rear of expanded sailing building, providing a kayak storage shed along the water to the north of the rescue launch building,

maintaining long shell storage in the existing boathouse so a new rowing boathouse does not have to be as deep, reducing or eliminating the restrooms associated with the meeting space since there are restrooms at the site, utilizing exterior stairs and deck to provide egress to a second level is one is need so as to reduce the bulk of the building and provide more visual interest and evaluating whether a kitchen is needed. They think a more compatible approach may be to break the program needs into separate structures, thus reducing he bulk of any individual building. The FSOP would be happy to participate in further design development discussions so that a successful solution can be found from all perspectives.

Sy Iffert, Queen Anne resident/Kerry Park neighbor, would like the park to be kept exactly as it is. Blackberry bushes form a barrier against erosion and provide a hindrance to the wind velocity at the top of the hill. In addition, the blackberry bushes also provide a barrier for “tourists” that visit the park. There is noise from the “tourists” at 2: 00 or 3:00 a.m. The “tourists” relieve themselves in the park, drink and make a lot of noise. The neighbors hire a guard on holidays in order to protect their condominium residences. If the park is made into a tailored park you will have the beer drinkers coming up and down the steep hill at all hours making noise.

Karen Jones, Queen Anne resident/Kerry Park neighbor, supports the position of the Queen Anne Community Council of having a slower approach to the plan for the trees in Kerry Park.

Paul Barrett, lives directly across the street from Kerry Park, and has wondered for years why the park has not been maintained and why the trees at the viewpoint have not been topped. Mr. Barrett supports the Queen Anne Community Council position as stated in their December 12, 2001 letter.

Roger Belanich, Queen Anne resident, stated it is a requirement of the city to maintain the park. What is the mystery of what is the viewpoint? He has been living on Queen Anne all his life. The view has been maintained until the last 20 years and now it has become an entitlement having to do with trees. He wonders why the spruce trees were planted at the viewpoint years ago. There has not been enough money to maintain views at the parks at Kerry or Marshall Park. It is not a Queen Anne issue as the view is for everyone. There are issues in the park relative to beer parties but that is a separate control issue. He urged the Department to get to the maintenance of the viewpoints.

Chris Leman referenced the Zoo Agreement and inquired when it would be signed. Superintendent Ken Bounds stated the earliest it would be effective is March 1, 2002. Mr. Leman referenced the Park Board’s letter to the City Council after the joint public hearing on December 3, 2001 which recommended approval of the Woodland Park Zoo Operations and Management Agreement as amended with a caveat that public disclosure be included in the Agreement subject so specific exclusions and that all animal records remain publicly accessible. Mr. Leman stated there is no legal language in the Agreement to carry out the Park Board’s request and there is time to develop good language. He further noted at the last minute a provision was added that the right of the City Auditor to

have access to Zoo Society information on donors and fund raising activities was denied. Mr. Leman believes that is a major setback from what we have now and all of us have a strong interest in maintaining public confidence and accountability in how the zoo is managed as it is turned over to non-profit management. He urges the Park Board to improve the Zoo Agreement before it is finalized.

Mimi Cristall, Queen Anne resident, believes the Queen Anne Community Council has found some middle ground for the trees at Kerry Park. She says what it all comes down to is what is a view? She asked what if everybody cut down their trees rather than trimming them and added we would all be the poorer for that. Why does city policy seem to preclude pruning? It will take an average lifetime to grow back these trees. What makes sense to her is pruning and prudent removal at a slower pace?

Scott Strickland, Queen Anne resident, favors pruning rather than cutting the trees in Kerry Park. It is prudent to save the resources we have. View protection is important and the Queen Anne Community Council's compromise is reasonable.

Consent Agenda Items

The Board approved the consent items with one correction noted in the minutes of December 13, 2001, page 4 – Broder corrected to Broden. Correspondence received included an e-mail Bonnie Miller and letter from Marion Munn regarding Kerry Park vegetation plan, copy of letter to Seattle Times from Regina Poirier regarding Camp Long, minutes of Mount Baker Rowing and Sailing Center proposed expansion January 3, 2002 meeting, letter from Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks to Mt. Baker Boating advisory council regarding center expansion, letter from Barbara Broderick regarding Discovery Park dogs running off leash. news release announcing Interbay Golf Center named Top 100 golf ranges in America and Joint Athletic Facilities Development Program draft. The Revocable Use Permit for twin service gas line to serve 4123 and 4131 Lake Washington Boulevard South was approved.

