

**BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING MINUTES  
August 28, 2003**

**Present:**

Joanna Grist  
Terry Holme  
Sarah Neilson, Acting Chair  
Kate Pflaumer

**Excused:**

Bruce Bentley  
James Fearn

**Staff:**

Ken Bounds, Superintendent  
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

Acting Chair Sarah Neilson called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. **Kate moved and Terry seconded that the agenda consent items be approved, including the August 28 agenda and the acknowledgment of correspondence. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.**

The August 14 minutes will be approved at the September 11 meeting.

**Superintendent's Report**

Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds reported on the following:

**City Hiring/Travel Freeze:** Last week the Mayor proposed a hiring and travel freeze for the remainder of 2003. B&O tax revenues continue to lag and are not keeping up with earlier City Budget Office forecasts. Parks Department seasonal staff will probably be released early this year and the Department is restricting other expenses.

**New Baby Otter:** Aquarium staff flew to Seward, Alaska, over the weekend and brought back a rescued baby otter that will be raised at Seattle's Aquarium.

**Pool Closures:** Next week, both Ballard and Southwest Pools will be closed for one week for budgetary purposes. The Department has begun closing the wading pools for the season. A few will be open over Labor Day weekend, and then will close for the season.

**Green Lake News:** All water access to Green Lake was recently closed due to toxic algae bloom. Every day through the summer, water samples have been taken daily from the swimming beaches at both Lake Washington and Green Lake. Green Lake recently tested high and was closed. It will remain closed for the season, as all swim beaches are scheduled to close soon.

The good news about Green Lake is that staff are continuing with the permitting process in anticipation that funds will be forthcoming from the 2004 capital budget to implement an alum treatment for the lake. The lake would then be available next summer for recreational activities.

**Homer Harris Park:** The first, and well attended, public meeting with the community for the development of Homer Harris Park had a full house at the Garfield Community Center on August 20. The community was fully engaged in the park design/concept discussion.

The Board asked to receive a copy of announcements regarding this park.

**Cal Anderson Park:** The Department has been working with the community over the last two-three weeks regarding some illegal behavior in Cal Anderson Park. Ken, several citizens, and Parks Department staff did a walk-through this morning to look at ways to improve the situation.

**Don Armeni Boat Ramp Repaved for Free:** Chevy Truck Company re-paved and re-stripped the Don Armeni Boat Ramp parking lot in exchange for use of the parking lot on August 23-25 for a photo shoot.

**Summer Beaches:** Although two beaches have been closed this summer, attendance is up nearly 45% over last year.

**Deputy Superintendent Hiring Update:** Park Board Chair Bruce Bentley was involved in the hiring process for the Department's new Deputy Superintendent. Ken has selected a candidate, B.J. Brooks, who was previously head of Denver's parks system. Hopefully, this position will be exempted from the hiring freeze and she will begin work in mid-to-late November.

### **Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience**

Sarah 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.

### **West Point Settlement Agreement Briefing/Public Hearing**

Kevin Stoops, Parks Department project manager, came before the Board to give a briefing on the West Point Settlement Agreement. The Board also received a written briefing, included in these minutes. A public hearing followed the verbal briefing. The Board is asked to make a recommendation on the Agreement at its September 11 meeting.

### **Written Briefing**

At the August 28 meeting of the Board of Parks Commissioners, a proposal to accept

approximately \$5,000,000 from King County as a result of the West Point Settlement Agreement will be presented and public testimony taken on the matter. This memo and supporting documents are intended to provide a brief background on this issue. The Board is scheduled to discuss this on September 11 and make recommendations to the Superintendent.

**Background:** King County, as a result of a settlement agreement between Metro and several citizens groups in 1991 relative to expansion of the West Point Treatment Plant, will provide approximately \$5,000,000 in additional Shoreline Park Improvement Fund monies to provide for further improvement of Discovery Park. The settlement provided that such monies should be used for improvements in Discovery Park if King County was not able to implement offsite or alternative sewage solids processing facilities that would allow for removal of the five digester facilities at West Point. In late 2001, after attempting several alternative processes in the early 1990's, King County determined that the digesters would need to remain at West Point and that payment per the Settlement Agreement would need to occur. During 2002, a King County sponsored West Point Citizens Advisory Committee drafted a memorandum of agreement and a slate of recommended projects to be undertaken with the money.

