

Board of Park Commissioners  
Meeting Minutes  
June 24, 2004

Present: Bruce Bentley, Chair  
James Fearn  
Joanna Grist  
Terry Holme  
Sarah Neilson  
Kate Pflaumer

Staff: Ken Bounds, Superintendent  
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

Chair Bruce Bentley called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. **James moved approval of the Consent Items including the June 24 agenda, June 10 meeting minutes, and acknowledgement of correspondence. Terry seconded the motion. Sarah asked for corrections on pages 1 and 11 of the minutes. The vote was taken and the motion, including minutes as amended, passed unanimously.**

### **Superintendent's Report**

Ken Bounds, Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, reported on the following:

Emergency Repair at Pier 62-63: Damage occurred to the stringers at the concert area this past week. Crews performed emergency repairs and the Department's engineers have inspected and approved the repairs.

Good News on Summer Youth Scholarships: The Mayor and the City's Budget Office have come up with \$186,000 for summer youth scholarships for 330 kids on the waiting list. The funds are from the Family and Education Levy.

WMBE Vendor Fair: Parks held a successful Women and Minority Owned Business Enterprises (WMBE) fair this week, with 70 vendors in attendance. Staff from Parks, as well as other City departments, attended. Vendors were pleased as this opportunity to meet City buyers.

Occidental Square Improvements: On Monday, June 14, Project for Public Spaces (PPS) led the last of three public workshops to engage the community in establishing a vision for transforming Occidental Square. About 30 residents, business representatives, and property owners attended. PPS presented recommendations for programming, management, and physical improvements. Attendees were supportive of the efforts but expressed a variety of concerns. Parks Department staff also provided a briefing on the PPS plan to the Pioneer Square Preservation Board on June 15. The Board echoed some of the community comments.

Alki Beach: Alki beach fire maintenance and monitoring program will start next week with two staff working the evening shift. They will help park users understand and use good practices when burning fires on the beach and help with general maintenance. Parks staff are looking for the same positive results as last year, and we will coordinate with the Northwest District to provide consistency between Alki and Golden Gardens, the other beach where fires are allowed.

Goose Count: Last week staff from Seattle Parks, Seattle Public Utilities, the University of Washington, and Seattle Police Department Harbor Patrol counted adults and goslings during the second regional Canada goose count. The numbers of geese are declining — a three-year comparison based on the count for June shows 1,425 in 2002; 846 in 2003; and 750 for this year.

Lifeguards and volunteers cleaned up mounds of goose droppings from the swimming beaches and grass areas around wading pools. This appeared to be the first real cleanup effort of the year, so the assistance of the goose volunteers was appreciated. After being cleaned, the beach rafts were disinfected.

Sarah asked if animal groups are happy with these results. Ken will assess this with the groups and report back to the Board.

Summer Playgrounds Open: Seattle Parks and Recreation opened 21 playground sites across the city to provide safe, supervised, drop-in activities for children and youth. Vital staff support for Parks Playground Recreation Leaders comes from Seattle teens participating in the Human Services Seattle Youth Employment Program (SYEP) and teens volunteering with Parks Youth Engaged in Service (YES).

Beaches Open: With temperatures in the 80s, four life-guarded swimming beaches opened this past Saturday. Matthews Beach, West Greenlake Beach, Madison Beach, and Seward Beach recorded 4,896 passive patrons and 1,854 active swimming patrons. Madison, as usual, received the most visitors — an astounding 619 active swimmers and 2,657 passive patrons in just two days. Lifeguards performed **four** deep water rescues in the first three days.

Since the alum treatment was applied, Greenlake is remarkably clear and the bottom of the lake is now visible. Bruce complimented Parks staff on a great job in restoring the water quality.

Fairmount Ravine: Parks Planning and Development staff, along with staff from the Department of Planning and Development (DPD), are working together to resolve issues associated with illegal grading, tree cutting, and brush removal on Park Department property next to a housing development at 2100 Fairmount Avenue SW in West Seattle. In mid-May, the contractor for the adjacent development was observed grading an environmentally critical area more than 40 feet onto park property. In addition to illegal grading, large areas of Park vegetation have also been cleared in anticipation of the development. As soon as the problem was identified by Park's staff, DPD issued a "Stop Work" order for the project and advised the property owner to rectify the issues outstanding with Parks before they would allow the development to continue. The developer has acknowledged his responsibility for much, but not all, of the damage. Parks staff members are working with the Law Department on next steps.

Grand Opening of the Sonics/Storm Basketball Courts: Earlier this year, the Park Board voted to recommend renovation of the outdoor basketball courts at Green Lake Community Center. On Monday, June 21, the newly-renovated courts opened, with a great turnout. Seattle Storm and Sonic players attended the grand opening along with Nate McMillan, Wally Walker, and the Sonics and Storm CEO, Howard Schultz. Green Lake courts are one of many courts renovated through the partnership of the Sonics/Storm and the Seattle Parks Department.

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

Bruce explained that this portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had, or are not scheduled for, a public hearing before the Board. 10 people signed up to give testimony and 7 of those spoke when their name was called.