Chair Bruce Bentley noted the Park Board does not normally allow public testimony under the Oral Requests and Communications portion of the agenda on an item that the Board will be discussing and making a recommendation at the same meeting. A public hearing on the Kerry Park revegetation plan was held on December 13, 2001 and written comments were welcome up to this evening's meeting.

Mount Baker Rowing & Sailing Center Proposed Expansion – Briefing

Jack Lane, Chair of the Mount Baker Boating Advisory Council, introduced Ned Gulbran, landscape architect, who presented a historical overview of the site. He displayed boards showing Lake Washington in 1916, when the lake was nine feet higher. There was a shoal at the mouth of Wetmore Creek. The estuary of Wetmore Creek went all the way to Columbia City. Wetmore Creek drained most of the Central Area, Rainier Valley and parts of Columbia City. When the lake was lowered the land appeared which is now Stan Sayres Park. The city made the connection southward by building a trestle across the wetland that remained in the area. The city filled the remaining estuary with

garbage, which became the Genesee Landfill. He displayed a board that showed the site in 1983 which was used primarily by motorboats and by Seafair for the hydroplane racers.

The rowing and sailing center was originally funded in the Forward Thrust Bond Issue of 1968 and was completed in May of 1985. Eventual expansion of the Center was provided for when the existing structures were built. Plans for another structure at the Center are included in the Complan. The popularity of the boating programs has outgrown available space in which to store equipment. In the course of a year, the facility must house rowing shells, two kinds of sailboats, sailboards, kayaks and rescue launches that do not fit in the over-the-water launch houses. Lack of space hampers safe and efficient operation of the current program and prevents the offering of new recreation programs such as open-water kayaking that the public has requested.

The Boating Council has undertaken a project to raise the money to build a new structure to allow for program expansion. No funding from Parks and Recreation has been identified for implementation of the improvements. The new building will be used for small craft storage, sailboat storage with masts up, indoor program activity space, an ADA-accessible multi-use community meeting space, and ADA-accessible showers and restrooms. The Boating Council has received two Small and Simple grants from the Department of Neighborhoods/Neighborhood Matching Fund, a grant from McEachern Foundation, and several private donations. The Boating Council has held public meetings to invite comment, successfully completed a CORE review, received approval to proceed and began a fundraising campaign. Some of the meetings held included the Friends of Olmsted Parks, Mt. Baker Community Club, Madrona Community Council, Leschi Community Council, Rainier Chamber of Commerce, Lakewood-Seward Park Community Council and the SE District Council. Letters of endorsement have been received. The FSOP were concerned about the building height. Meetings also have been held with the Department of Construction and Land Use and the Seattle Design Commission. On April 26, 2000, the public was invited to the Mount Baker Community Center to view and respond to the preliminary plans. Approximately 300 people reviewed the planned expansion and the feedback was positive. A presentation was made to the Park Board on June 8, 2000. The Board approved the project. The proposal was for a building of approximately 4,800 s.f. along with 1,000 s.f. for a restroom and shower area. The designer and advisory council have been receptive to comments from Park staff. They are sensitive to height concerns and those concerns have been reflected in the most recent changes made in the design. On September 6, 2001 a public meeting was held by the Mt. Baker Boating Advisory Council on the proposed expansion. Another community public meeting was held on November 7, 2001.

Jack Lane explained that four schematics have been completed and they have come up with a single building of approximately 5,035 s.f. which includes restrooms, crew house, sailhouse, kayak storage, meeting room showers and changing area and storage. The tower element includes an elevator, which would access the second floor meeting room with a capacity of 100 people. In the junior rowing program there are 160 rowers in the programs on a daily basis. Overall the height of the building has been dropped 7-1/2 feet.

The tower is 3 feet taller than the existing sailhouse and the bridge of the new building is 1-1/2 feet taller. The difficulty with the site for building configuration is the number of underground utility vaults. They have met with DCLU regarding building setbacks. When the Boating Council was looking at the site they were very concerned about the view and took the FSOP and the neighborhood concerns into consideration. As you are driving south along the boulevard which is approximately 5-1/2 miles long there is no view obstruction by the facility. The only obstruction occurs as you come around the corner and you cannot stop at that location. Because of the openness of the entire boulevard the Boating Council thinks the proposed siting has the minimum impact on the view corridor. Connecting paths are proposed to connect the boulevard.