Later this year, legislation will be submitted to the Seattle City Council to accept the Settlement Agreement monies and authorize the use of such monies for Discovery Park projects. Such monies will need to be appropriated of specific projects as is done for all capital projects.

**Public Review:** Seattle Parks and Recreation has undertaken a public review of the proposed Memorandum of Agreement and West Point Citizens Advisory Committee recommended projects in anticipation of the preparation of legislation to accept the Settlement Agreement monies and authorize projects at Discovery Park. Over 10,000 fliers were sent to all households in Magnolia and to other interested individuals and organizations throughout Seattle to announce public meetings on June 18 and July 16 at Discovery Park, and comment forms were provided at the meetings, which were well attended.

**Areas of Agreement:** There was general public support for all the projects recommended by the West Point Citizens Advisory Committee except for the proposed removal of the Chapel and Annex. Several citizens have come forth to suggest that the Chapel, which was built in 1942 as a Protestant church at Fort Lawton, should be saved as an historic landmark that recalls the site's past as well as the structure's former spiritual use.

**Areas of Controversy:** The West Point Citizen Advisory Committee recommended removal of the former Nike building at Discovery Park. This former missile control center is a substantial, reinforced concrete structure of approximately 40,000 square feet and has been used as a warehouse by Parks for the past twenty years. The staff recommendation is to not remove the building until a replacement can be found. Costs of replacing the warehouse and storage yard are estimated at \$3,000,000 to \$3,500,000 in acquisition costs.

There has been strong opposition to not pursuing the building demolition at this time, as well as opposition to the Parks' staff suggestions to use the monies earmarked for such on other work in Discovery Park. Such work includes rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the West Point Lighthouse (Parks has applied to the federal government to acquire the lighthouse, requiring responsibility to renovate the facilities), development of a new comfort station at the Visitor Center area (there are no restrooms for the play area at the park when the Visitor Center closes at 5 pm each day), renovation of the North Bluff Comfort Station (it is currently closed), planning for the future of the Fort Lawton Historic District since the Navy may vacate the housing in the park in the foreseeable future, and painting and repair to the seven City-owned buildings in the Fort Lawton Historic District that were renovated in 1990 and now in need of work.

Much of the opposition to the staff suggestions center on the desire to use the Settlement Agreement monies on habitat related improvements and not park structures.

**Timeline:** Following receipt of recommendations from the Board of Parks Commissioners on this matter, Superintendent Ken Bounds will recommend legislation to the City Council by way of the Mayor, Department of Finance and Law Department. It is assumed that legislation would be submitted in late September and be resolved by year-end such that project planning and design could begin in early 2004.

### **Verbal Briefing**

Kevin displayed a large photo of Discovery Park and pointed out the various areas and buildings that are proposed projects in this settlement. He reviewed the history of the West Point Settlement and public involvement process. He then reviewed the slate of projects the citizen panel recommended. He reviewed the projects that have general public support and the projects that are controversial. Kevin described an additional controversial project as the proposed demolition of the small chapel located near, but not a part of, the historic building group. Kevin also reviewed the timeline for the project. (See written briefing above.)

After tonight's briefing, the Park Board will hold a public hearing and is being asked to make a recommendation to the Superintendent at its September 11 meeting.

### **Board Questions & Answers**

Terry asked how much of the ongoing removal of invasives is done by volunteers and what type of support the Parks Department gives to the volunteers. Kevin answered that there are three ways to remove invasives: (1) on rare occasions there is a capital project that will have a bulldozer come in and scrape away the invasives; (2) as the Park Department crews have time, they do small-scale clearing; and (3) there is a very aggressive volunteer group who remove scotch broom and other invasives. The Parks Department provides the tools and cleanup.