Wayne Palsson: He has lived in the Seattle area for 25 years. He urged that the Wawona (a large wooden ship undergoing refurbishment and slated to be moved from South Lake Union (SLU) Park) remain moored at the Park. He gave an overview of the ship's history and stated that it is a centerpiece of the maritime heritage park being planned at SLU. Northwest Seaport owns the large ship and has been told by City staff that it must be

moved during the refurbishment. He presented a petition with 700 names requesting that the ship remain at SLU and asked that the SLU park plan be amended to allow the Wawona to remain there.

Alice Winship: She has worked as a volunteer for eight years restoring wooden boats. She asked that the Wawona remain at SLU during its refurbishment. A maritime center is not only a row of picture perfect ships — the public wants to see the restoration process, too. The refurbishment work at this site has a good history, as no volunteer has ever been injured during the work. She invited the Board to attend the Wooden Boat Festival. She asked the Parks Department to not make an irrevocable decision that the Wawona must move from SLU. The ship is too large to fit in the area at the north end of Lake Union, where it is scheduled to be moved. Don't bulldoze the current site where the ship is moored, just to turn it into a parking lot.

Shannon Fitzgerald: She thanked the Park Board for the opportunity to address them and requested that the Wawona remain at SLU. The Wawona is an icon and has a unique story of hauling lumber and cod. She has lots of out-of-town visitors and always takes them to see the Wawona — and they always feel the trip is a memorable one. Citizens and volunteers see great potential for an educational opportunity here. Her volunteer group is writing a business plan for the restoration efforts and is working on education and outreach.

Susan Givins: She discussed the economic impact of the Wawona. She gave as an example the maritime museum in San Francisco, which 35,000 students visit yearly. The Wawona is part of an economic and educational opportunity. Maritime heritage has a strong following not just in Seattle, but in many other areas. Folks will come from all over to visit a maritime museum in Seattle.

This concluded the 15 minutes of Oral Communication scheduled to be heard at the beginning of the meeting. The Chair resumed regular agenda items, and the remainder of the speakers who signed up to testify were heard after regular Park Board agenda items and just before Park Board business.

## **Briefing: Woodland Park Zoo's Proposed Naming Policy**

Dewey Potter, Parks Department Communication Manager, came before the Board to give a briefing on the Woodland Park Zoological Society's Proposed Policy for Naming of Buildings, Spaces, and other Features or Objects. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing — both are included below in these minutes.

### **Written Briefing**

#### **Section 1. General Policy**

Proposals for naming facilities, including but not limited to buildings, interior and exterior spaces, landscapes, roads, physical features or objects at the Woodland Park Zoo (WPZ) are forwarded prospectively to the WPZ Names Committee. The Committee, which is appointed by the WPZ CEO, reviews all naming proposals and forwards its recommendations to the CEO, who has recommendation authority for names of interior spaces, features or object. The final decision to name buildings and exterior spaces rests with the Seattle Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, upon recommendation of the WPZ President and CEO and the WPZ Board of Directors. Members of the Committee also work with naming sponsors to approve the design, placement and wording of plaques. Per the 2002 Management agreement with the City of Seattle, all naming opportunities are to be submitted and updated annually with the Supervisor of Parks.

#### **A. Buildings or Exterior Spaces (Landscapes, Roads, Physical Features or Objects)**

Buildings or exterior spaces may be named for a person or family associated with the Woodland Park Zoo community who has rendered distinguished service to the zoo. Buildings or exhibit spaces also may be named in recognition of a benefactor of WPZ whose gift(s) represent a significant portion of the cost of the building, renovation or development.

1. The guidelines for determining the gift amount which represents "a significant portion" of the project cost, are as follows:
  - a. While a minimum of 50% of the cost of the building/renovation project (which may include an operating endowment) is the desired amount for naming, the target gift amount

for naming will be set for each project as part of the Business Plan section of the Project Agreement, and

- b. Donations for naming must be realized in full within five years of the commitment.
2. Buildings and Exhibits named for an individual/family generally are to be termed "Building, Exhibit, Center, Amphitheater," etc.
3. The names are to remain on the building, exhibit or exterior space for the life of the building/space. If at some future time the building/space is replaced, the name may or may not be carried on the replacement at the WPZ's sole discretion. If the name is not used on the replacement facility, there is to be appropriate recognition incorporated into the new building or exhibit space.

#### **B. Interior Spaces, Features or Interior Objects**

Interior spaces, features or objects may be named for a person or family associated with the WPZ community who has rendered distinguished service to the Zoo. Interior spaces, features or objects also may be named in recognition of a benefactor of the WPZ whose gift(s) represent a significant contribution to the relevant program, or of the cost to construct/renovate the space, or provide the object.

1. The guidelines for determining the gift amount which represents "a significant portion" of the project cost are as follows:
  - a. While the desired goal for a naming gift is the cost to provide and equip the space (which may include an operating endowment), the target gift amount for naming is to be set for each project in advance of soliciting donors in coordination with the WPZ Vice President for Development. Interior spaces which are a part of a total building fundraising campaign should be included as part of the building Business Plan section of the Project Agreement.
  - b. Donations for naming must be realized in full within five years of the commitment.
2. The name is to remain for the life of the space, with appropriate recognition if the space is replaced.