The project has changed from the original presentation to the Park Board and there was interest in a follow-up presentation, which allows for the Park Board consideration of the current plan. Kathleen Warren inquired if the site has a construction sign posted. Since the Master Use Permit has not been applied for yet the site does not have a posted sign but information has been placed on the public bulletin boards located on the exterior of the facility. Susan Golub inquired about the process of the project. Pam Kliment, Planning Development Specialist, briefed the Board on the Neighborhood Matching Fund project background and the public involvement process. Peggy Tosdal, Mount Baker Sailing and Rowing facility manager, briefly described the location of the six utility vaults located on the property, the program needs, the desire to avoid moving bulk equipment to use space for indoor programs, expanding the year-round sailing and kayaking programs, maintenance expenses for more roofs and walls if separate buildings are constructed as well as security concerns. The one building aspect makes more sense for future costs and upkeep.

Susan Golub requested the Park Board hold a public hearing. Bruce Bentley commended the advisory council for their fund raising efforts to build a facility to meet the expanding needs of the community. Staff will work with the advisory council to select a date for a public hearing.

Kerry Viewpoint Park Revegetation Management Plan Board Discussion/Recommendation

Kerry Park is a designated viewpoint of the park system and as such the view from the park is required to be maintained. An ordinance amending the Seattle Municipal Code Section 25.05.675P, Public View Protection, was referenced as well as Environmental Policies and Procedures relative to public view protection. The intent of the project is to preserve views from the top of the hill, to reduce maintenance requirements, to remove hazardous trees and to establish erosion-reducing plants along the slope. Fritz Hedges, Citywide Director, introduced Mark Mead, Senior Urban Forester, and presented the proposed discussion outline.

The Park Board had a briefing of the Kerry Viewpoint Park Revegetation Management Plan at its October 11, 2001 meeting and held a public hearing on December 13, 2001. Public comment received at that meeting is reflected in the minutes. The lower residents consider Kerry Park a community play area and enjoy the setting of tall trees and semi-

forested setting. The upper residents, tourists, as well as local media, enjoy the viewpoint with views of the Space Needle and Puget Sound.

Mark Mead displayed screen projected photos of the site and outlined what has been done in the past and what is proposed park in the near future as well as long term. Priorities have been placed on the maintenance work to be performed in this park based on three criteria: health and hazard, invasive plants and view issues. The plan calls for the removal of the ash along West Prospect as they are hazards to traffic. The spruce along the upper slope would be removed as this species does not tolerate the amount of topping necessary for view recovery. Topping opens a tree up to infections and weakens the canopy of the tree. The replanting of selected species of trees that will retain the character of the lower park without growing to heights that will impact the viewpoint is the goal. A replanting plan is being prepared by park landscape architect Pam Alspaugh. The removal invasives and 3 to 5 stems from large deciduous trees to create view corridors is proposed

Kate Pflaumer referenced the Queen Anne Community Council's concerns regarding the value of views and the value of trees and inquired about a compromise. Mark Mead referenced the mandate of retaining the designated view as required by city ordinance. Options to the removal of all trees, reductions in the amount of trees that would immediately be cut down or trimmed and replanting plans have been presented to the Queen Anne Community Council.

Susan Golub lives on Queen Anne and stated the view from Kerry Park has disappeared. People that live on Queen Anne that do not have a view from their homes, other citizens and tourists visit Kerry Park Viewpoint. Susan stated although she was not able to attend the December 10, 2001 public hearing, she was at the briefing on October 11, heard public testimony at that meeting as well as this evening and has thoroughly reviewed the minutes and correspondence. **Susan Golub moved the Park Board recommend approval of the Kerry Viewpoint Park Revegetation Plan to re-establish the view of Kerry Park.** The motion was seconded by Kathleen Warren. Sarah Neilson noted the view is for all citizens and has been officially designated as a view protected site. Kathleen Warren related she is concerned about the maintenance resources that would be required if the trees are not removed. She appreciates the Queen Anne Community Council's point of view and stewardship. Not maintaining the view is against the law. The Department has been sensitive to the community concerns and has made changes to the plan. **The motion carried with one nay vote voiced by Kate Pflaumer.**

Joint Athletic Facilities Development Plan Briefing

The Draft Joint Athletic Facilities Development Plan was presented to the Park Board on August 9, 2001. Following that briefing the draft was circulated for public comment which was due October 5th. Three public workshops were held: September 10 at Bitter Lake Community Center, September 12 at Miller Community Center and September 20 at Jefferson Community Center. The plan was available on the Department's website, at community centers, neighborhood service centers and at Parks Headquarters at 100 Dexter Avenue North. Staff reviewed all comments received and consolidated these

comments into general themes. These themes are presented in two categories: 1) clarifications to the document and 2) feedback that would result in a significant change in the direction of the document. The clarification section outlines issues staff feel are addressed in the draft document but require clarification, as they seem to have caused confusion during the initial review. The policy section outlines issues for Park Board consideration and potential additional recommendations to the Superintendent. A new draft was distributed to the Commissioners.