Terry asked if \$50,000 is allotted because the restoration work is too big for volunteers to do. Kevin answered yes and talked more about restoration work and habitat restoration.

Terry asked what the Park Department's expectations for maintenance of these old buildings were when it took ownership. Kevin said the maintenance is included in the Department's Major Maintenance plan. The problem is that at any given time, there are 800-900 projects on the list. Depending on the condition of the Department's budget, 10-30 projects are taken on each year. These old buildings have not been high on the list. Ken said it is possible to do the work with the Department's crews. However, the buildings are large and there are potential asbestos issues. The Department has 400 buildings to maintain, a limited number of painters, and would prefer to spend capital dollars to do this work.

Joanna asked if the \$5 million is to be used just for capital projects, not maintenance and operations. Kevin answered yes.

Sarah asked if the staff recommendation to leave the Nike building as it is now is followed, would those funds proposed for its demolition be available for that purpose at a later date. Kevin answered that the staff recommendation is that, rather than demolishing the Nike building, the funds would be spent on other projects. Sarah asked when space is eventually found to store the materials currently at the Nike site, how would demolition then be paid for or would that still be the intent? Kevin said that funding would have to be sought at that time.

Ken and Kevin explained that the estimated \$3.5 million includes demolishing the Nike building and buying a 1-1/2 acre property with a 40,000 sq. ft. building as a replacement. Demolition is very expensive. The Department is in the process of doing a thorough inventory to determine how much storage space it actually needs. It is known that the Department does not need a space as large as Nike. Because the amount of needed storage space is not yet determined, it is difficult to estimate replacement costs. One Reel has its "Bumbershoot" and "Summer Nights on the Pier" material and equipment stored at Nike. Parks has asked for these items to be moved and One Reel is in the process of doing so.

Kate asked if One Reel is paying rent for this storage. Ken answered that the negotiations with One Reel occurred when Bumbershoot was transitioning from management by the City to nonprofit management. This storage agreement was made some time ago to assist in this transition. Ken has now asked One Reel to remove their items, as the storage was intended for the short-term, not the long-term.

### **Public Testimony**

The following people signed up to give public testimony on the West Point Settlement Agreement:

***Heidi Carpine:*** She is a member of the Discovery Park Advisory Council and co-chair of Heron Helpers. She supports the proposal, except for the destruction of the chapel. She distributed a photo of the chapel, taken in May, showing a sign that she believes encourages the public to believe the chapel is part of the historic district. This is a beautiful wood building in a view setting. It is used for picnics and other gatherings and

is a sacred space to her. It is the only World War II building remaining in Discovery Park. Please save this building for the veterans' sake.

**Valerie Cholvin:** She is a member of Friends of Discovery Park and worked on one of its committees, which agreed early on that no maintenance would be funded from SPIF monies. She distributed a flyer to the Board and volunteered to lead them on a tour of the Nike building. Nike is a mess in the middle of Discovery Park. This is a one-time chance to get rid of it. She is disappointed that the Parks Department has grabbed the \$1 million, which is needed for the Nike destruction, to use for other projects. She urges that the chapel remain and not be scheduled for weddings.

**Mike Ruby:** He lives in the Wallingford area and worked on the negotiations to make Discovery a park. Stay true to the rule that the funds are for open space and natural area functions. Don't take the \$1 million slated for Nike destruction for maintenance and painting. He also wants the lighthouse as part of the park, but do not use this money for that purpose. He agrees that it is a problem for the Parks Department that it currently has no other space to store the materials at Nike. He suggested that Parks hold onto the demolition funds until a later date. He complimented Kevin for giving a fair and balanced summary of this project.

**Philip Vogelzang:** He is a long-time supporter and volunteer for Discovery Park. This is an old military base with lots of problems. He was on the West Point Advisory Council and although it was a frustrating process, he was proud of what the Council came up with. He is disappointed about the possibility that the Nike building might not be demolished, but understands Park's storage problem. He also urged that if the building isn't demolished, that the funds not be spent on other projects but be kept for future demolition. He distributed a picture of the Nike building taken earlier today. He asked that the chapel remain. The Parks Department has 400 buildings to deal with. He suggested that Matching Funds be applied for. Matching Funds cannot be used to paint these buildings, but they may be used to restore areas.