#### **Section 3. Corporate/Organizational Naming Guidelines**

Corporations or organizations are encouraged to be major benefactors of WPZ by recognizing a person/family important to its success. However, in some situations, the corporation or organization name may be used for a building or exterior/interior space based upon the following criteria:

- A. The corporation/organization is prominent in the history of Woodland Park Zoo and/or State or City, with a positive image and demonstrated integrity defined by its commitment to extending the mission of the zoo (education, conservation, research, etc.); and
- B. Donation of a minimum of 50% of the cost of the building/renovation project, unless a different gift amount for naming is specified in the Business Plan section of the Project Agreement; and
- C. Donations must be realized in full within five years of the commitment.

In cases where the corporate/organizational name is used, the gift agreement is to specify the number of years for which the building or space is named and the style of the signage, including the clause that any name changes during that period are at the WPZ's sole discretion, subject to approval by the WPZS Board of Directors and the Seattle Parks and Recreation Superintendent.

#### **Section 4. Approval Process**

Proposals for naming opportunities are to follow the approval process described below to obtain appropriate approvals before any public discussion takes place about recognition of a person/family or approaching a prospective donor for a naming gift.

##### **A. Recognition of Distinguished Service**

1. The President and CEO or Vice President of Development prepares and submits a recommendation for naming a building or interior space to the WPZ's Naming Committee, to be determined by the President and CEO and staffed by the Vice President of Development with the appropriate background materials for consideration. The Naming Committee is comprised of staff and/or board members from the following areas: facilities, development, public affairs and marketing.
2. Favorable recommendations by WPZ's Naming Committee are forwarded to the President and CEO. If approved by the WPZ Board of Directors, the President and CEO forwards the naming request to the Seattle Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, who makes the final decisions on building names.

##### **B. Recognition of Benefactors**

1. The Project Director/Vice President of Development reviews potential donor opportunities with the President and CEO of the Zoo. The WPZ Naming Committee is consulted as part of the development of the project's naming opportunities, before a specific naming request reaches the President and CEO for approval. Naming opportunities should be completed by the "80% of the schematic design" point in the project's development. Likewise, a donor recognition plan and design within the facility must be completed by the end of the design development phase of the project's development.
2. When a naming donor is identified, the Vice President for Development submits the naming proposal to WPZ's Naming Committee for its consideration. The Naming Committee forwards a recommendation to the President and CEO. If approved, the President and CEO forwards the naming request to the WPZ Board of Directors and the Seattle Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, who makes the final decision on building and exhibit names.

#### **Verbal Briefing/Board Discussion**

Along with Dewey, two Zoo staff members shared information and answered questions: David Wu, Vice-President for Development and Bruce Bohmke, Deputy Director of the Zoo. Ken stated that this is an informational briefing to the Board. The Board isn't being asked to take action on the policy, as the policy is consistent with that of the Parks Department.

Dewey stated that the Zoo policy must be consistent with the Parks Department naming policy. She has reviewed the draft and has found it to be consistent. Kate asked about some edits that were highlighted in the copy the Board received. David answered that these were very minor edits and not substantive. Kate asked about the definition of "exhibit space". David answered, as an example, that there is a new rhino viewing porthole and this porthole would be a good exhibit space naming opportunity. Kate asked if there is a limit on the size of the plaque. David stated that the plaque would have to be aesthetically pleasing in both style and context. Ken stated that the Parks Department is very specific about the size of names and will work with the Zoo so that both entities are comfortable with this.

Terry asked how many exhibits are already named. Bruce answered only a small percentage. Some donors don't want to be named. Ken added that donors don't have to be deceased to have areas named after them. The Board thanked Dewey, Bruce, and David for the briefing.

## **Briefing: Green Seattle Partnership**

Mark Mead, Senior Urban Forester, Duane Penttila, Manager of Horticulture Administration, Peter Boen of the Cascade Land Conservancy, and Steve Nicholas of the City's Office of Sustainability briefed the Board on the Green Seattle Partnership, a collaboration of the City of Seattle and Cascade Land Conservancy. No action is requested from the Board at this time. The Board received a written and verbal briefing, both of which are included in these minutes.

### **Written Briefing**

#### **The Forest Resource:**

Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) is responsible for managing approximately 3,700 acres of forested, or "natural area" property within the city. These properties consist of the forested portions of established parks and the many "open-space" properties that have been purchased over time. Within these areas the Department is responsible for the care of over 1,100,000 trees. The Department is also responsible for an additional 120,000 trees that are located within developed park areas and along park owned boulevards. Our forested areas, also referred to as "remnant forests", contain many ecosystems that are vital to the health of the city, including five salmon-bearing streams. These forest resources make Parks the largest single owner and manager of forested property in the city, and the SPR properties make up a substantial amount of the city's total "urban forest".

#### **The State of the Forest:**

With the rare exception of properties like Seward Park and Schmitz Preserve, logging and development have impacted virtually all our forested areas. The removal of the original conifer forest in the late 1800's was followed by a natural re-colonization of the logged areas with short-lived (70 to 100 year) native deciduous species like big-leaf maple and red alder. In an undisturbed natural system, this process would have prepared the forest for a second re-colonization by the longer-lived (300 to 800 years) conifer species like Douglas fir, western red cedar and hemlock through the process called "forest succession". Over time, a typical Pacific Northwest "climax forest" would have been reestablished.