Alix Ogden outlined the Clarification Issues:

Project Reprioritization – Many comments were received to reprioritize projects or requests to move a particular field or set of neighborhood projects from Attachments B or C (unfunded) to Attachment A (fully or partially funded). Projects mentioned include soccer fields in the Capitol Hill and Central Area neighborhoods, Soundview and Whitman projects, Hiawatha, Interbay and Miller playfields. While staff understands the desire to improve these sites as expeditiously as possible, this document is not the mechanism to reprogram funding previously allocated. To address these comments, it is proposed to clarify the document explanation of the three Attachments and the process for funding projects.

Conversion of Open Space – Some comments focused on the notion that through JAFDP projects, neighborhoods would be losing valuable open space. It is recommended clarifying language be added in the document to explain that most of the sites included in the project list are currently athletic facilities and therefore generally the document does not recommend converting open space into athletic fields. The focus is to make improvements to allow greater use of existing fields.

JAFDP Relationship to Complan – There were a number of comments received requesting clarification of the relationship between the document and the Department's comprehensive plan and neighborhood plans. It is proposed to expand the policy basis section to explain this relationship. The 2000 Seattle Parks and Recreation (Complan) outlines the policy basis for decision-making and prioritizing within all functions of the Department. The JAFDP specifically addresses the Department's goal of providing quality athletic facilities. Include information in the document that shows which projects are listed in neighborhood plans previously adopted by the City Council.

Guiding Principles – A number of comments received related to guiding principles of the document. Comments included ensuring projects were designed to enhance public safety, ensuring projects minimize impacts on habitat, and ensuring projects are adequately maintained after improvements are completed. It is proposed to clarify the first goal on 'quality facilities that provide safe, fun, quality athletic facilities throughout the city' to include that facility design should include principles of public safety in addition to player safety on the field. Guiding Principle 3 under the goal of 'being a good neighbor' addresses habitat impacts. In addition, SEPA review requires a thorough assessment of habitat impacts. The SEPA review process is likely for many of the projects in the JAFDP. Guiding Principle 1 under goal of 'durable fields' states "the development of

new or improved athletic facilities should take into account the relative capital investment of improvements and the costs of ongoing maintenance costs of these projects.” Language would also be added regarding efforts to maintain fields to the highest quality possible given the budget.

Lighting Issues – There were many comments regarding field lighting. Staff believe that some issues can be resolved through clarification of the draft JAFDP. The 2001 Ballfield Lighting Study makes recommendations for lighting standards in order to ensure a safe playing experience for recreational field users. The Department will develop field lighting standards based on these recommendations and other pertinent information regarding lighting technology, player experience, operational considerations and neighborhood impacts. New lighting technology requires light poles must be relatively high in order to safely light the field surface while allowing for shielding surrounding areas. In most instances projects to replace field lighting and projects to add new lighting systems to other fields do not compete for the same funding. It is a priority to improve the quality of play and minimize the impact to neighbors at fields that are currently lighted and it is a priority to increase capacity by adding quality lighting systems on currently unlighted fields.

Term ‘Field Sports’ – Concern was raised by the use of the term “soccer fields” throughout the public review draft of the JAFDP actually refers to fields that can be used by multiple sports, such as ultimate frisbee and rugby. These sports groups requested different terminology be used to acknowledge that a variety of sports may be played on many of the proposed improved fields. The document will be modified to include language for appropriate sites (including project lists and table 1).

South Seattle Community College – The community college has stated they have no plans to pursue this project; the project will be removed from Attachment B.

Genesee Field #1 – Concern was raised by some community members that this field was not included in the list of projects. This omission was an oversight and should be included in Attachment B.

Michele Finnegan outlined the Policy/Project Issues:

Field Lighting – Hours of field light use at outdoor athletic facilities was the topic of many comments received during the public comment period. Many neighborhoods with existing lighted fields, as well as neighborhoods with proposed new lighting systems, raised concerns over field use until 11PM. The JAFDP focuses on the physical development of athletic fields. In recognition that the increased capacity that results from these physical improvements has an impact on surrounding residents, the JAFDP Guiding Principles includes a section on neighborhood impacts. Staff recommends revising Use and Scheduling of Outdoor Athletic Facilities Policy to include hours of scheduled use at Athletic Facilities and to address several other issues. As part of these revisions, we will bring options to the Park Board in the next couple of months that will include turning off field lights at certain Parks-owned fields earlier than 11PM along with an analysis of the

impacts on the capacity of our field system. The School District has determined through a separate process that lights at the four athletic complexes being constructed at Chief Sealth, Rainier Beach, Ingraham, and Addams/Hale will be turned off by 10PM every evening. Additional issues that revisions to the policy may include are noise, user behavior, parking, complaints, etc. All issues that have been raised in the public comment on the draft JAFDP. Language referring to the revision of this policy will be included in the JAFDP.