**David Hutchinson:** He is a member of the Citizens Advisory Council and Discovery Park Advisory Council, a trained naturalist, a volunteer at the park, and lives on Capitol Hill. He read a portion of the Memorandum of Agreement, which states "The City shall not use West Point Settlement Agreement monies to supplement funding of routine maintenance or other costs associated with current operations at Discovery Park." The Superintendent signed this agreement and, within 10 days, came up with a plan to spend \$1 million on maintenance projects for which the Parks Department did not have other funds. In 1986, City Council passed a resolution that the Nike building should come down as soon as alternative space is available. 17 years later City staff are still hanging on to this site. He went on to describe \$500,000 in these funds that could be used for the Superintendent's plan.

Due to comments the speaker made during testimony, the Acting Chair reminded speakers that no personal attacks are to be made during public testimony.

**Ellie Adman:** She is a member of Friends of Discovery Park and a volunteer. She urged that these funds be spent for mitigation and to be used appropriately. This is a one-shot opportunity to get rid of the Nike building. If there is extra money to do this, get rid of it but only if there is extra money. She complimented Kevin on his balanced presentation.

**Rosealma Smith:** She has been working for Discovery Park since 1973. These mitigation funds are for the digesters that Metro cannot remove. Consequently, Metro is giving \$5 million in mitigation. The amount was originally \$50 million, and then was lowered to \$23 million. In the 1980's, King County Metro tried to lower the amount to \$12 million, which led to a 15-year lawsuit. These funds are for lost shoreline, due to the digesters remaining, and are supposed to be used for shoreline. Use these funds for legal uses at the lighthouse and to get shoreline at Smith Cove Park. She would also like to see the funds used to remove trees (but not the madronas) that are growing up and blocking the view along Magnolia Boulevard.

**Jim Nuereberg:** He is the Discovery Park Advisory Council Chair and a member of the West Point Citizen's Advisory Committee. Keep in mind that the Discovery Park Master Plan is the guiding principal for his group to address land use issues and uses of monies. The Citizen's Advisory Committee chose projects to fulfill the Master Plan with these mitigation funds in order to get the most "bang for the bucks." He agrees the Nike demolition is an issue and urges that the demolition funds be preserved for the future. Follow the path that the Citizen's Advisory Committee blazed and vote approval of the recommendations, as submitted by the Committee, to City Council. He then listed the Committee's recommendations.

**Diane Spaulding:** She is a friend of Discovery Park and honors everyone for the volunteer time and effort they spend. Discovery Park is a treasure and this is the only time to take back this natural area, with the efforts of volunteers and a good Park Department. This is a sacred piece of property. Don't ignore that the primary priority is eliminating the Nike building and restoring the area around it. She walked through the Nike building and saw lots of broken toilets, broken wiring, boxes, and lots of garbage. These funds will never be available again.

**William L Hews:** He agrees that the Nike building needs maintenance; however, it isn't likely to fall any time soon. If it were up to him, he would drill a hole in the roof, fill it full of concrete, cover it with soil, and plant vegetation. If you can't find the money to maintain the historic buildings now, where will you ever find \$1 million dollars in the future to tear the Nike building down?

**Janet Haggeth:** She has been a resident of Magnolia for 14 years and is also trying to buy the lighthouse. Tonight she is to here to speak in support of the chapel. She read an excerpt from the quick claim deed, which the City acquired in 1978. The deed reads that the chapel should not be neglected or demolished. Who allowed it to be neglected and why has no funding gone to its maintenance since 1978? She continued reading from the deed. If Parks has neglected the chapel, why should Parks be allowed to acquire the

lighthouse when it has not maintained the historic district that it is required by contract to do?