However, very few of the native conifers were left by the logging operations to produce the seed source that would be needed to produce a new coniferous forest. Consequently, over-mature alder and bigleaf maple trees now comprise over 75% of the forest canopy. Many of these over-mature deciduous trees have died, or are dying, resulting in a loss of forest canopy. These changes in the forest canopy and character allow sunlight to reach the ground surface and invasive, non-native plants like English ivy, Himalayan blackberry, holly and others have become the dominant forest species over many acres. These invasive plants now strangle more than 50% of our forested areas and out-compete the native forest understory. The result of these "unnatural actions" is a forest that is generally in poor ecological health and has little or no chance of returning to a native conifer forest without our assistance. As Dr. James Clark, et. al., emphasized in "A Model of Urban Forest Sustainability", *Journal of Arboriculture* (1997), "Given the goal of maintaining net benefits over time, the regeneration of urban forests requires intervention and management by humans." They further state, "people want and need to direct the renewal process because natural regeneration does not meet most urban needs."<sup>1</sup>

#### **The Importance of Forest Restoration:**

Given that the process of restoring the urban forest will be long and costly, one may ask, "Why should it be done at all?" Part of the answer is the variety of benefits that people normally associate with a healthy urban forest such as wildlife habitat, aesthetic values and opportunities for passive recreation and environmental education. These are important benefits for humans and wildlife, particularly salmon.

However, the most important benefits of the urban forest are the values that most directly impact our lives. Trees exchange carbon dioxide for oxygen and thus provide the air that we breathe. As is often stated, "trees are the lungs of the city". In this process trees also remove pollutants from the air that we might otherwise breathe. Trees modify our local climate and, at an individual site scale, can have a dramatic positive impact on air

---

<sup>1</sup> James R, Clark, et. al. A Model of Urban Forest Sustainability. *Journal of Arboriculture*, 23(1): January 1997. p. 21.

temperatures resulting in reduced heating/cooling costs. A healthy forest also acts like a sponge, taking in, holding and slowly releasing rainwater. This leads to reduced local flooding, reduced soil erosion, reduced property damage from flooding and a reduced need for expensive storm water containment facilities.

*American Forests*, the oldest non-profit conservation organization in the country completed an “Urban Ecosystem Analysis of Seattle” in 1999. This analysis measures how the landscape of the City has changed over time and assesses the economic impact of those changes. The analysis is also able to project future benefits as landscape assets are added to and grow. The analysis focused on tree canopy changes in Seattle from 1972 to 1996. During that period of time there was a substantial loss of canopy throughout the City. The analysis estimates the loss of canopy has resulted in additional costs to the City of \$1.3 million annually in storm water management, a loss over time of \$15 million dollars of “natural” stormwater retention capacity and a loss of air pollutant removal capacity valued at \$226,000 annually. Conversely, the analysis estimates that a 12% overall increase in the urban forest canopy (from 13% to 25%) would remove an additional 175,000 pounds of air pollutants with a value of \$1 million annually and would reduce stormwater runoff by an additional 29 million cubic feet with an annual value of \$5.1 million. This information is consistent with the trend for utilizing more natural technologies for environmental mitigation such as “bio-swales” for storm water control as can be seen in Seattle’s ‘Sea Streets’ projects.

### **The Goal – A Restored and “Sustainable” Urban Forest**

The urban forest management goal for the Department and the City needs to be one that restores a sustainable forest with a rich diversity of ecosystems. This is a legacy for future generations worth striving for. We are at a critical time with respect to Seattle’s urban forest. The deterioration of Seattle’s forest, which began over 100 years ago, is going to accelerate at a rapid pace as the predominant deciduous tree species reach maturity and die. We have only to look at current conditions to quickly understand what fate lies ahead for all of our forested lands if we don’t begin to take meaningful action. A sustainable forest will be one that is relatively free of invasive, non-native plants. It will have a substantial canopy cover and will be primarily coniferous. It will have a great diversity of native understory plants and will be host to a great diversity of wildlife.

Sustainable however, doesn’t mean unmanaged. Clark, et. al., have shown that, in an urban environment, the forest is faced with many stresses and requires the help of mankind to be successful. The notion that forests or natural areas “don’t require management or care” is simply not true in an urban setting.

### **The SPR Forest Restoration Program**

In 1994 the Department began to take steps to make up for over 100 years of benign neglect of our forested areas. In that year a “Forest Restoration Program” was initiated in Parks with funding from the City’s Cumulative Reserve Fund.

The decision to allocate CRF funds for forest restoration was important for three reasons:

- ❑ This was the first time the City had ever allocated funds for this purpose
- ❑ This was the first time the City had officially recognized the urban forest as an important part of the City’s “infrastructure” and a valued asset.
- ❑ This action clearly identified the restoration of Seattle’s declining urban forest as priority for the City

The program has had two primary elements. The first element is the development of “Vegetation Management Plans” (VMPs) for selected parks. Through these plans the forest is inventoried, its condition assessed and specific actions or restoration ‘projects’ are identified. The second program element is implementation of the plans through the restoration projects. Typically these projects include the removal of invasive plant species followed by replanting with desirable native plants. Community volunteers accomplish the majority of this work. The initial work is followed by a 3 – 5 year ‘plant establishment’ period. Until the plant establishment period is completed, we consider the site to be ‘under restoration’. Following plant establishment, the site is considered ‘restored’ and transferred to long-term management.