The Board will be reviewing revised field scheduling policies at a future meeting. A city audit has just been completed which staff is reviewing. The policies will include procedures for practice, hours of lighting and behavior code requirements. Kathleen Warren expressed concern about budget cuts and what is going to happen to Seattle's field scheduling as King County closes athletic fields. Michele Finnegan indicated John Bates of the Department's Scheduling Office will need to have the revised policy of the operating hours prepared by late spring for implementation in 2003.

Queen Anne Bowl: Two primary issues were raised with regard to Queen Anne Bowl. Many people expressed concern over lighting the field (and some supported lighting the field). There was also the recommendation to make it a youth only field. Staff Recommendation: Maintain existing draft language proposing field lights at Queen Anne Bowl and use by both youth and adults. Lighting: The decision to include lights at Queen Anne Bowl is consistent with the criteria to light other athletic facilities throughout the City. Many of other existing lighted fields as well as many fields that are proposed to have new lights are in residential areas; some of which have more residential units more closely located to the field than the current conditions near the Queen Anne Bowl. Design decisions to minimize impacts to the community and a determination for hours of operation would be part of the public involvement process for the project once design funding is secured. Youth Only Facility: Our youth only sites are designated as such because of size, some of our fields are too small for adults to use safely or effectively. Designating a field capable of accommodating adults, as youth only, is not consistent with our current policies.

West Seattle Stadium: We received some comments regarding the development of the Stadium as a dedicated track and field facility. Comments were based on the historic use of this site by West Seattle High School (WSHS) football as a home field. If football is no longer played at West Seattle Stadium, WSHS would have to play at one of the School District sports complexes or Memorial Stadium. We also heard some comments to keep the rifle range at the site. Staff Recommendation: Maintain existing language regarding dedicated track and field facility. Track and Field Facility: While there are 5 dedicated football stadiums in the City, this would be the only dedicated track and field facility. This facility would be the only site that provided all track and field events and would be a training site for school and recreational teams throughout the city. Rifle Range: The rifle range operation is a separate issue from the JAFDP. It is possible for the range to continue operation if either the dedicated track and field facility was developed or if football and track both continued at the Stadium. The only improvement that would impact the rifle range is if the south grandstands were demolished for a 400-meter oval.

This scale of improvement would far exceed the current funding available for improvements.

Patti Petesch, Manager of Citywide Programs, informed the Board that West Seattle Stadium users including West Seattle High School, O’Dea High School and Seattle Prep will be able to use Seattle School District facilities for football.

The Park Board will be holding a public hearing on the Draft Joint Athletic Facilities Development Program on January 24, 2002 at 7:00 p.m. in the Park Board Room at 100 Dexter Avenue North.

Park Board Business:

Superintendent’s Report

- The Sand Point/Magnuson Park DEIS for Drainage, Wetlands, Sports Fields/Courts has been published and distributed. A public hearing is slated for February 4, 2002. Comments are due by February 28, 2002. The Park Board will be briefed on the EIS in the spring with the document is scheduled to go to the City Council in June or July.
- Pro Parks Opportunity Fund – 44 applications were received – 19 for the \$2 million for acquisition and 25 for \$1 million for development projects. The applications are well
- distributed throughout the city, with both development and acquisition applications from each of the six neighborhood sectors.
- Golf –The Department has received a consultant’s final response regarding the current management arrangement with Seattle Golf. It is anticipated the Park Board will be scheduling a review process in February.

Items of Interest to the Board

Retreat Agenda Items:

The Park Board will be attending a retreat on Saturday, January 26, 2002, 9 a.m. - 2:00 p.m., at the Cedar River Watershed Education Center.

- Kathleen Warren requested the Board discuss budget challenges and new Mayoral changes and focus.
- Sarah Neilson requested the agenda to include Pesticides and Jet Skis
- Bruce Bentley requested updates on the Community Center Levy Projects

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

APPROVED: _____ DATE: _____
Bruce Bentley, Chair