**Aileen Quackenbush:** She opposes destruction of the chapel; however, she does not want it used for purposes other than as a place to go to seek some spiritual connection. The cost of tearing the Nike building down and hauling it to the landfill would be exorbitant. She asked whether the option of covering it with earth to make a natural habitat has been explored.

**Judy Raymer:** She lives in Bay Terrace, which borders the park. She is a volunteer at the Discovery Park Visitor Center and lives near the park. Add the word "inspiration" to the description of the chapel. She read a note her mother wrote her in 1968, while she lived in New York, regarding Jane Fonda and United Indians of All Tribes disrupting services at the chapel. 40-50% of the visitors she assists are interested in the lighthouse. Please be mindful of the chapel and lighthouse both are treasures.

**Thomas Palmer:** He is a member of the Discovery Park Advisory Council and Adopt-a-Park and has spent over 6,000 hours in volunteer work at the park. Keep the Nike money until an innovative solution is found. \$1 million is much more than adequate to demolish this building. He stated that he and other volunteers do many plantings in the park. Often the plants are donated from nurseries and aren't the appropriate plants for the park. He urged the Department to add a line item for the Discovery Park vegetation management plan so appropriate plants can be purchased.

The public hearing concluded.

### **Board Questions & Answers**

Terry asked how long the Nike demolition funds could be "piggy backed" into the future. Kevin said the assumption has been that once the funds are transferred over from King County Metro that the funds would be used. However, he believes some provision could be made to accommodate holding a portion of the funds into the future.

Terry agrees with the idea to explore waterproofing and burying the Nike building. Kevin answered that this idea has been brought up over the years; however, it has not been studied in depth. Terry observed that it seems to be a strong enough building to cover with soil. Kevin said that are structural considerations, as all the air-handling units are on the roof.

Kate asked about the earlier citizen testimony that 17 years ago City Council agreed to remove the Nike building. Kevin answered that City Council passed a resolution in 1986 that adopted the Discovery Park Long Range Development Plan. Removal of the Nike building was one of the recommendations in the plan.

Kate asked what is the Department's priority of shoreline restoration as opposed to other restoration. Kevin answered that the settlement agreement allows for improvement of Discovery Park and purchase of other shorelines. The focus of the community groups that

met during the summer and fall of 2002 was 100% focused on Discovery Park and there wasn't discussion of spending the funds outside Discovery. Ken said the agreement reads "if any funds remain ....." There are many different ways to spend \$5 million in Discovery Park and the likelihood of any funds remaining is small.

Kate asked about the earlier citizen testimony, which referred to the deed in perpetuity in 1978. Kevin answered that when ownership was transferred to the City, the stipulation was that the City would maintain it as a non-denominational shrine. It has been minimally maintained and heated over the years. The roof has been replaced and the steeple has been repaired.

Kate asked about the Parks Department's view for use of the chapel. Kevin answered that an architect looked at the building in 1993 for possible use by the Department. It was determined that the restroom was inadequate, it would need seismic work, and in 1993 dollars the upgrades were estimated at \$700,000

The question was re-stated to "is there a legal requirement or obligation that the chapel be maintained?" Kevin answered that the discussion with the National Park Service is that the Parks Department is obligated to maintain it for its economically useful life. We are at that junction now. Ken stated that his understanding is that this obligation is different than the obligation the Department has to the seven historic buildings in the park. Kevin agreed. The chapel is not one of these historic buildings.

Kate asked if the public is allowed to enter the chapel. Ken and Kevin answered that the chapel is locked. If it were opened to the public, various fire and other codes would need to be met.

Sarah stated that anyone wishing to submit written testimony to the Board may e-mail their comments to [sandy.brooks@seattle.gov](mailto:sandy.brooks@seattle.gov). Instruction sheets for submitting testimony are located at the sign-in table near the entrance of the Park Board room. Testimony should be submitted as early as possible.

The Board plans to discuss the agreement and make a recommendation at its September 11 meeting. The Board thanked Kevin for the presentation.