To date the program has developed VMPs for 35 parks, encompassing some 600 acres of forested area. Approximately one sixth of the planned area, an estimated 100 acres, has been replanted with native trees. In

addition, approximately 5% of the area has been cleared of invasive plants and revegetated. It was never our intent to develop a VMP for every park in Seattle, only those that possess unique combinations of forest and use. To that end, within a year or two, all planned VMPs will be complete. These plans, in combination with the substantial information made available by the Seattle Urban Nature Project, have put the Department in a position to move forward with a much more aggressive forest restoration program.

### **The Challenge**

The multitude of successes achieved by the Forest Restoration Program has shown that the program model does work. In particular, the amount of interest shown by community volunteers, as demonstrated by their willingness to perform arduous work in the pouring rain has been motivational. However, as a greater understanding of the overall resource has been gained, as well as the costs associated with restoration, it has also become clear that current funding levels will not allow the program to achieve its ultimate goal(s) within any reasonable time frame, if ever. At the very outset of the program we acknowledged that true forest restoration success would require a collaboration with the greater Seattle community of the like not seen in recent times. After 10 years in preparation, the Green Seattle Partnership was born.

### **The Green Seattle Partnership**

The Green Seattle Partnership (GSP) is a collaboration between the City of Seattle (City) and the Cascade Land Conservancy (CLC), created to restore and sustain Seattle's urban forest. It will be created through a Memorandum of Agreement between the City and the CLC and will be housed at and administered by the Conservancy. The GSP is a cornerstone of Mayor Nickels' recently launched Green Seattle Initiative, which seeks to build healthy communities and improve environmental quality, public health, livability, and economic vitality by "increasing the green" in Seattle. The overarching vision of the GSP is a healthy, sustainable urban forest -- diverse and invasive-free -- and an aware and energized community in which individuals, neighborhoods, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and City government are working together to protect and maintain Seattle's public forests for current and future generations.

### **Goals**

The three main goals of the Green Seattle Partnership are:

1. Restore 2,500 acres of urban forest by 2024
2. Provide training and employment opportunities for youth and others
3. Build the community's capacity for long-term stewardship of the urban forest through increased public awareness of, and engagement in, protecting, restoring, and helping to maintain healthy urban forests

### **Key Functions**

The GSP will coordinate the development and implementation of a program that meets the three goals of the Partnership, and will rally the community behind these goals by linking and advancing urban forest protection and restoration efforts by the City of Seattle, key nonprofit organizations (e.g., Earth Corps, Seattle Urban Nature Project, Seattle Audubon Society, Washington Native Plant Society, etc.), and community-based groups, individual volunteers, and many 'friends of' groups. Specifically, the GSP will:

- Develop a 20-year strategy, a 5-year implementation plan, and annual work plans for achieving the goals of the GSP
- Establish clear performance indicators and targets for the GSP (e.g., acres restored, trees planted, youth trained/employed etc.)
- Monitor and report annually on progress toward the goals and targets
- Raise funds and allocate funds via contracts with appropriate nonprofit organizations and landscape contractors to:
  - Implement urban forest restoration and trail improvement projects at sites agreed upon by the GSP, including volunteer coordination, youth training, and employment opportunities for youth and others
  - Educate the public about the importance of a healthy urban forest, and how individuals, households, businesses, and community groups can contribute to a healthy urban forest

### Verbal Briefing

Mark, Duane, Peter Boen of the Cascade Land Conservancy, and Steve Nicholas of the City's Office of Sustainability, briefed the Board on the Green Seattle Initiative and answered questions. A PowerPoint presentation highlighted the goals of this new partnership, which Duane described as exciting and 10 years in the making. After the presentation, Board members asked a number of questions.

### Board Discussion

Terry asked if staff consider the 12% overall increase in the urban forest canopy (from 13% to 25%) as measurable and an amount that will have a positive effect on runoff and other issues. Duane answered that even though the 13% sounds small, it is not a statistically insignificant amount and is a reachable goal over time. When compared to some cities, 13% canopy coverage is a small amount — Sacramento is at 40% and Modesto is at 35%. Seattle currently has lots of trees, but there are many areas that will need lots of work in years to come. Mark stated that Parks currently owns 10% of the land in Seattle and 25% of this is canopy. If this work isn't done now, we won't have this forest in the future.

Sarah asked how fundraising for this work will be done. Peter stated that it is ultimately the City's responsibility. Cascade Land Use Conservancy recognizes that loss of urban forest is a newer problem. Previous generations did not have to deal with this problem. The goal is to raise \$3 million over the next 5 years. Some cities have received direct federal appropriations to help in their reforestation. Partners in this effort are also thinking of innovative ways to tap into the local business resources. Two-thirds of the value of an urban forest is for stormwater management. In addition, another 1/8 to 1/4 of the value comes from carbon sequestration. He gave as a good example a small local coffee roaster, Vivace, which has a goal of planting enough new trees to mitigate all the carbon dioxide emitted from its coffee roasting processes. If Vivace plants 6,000 trees (5 acres per year over the next three years), their roasting business will reach the "carbon neutral" level and can so advertise itself. That is just one way businesses can contribute and see results from their contributions. This year Vivace has planted 2,000 trees in Interlaken Park.

Sarah asked whether part of the goal will be to plant on both park land and private property. Peter answered that the partners want the Green Seattle Initiative to have very clear goals. There are many other organizations doing good work to remove invasives and re-plant on both public and private land. Seattle Public Utilities, as another example, has a good storm steward program. Peter stressed that the Initiative is huge and the largest of its type in the United States. The partners want to stay focused on clear goals and not go in too many directions.

Duane stated that the City is also developing a citywide urban forestry management plan, which will almost certainly have incentive programs for private property owners to encourage them to plant additional trees to increase the urban canopy on private property. Mark stated that educating the public and training them in stewardship is an important result of previous efforts. Part of this partnership is to honor and build upon the efforts of those citizens who have long been engaged in urban forest stewardship. Parks has been restoring 8-10 acres yearly; in this partnership effort 150 acres will be restored yearly. A shift in philosophy is that removing invasives isn't enough; the areas will require years of community stewardship and it is hoped that eventually the community will do this work in their "backyards" all over the City. Many, many volunteers have already stepped forward to assist in this effort.

Ken commented that 4-5 years ago Duane put together a plan on what it would take to make our greenbelts look like they did 120 years ago. The plan was "shopped around" a bit and only Cascade Land Conservancy stepped forward to partner with the City. Ken thanked Cascade for seeing the importance of this plan and for bringing Peter on board as the Plan's steward. Ken also stated that Steve Nicholson of the Office for Sustainability has given great leadership to the effort, Mayor Nickels is extremely interested and supportive, and EarthCorp has been a huge part of this effort.

Ken pointed out that there is still a lot of work to be done. One component is looking ahead to change what is eligible for State and federal grants in urban areas. A brief discussion followed. Ken and Board member Joanna Grist, who is also Executive Director of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, will meet soon to discuss this idea.

Terry asked how good is the science that this proposal is based upon. Mark stated that the science is cutting edge and very well developed. The Department has very good information on what currently exists and what needs to be done. The next step is how to get the work done. Mark gave additional information. The Department has completed approximately 60 Vegetation Management Plans for 60 different parks. Approximately 40 of those plans have been funded by the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). A recently developed park, Hitts Hill, used the Initiative model, with excellent results. Duane stated that during this learning process, a few things were also discovered that didn't work.

Peter stated that EarthCorp has been doing a fantastic job hiring high school students for 10-12 weeks during the summer to remove invasives, learn about the urban forests, and go on field trips. The students receive some pay, have great learning opportunities, and become engaged with the City's forest. This is a compelling part of EarthCorps' efforts.

Peter stated that the idea that ivy is a problem is a new concept to many people. A local citizen has donated funds for a public relations campaign to involve a humorous campaign, such as the "I Planted Ivy 12-Step Program."

Kate stated that this is one of the most exciting programs she has seen come out of the City and asked if the Mayor's budget is committed to this program. Steve answered that funds will be allocated to this partnership in the next budget, with the exact amount still being negotiated. Mark stated that the Mayor is a driving force in this partnership. He and Ken agreed that it is incredible to have the Mayor give such strong support to this Initiative.

Kate said she lives near Volunteer Park and asked if there are any heritage trees there. Mark answered that some of the trees may be 120-130 years old, but are not original trees. Sadly, as late as the 1940s, old growth forest in the Ravenna Park was designated "hazardous" and was logged.

Bruce and Kate asked how youth employment and involvement connects with this partnership and see this as a great way to connect with kids' organizations. Peter stated that the partnership is very excited about the youth involvement possibilities, and believes that stewardship of our urban forests by youth is priceless. He gave several examples of current youth involvement, including EarthCorp and Delridge-area youth.

The Board commented that they are very enthused about this partnership and thanked the presenters for the briefing.

## **Briefing: Navy's Privatization of Capehart Housing at Discovery Park**

Kevin Stoops, Parks Department Manager of Major Projects and Planning, came before the Board to give a briefing on the Navy's privatization of the Capehart Housing at Discovery Park. The Board is not being asked to take action at this time; however, members will continue to closely monitor developments and work closely with the City to help ensure that this property becomes part of Discovery Park. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing and both are included in these minutes.

### **Written Briefing**

**Introduction:** Under authorization provided by Congress in 1996, the U.S. Navy will work with a private developer to revitalize and build new family housing throughout the Puget Sound region over the next five years. The Military Housing Privatization Initiative will mean that a total of 3,098 existing Navy housing units will be leased to a private developer for redevelopment or replacement. Most of the redevelopment will occur on existing Navy bases at Bremerton and Whidbey Island. A new housing development will be built in the Marysville vicinity near the Everett Naval Station. Several other existing housing complexes will be subject of divestiture, including Fort Lawton property at Discovery Park. The Navy has recently announced that American Eagle, LLC has been selected to be the development partner.