### **I-5 Open Space Discussion/Recommendation**

David Goldberg came before the Park Board at its August 14 meeting to brief the Board on this project, which was followed by a public hearing. David returned to tonight's meeting to answer the Board's questions. He asked to make several clarifications to citizen correspondence the Board has received regarding size of the proposed uses in the park, the preliminary cost estimates and budgets for these uses, and lighting. Some correspondence has suggested that an inordinate portion of the budget is being designated for irrigation in the off-leash area. The preliminary estimates are:

- 20% or so for irrigation; this figure may decrease

- 10-15% for the mountain biking area
- 15-20% for the pedestrian stairs
- 25% for landscaping
- 14% for pathways
- 16% for parking and seating

60% of the funds are going toward the neighborhood plan implementation, which requested the inclusion of stairs, pathways, vegetation, public art, lighting, call boxes, sports climbing, and bicycle area. The lighting and call boxes are not included in the current budget because of cost. It is not uncommon for the Parks Department to not light parks.

Joanna asked if the amount of vegetation would increase or decrease near the bike path. David said existing vegetation decreased greatly over the last year due to WSDOT construction. Invasive plants that are there now will grow back and it is believed that the amount of vegetation will return to about what it was before the project's beginning.

Kate referred to the recent proposal to install an off-leash area at Gas Works Park. She made a motion to make the 1.2 acres at Gas Works, which had 4" fill and a concrete wall around it, into an off-leash area. The motion was defeated, due to language in the Pro Parks levy. Ken said the Pro Parks Levy identified the I-5 area as a site to consider an off-leash area. Kate said she believes Gas Works Park seemed a natural site for an off-leash area. Why is a site being chosen that requires irrigation and how much will it cost? David worked to develop a site plan that would accommodate all the elements suggested in the levy. The I-5 park is not an existing park and it is a large area. He agreed that irrigation is expensive and the project team is looking at alternatives to keep dust down and to rinse the materials used in an off-leash area. Kate asked where the drainage would run. David said into gravel and soil and the rest will go into a swale, then a detention area, and then the storm sewer. A soils consultant is working to test percolation of the soil. Ken explained that I-5 is being considered as an alternative to the Volunteer Park off-leash area, which was closed after the trees were negatively impacted.

Kate wondered whether many off-leash users might drive their dogs to the area, and, if so will there be a deficiency of parking. She is also concerned that the soil study is not yet complete for stormwater runoff. David said the arborist who evaluated the trees at Volunteer Park examined the amount of urine in the soil. It was determined that the problems were caused by dogs urinating on the trees and compacting the soil, and not caused by the amount of urine in the soil.

David said the amount of dogs in the city is increasing and reminded the Board that each off-leash area undergoes an 18-month trail period. Kate and Sarah asked if putting in an irrigation system in a new off-leash area isn't a waste of money. David said it is a commitment of resources.

Joanna stated that, due to time constraints, she was unable to read all the written testimony sent to the Board on this complex issue. She asked if the Parks Department is

ready to make a decision. Ken answered that a determination of uses will be made, based on the recommendations of Parks staff and the consultants and testimony from the public.

Kate commented that there had been testimony for and against the off-leash area. A decent size area must be allocated or the off-leash area will be a mud pit. She is troubled that volunteers plan to do maintenance on the mountain biking trails they are not experts. David explained that the mountain bike groups do have expert trail builders who will hold training classes for others. The biking volunteers are an extremely organized group and have already demonstrated their dedication to this project.

Ken described the Parks Departments' only "unofficial" bike trail, which is located in Lower Woodland Park, west of the ballfields. Parks intentionally stores materials here that are used by mountain bike enthusiasts.

Terry suggested that the mountain bike trail also undergo an 18-month trial period. Kate agreed with Terry. Ken said that in a trial period, all the proposed improvements aren't made and the project is monitored. David said that there is a huge volunteer effort from the mountain bike enthusiasts for this project and they are proposing \$100,000 in improvements. He suggested a longer trial period.