**Background:** Fort Lawton was established in the late 1890's on Magnolia Bluff and was an active Army base from that time through the Cold War years of the 1970's. Much of the old fort is now Discovery Park. The park

was created in 1972 after the Army had declared approximately 390 acres around the perimeter of the fort surplus to their needs and the City acquired the land at no cost through the efforts of former Senator Henry M. Jackson. Several other parcels were added to the park in ensuing years, and in 1980, 127 acres in the Fort Lawton uplands were acquired when the Army closed the fort. The park now totals 535 acres and is the City's largest park. Since the original acquisition of the site, the development of the park has been guided by a master plan that calls for the park to be a place of quiet and tranquility. Much of the park has been devoted to natural habitat preservation or restoration. Since the park's inception, it has been the home to a popular environmental education program.

Concurrent with the City's acquisition of the uplands, the Navy acquired four distinct parcels at Fort Lawton. These parcels, totaling 33 acres, have a total of 92 housing units and have been used by the Navy to help meet their family housing needs in the Seattle area. The housing, however, is now ill-situated to meet housing needs related to the new Everett Naval Station some 30 miles to the north of Seattle. The long range plan for the park, adopted by the City Council in 1980 after years of studies and public debate, calls for eventual addition of these areas to the park (Resolution 27399).

**Fort Lawton Housing:** Of the Navy's four Fort Lawton housing areas, the largest is the Capehart housing. It is situated in the western part of Discovery Park on a 23-acre parcel. There are 22 single family and 44 duplex units built in 1962 in a contained development. All are single story, wood frame, and slab on grade foundation structures with carports. Also associated with this housing are play areas, a recreational vehicle parking lot and garage, and a small convenience store.

To the east of Capehart are three smaller housing parcels that are part of the Fort Lawton Historic District, listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1978. Two of these parcels are atop the hill above the old fort parade ground and constitute the old "officers' row" along Washington Avenue. Three duplexes and one single family home are south of the Federal Aviation Authority radar installation, and three duplexes are to the south. All are of a military interpretation of colonial revival style and were built in period from 1898 to 1908 when the Army post was first constructed. The homes are large, wood frame structures on stone foundations and with large front porches. There are five wood frame garages that were added in the 1930's that are associated with these houses.

To the north of the old parade ground, on Montana Circle, is the old non-commissioned officers housing. There are four duplex units and one single family home built during the 1898 to 1908 period in this area. These are of wood frame construction and are in the colonial revival style, but are noticeably smaller than the "officers' row" homes. There are also two duplexes of brick construction that date from the 1930's.

**Issues:** As noted above, the Fort Lawton housing will be the subject of divestiture. This will be different than previous processes in which the Army declared parcels surplus and the land was eventually conveyed to the City for park purposes. Under the privatization arrangement, the development partner will take title to the property and have the option to use it, sell it, or redevelop it as allowed by the City's land use code. It represents an asset that can be marketed under any of these three scenarios to generate funds to support the remainder of the Navy's housing privatization program, but represents a conversion of the property to private use. Mayor Greg Nickels has written to the Secretary of the Navy and met with the Admiral Herring of the Navy's Northwest Region to oppose this turn of events and ask that the Fort Lawton property be withdrawn from the privatization so that it can be added to Discovery Park. The City Council, after being briefed by the Navy on the privatization process, passed a resolution to oppose the privatization as well. The Washington congressional delegation has pressed the Navy to resolve this matter due to the sensitivities surrounding Discovery Park.

At this time, the City has not been approached by American Eagle relative to specific plans for the Fort Lawton properties, but the Navy has indicated that the existing housing will likely be needed for several years while new housing is being built in the Marysville area. Should the private development partner decide to pursue redevelopment of the Fort Lawton housing, or sell to a third party for such a purpose, the City's various land use and related codes would come into play. Any development would likely involve an environmental impact statement process, a subdivision process, and other permit review procedures. Any proposal for the disposition of the housing in the Fort Lawton Historic District will be subject to consultation procedures with the State Historic

Preservation Officer. And any proposed changes to such buildings will be subject to review by the City's Landmarks Preservation Board, since the district is also designated as the Fort Lawton Landmarks District per Ordinance 114011 passed in 1989.

The Navy is expected to negotiate specific plans with American Eagle and enter into a final contract with them by later this year. The privatization schedule involves Department of Defense and Congressional endorsement by November.

### Verbal Briefing

Kevin displayed a large map of Discovery Park and pointed out various areas, including the 23-acre Capehart Housing area, and reviewed the history of Capehart. He also reviewed the written briefing paper. He stated that the Discovery Park Advisory Council met the prior night and is "prepared for war" to ensure the property becomes part of Discovery Park. It is estimated that 100 homes could be built on the 33 acres in question. It is unknown at this time what American Eagle's plans are.

Ken stated that the Navy is turning this property over to American Eagle to develop. These 33 acres are only 3% of the total amount of Navy land being privatized. The Mayor has made it very clear to both the Navy and American Eagle that he wants this property for Discovery Park. He has requested that these 33 acres be pulled out of the divestiture to American Eagle and transferred directly to the City of Seattle. The Navy's goal is to remove itself from ownership of the Capehart Housing property and build 140 new homes in the Everett area. Ken reminded the Board that the divestiture process is very different from the previous process where vacated military land was transferred directly to the City and added to Discovery Park. The Navy could decide to pull the Capehart Housing out of the big equation; however, there are economic consequences from this decision. This is a big deal to the City of Seattle and the residents of Magnolia; however, because it is only 3% of the land, it is not as big a deal to the Navy.

James asked what the estimated value of the land is and Ken answered that there has not yet been an evaluation. Kate asked what can the City use for leverage. Since the Capehart property is located within the park boundaries, could the park be zoned against access? Ken answered that access can't legally be denied; however, the Environmental Impact Statement process could delay events. Kate asked if there should have been earlier involvement by the City and citizens. Ken answered that the Navy has a specific process it is following and citizens and the City could not have had any earlier involvement.

Kate asked if the Washington State congressional delegation can put pressure on the Navy. Ken answered that the Navy has already been contacted by the delegation. Kate asked which should be leveraged at this point in the proceedings, the Navy or American Eagle. Ken answered that both must be leveraged

Kevin stated that developers are interested in building homes to rent to the Navy because they have a guaranteed renter and guaranteed cash flow for 50 years, while renting to Navy personnel. If there are no Navy personnel to rent to, then the developer can rent out the units at fair market value.

Terry asked if one source of leverage is the historic district. He asked for a map of the park, including the historic district, be sent to the Board and Kevin agreed to do so. Kevin pointed out the historical area and briefly discussed the federal historical building designation process. The City owns 45 of the 55-acre historical area in Discovery Park.

James observed that these measures could slow, but not stop, the building process if this valuable land is sold for development. Bruce commented that he has observed signs in homeowner's yards in various areas of the city, opposing the development of this property. Kate asked that the Board receive updates on what is happening in the process and be kept apprised of what assistance the Board can give.

Ken stated that tomorrow (June 25) he, Deputy Mayor Ceis, representatives of American Eagle, and possibly Navy representatives will meet and he will have more information to share. The Board thanked Kevin for the briefing.

## Oral Communications — Continued

Oral communications resumed, with three additional audience members speaking, two on the Wawona and one on the Navy Privatization of the Capehart Housing.

Karl Kammeyer: The Wawona is a wonderful old ship and should be taken care of. He has worked on this ship, both inside and outside, and believes it is physically impossible to stabilize and move the ship, in its current condition, to the north side of the lake. He also believes that, due to its condition, the Coast Guard will not allow the ship to be moved. The Park Board and Park Department's support and goodwill is needed to get the proper equipment, which is a forklift and crane.

Kimberly Hawks: The Wawona has been around for a long time and has served as a great volunteering experience for her. Since volunteering on the ship, she has experienced a strong sense of community connection with many other volunteers from all walks of life. She spends more and more time each week working on the ship. Visitors from other areas really enjoy visiting the ship, too.

Paul Thompson: He is the president of Friends of Discovery Park. He spoke in support of Navy housing at Fort Lawton becoming part of the park. He commented that earlier in the meeting, Board member Kate Pflaumer asked about support for this effort. His group has gathered 350 signatures on a letter to support this effort. They are also working with Senator Maria Cantwell and they have met with Deputy Mayor Ceis. There is a great deal of public support for this effort.

This is a tight timeframe. By October American Eagle will have its business plan prepared and could decide to build private homes on the land. Individuals should not live in our parks! To read more, go to <http://www.discoveryparkfriends.org>.

Several Park Board members requested one of the yard signs that are being posted in yards around the City. Friends of Discovery Park will get these to the Board. The Board was also asked to sign the petitions that are being sent to the Navy and American Eagle.

Sarah asked if there is public financial support to purchase the property. Ken answered that delegates want to first put pressure on the Navy to give the property back to the City as park land and to find out what American Eagle's offer will be.

Oral Communications concluded.

## Park Board Business

July 8 meeting: As there are three Board members out of town on this date, the meeting will be cancelled.

Wawona discussion: The Board asked for more information on the Wawona. Superintendent Bounds stated that those who testified tonight articulated the problem well. The South Lake Union Plan reads that no restoration of this magnitude will take place in the park. The area is a park and not a boat restoration area. The Wawona needs millions of dollars of restoration work. Both her condition and the amount of work needed for repairs is a problem. No decision has been made yet.

James asked if this will come before the Park Board for a recommendation. Ken answered no, that the South Lake Union Plan has already been adopted by City Council. Karl (from the audience) asked what might be allowed. Ken stated that Victoria Schoenburg, Director of the South Lake Union facility, is working with Northwest Seaport to find a viable alternative. Bruce referred to a letter the Board received from Jones, which referred to the Metro dock. Ken said this dock is located on the north shore of Lake Union, next to the Police Department dock. Parks staff members have been discussing this site with Metro; however, Wawona may be too

large for the site and might be in too fragile condition to move her there. Ken said there has been lots of passion for the restoration, but funds and efforts are still not enough. Another audience member stated that \$2-3 million dollars would restore the ship and then it would make a great education center. He urged the Department and Board to look at this as an opportunity and not as a problem. The Chair reminded the audience that the time for Oral Communications from the audience was over and that this time is reserved for Board discussion.

Bruce asked, if the ship is moved, when this might happen. Ken answered that there is no clear resolution yet. The Department will keep the Board updated.

**Old/New Business – None**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce Bentley, Chair