Terry asked how the size of the proposed off-leash area relates to other off-leash areas in the city and David answered that this is one of the smallest. Terry asked if any other off-leash areas require irrigation. David is unaware of any other off-leash areas that are irrigated.

Kate stated that, according to an e-mail from Chris Leman, an irrigation system for the off-leash area would require a more extensive system than vegetation would require. David answered that if any vegetation were planted here, it would have to be watered throughout the year. The off-leash area will require only periodic rinsing.

Terry asked about the storm drains and WSDOT. David described the proposed future work WSDOT plans for some of the area.

Terry asked about a cost analysis to light just the paths and stairs. David said that lighting for the area would need to be located every 30-40 feet at a cost of \$3,500 per light and would cost approximately \$25-30,000.

Kate asked if it is a requirement of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirement to light the stairs and paths. Joanna asked if the north section only could be lit. David said that the lighting guideline is to light a pathway before stairs, but those who are requesting lighting are primarily asking for lighting of the stairs. He will prepare a rough cost estimate to light the pathway, then the stairs, then the urban trails. If lighting is added to the project, other elements must be removed to stay within budget. Ken said if the Board wants to look at lighting in the design process, staff will prepare the information. However, it comes to a point in a project where the Department can't do

everything. Tonight, the Department is asking the Board if this is the right layout. If so, staff will go ahead and look at lighting and tradeoffs during the design process.

Sarah relayed concerns from Bruce (who was excused from the meeting) regarding parking concerns, especially along Franklin and Lakeview. David answered that Parks is asking for two-hour parking spaces along the eastern side of Franklin Ave. to replace the current all-day parking. David said 15 spaces are included in the site plan; 12 more could be provided in the north area of the park. The plan could be re-configured to get an additional 25 or so more, however, a portion of the mountain bike area would be lost.

Sarah asked if, where rain currently falls in the park, more trees could be planted in the style of formal English gardens. David said the project team discussed this idea. Irrigation would need to be installed to water the trees while they become established. It is very difficult to install temporary irrigation systems. A permanent irrigation system in this area would make the additional trees a costly improvement.

The Board is being asked tonight to approve both the proposed site plan (which includes the design approach, mixture of uses, and pedestrian and bicycle access as key elements, and the off-leash area and mountain bike trail as a subset of the mixture of uses) and to approve the budget. The plan will be brought back to the Board during the design/development phase. At that time, staff will answer specific questions and present recommendations/solutions on the design. Kate asked if, at that time, whether Parks staff will know if the proposed two-hour parking will be implemented. David believes that the determination will have been made by then.

### **Board Recommendation**

**Kate moved approval of the overall site plan, subject to the stipulation that additional information on lighting, drainage and watering of the off-leash area, and parking come back to the Board during the design/development phase. Terry seconded the motion.**

*Discussion:* Terry has been a long-time observer of off-leash areas and has long thought that use of general right-of-ways is a good way to meet the demand for these areas. At the same time, he believes that this site is in a whole new cost category, when its size is compared to others. If a large portion of the budget is being spent on the off-leash area and there is no money left for lighting, he would look to the proponents of the off-leash area to give support as the biking community is supporting the mountain bike trail as a way to free up some money for other improvements. As yet, fees are not charged for using off-leash areas, but he feels in this case it is appropriate to ask the proponents for donations to assist with the irrigation system and other improvements. A short discussion followed on how volunteer groups could give additional support to this project. Kate understood from written testimony the Board received that the off-leash area requires irrigation and that the trade-off for irrigating the off-leash area is that there isn't irrigation for vegetation. David asked to clarify this point part of the design concept is that this mostly dry area not be designed as a "green" park.

**There being no further discussion, the vote was taken and passed unanimously.**

The Board thanked David for the presentation.

**United Indians of All Tribes Agreement Briefing**

Due to time constraints, this briefing will be re-scheduled for a future Park Board meeting.

**Park Board Business**

- The Board asked about the status of committee lists. This will be an agenda item at the Board's annual retreat in September.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Bruce Bentley, Chair