

Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes
September 22, 2005

Board of Park Commissioners:

Present: Joanna Grist
Terry Holme
Debbie Jackson
Kate Pflaumer, Chair
Amit Ranade

Excused:

Angela Belbeck
Jack Collins

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

B.J. Brooks, Deputy Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Coordinator

Commission Chair Kate Pflaumer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. **Commissioner Holme moved approval of the Acknowledgment of Correspondence, the September 8 minutes, and the September 22 agenda as amended. Commissioner Jackson seconded. The vote was taken and motion passed.**

Commissioners Holme, Pflaumer, and Ranade are unable to attend the October 13 meeting. Commissioner Grist will act as chair.

Superintendent's Report

B.J. Brooks, Deputy Superintendent of Seattle Parks and Recreation, reported on the following:

Whale Tail Play Area Reopens: The new whale tail play area at Alki Playground had a grand opening the previous weekend. The play area was funded with Neighborhood Matching Funds and community fund raising efforts. Existing features include the whale tail sculpture and an old boat. New features include innovative play equipment, a sand play area, artwork, and new landscaping with stone built into the walkways and landscape beds.

Cal Anderson Park Dedicated: On September 24, Parks will join Seattle Public Utilities, the Mayor's Office on Arts & Cultural Affairs, Groundswell Off Broadway, and the Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks for a grand opening celebration of the renovations at Cal Anderson Park and Bobby Morris Playfield. The event will take place from noon to 3 p.m. and include an afternoon of entertainment, tours, short talks, a ribbon cutting, light refreshments, and live music. The many projects that make up this renovation include under-grounding the Lincoln Reservoir and construction of a new park on top, renovation of the shelter house and comfort station, and the upgrade and resurfacing of Bobby Morris Playfield. Park improvements, not including lidding of the reservoir, cost about \$8 million, with most of the funds from the Pro Parks Levy.

Aquatic Scholarships Awarded: Thus far in 2005, aquatics facilities have issued scholarships to 1,198 individuals from 415 families with a total value of \$39,262. Rainier Beach Pool awarded the largest number of scholarships, followed by Medgar Evers, Southwest, and Meadowbrook.

Seattle Mariner Grants Awarded: Friends of Dahl Playfield have been awarded a \$100,000 grant from the Seattle Mariners. Friends of Dahl worked with Department staff to complete the grant process.

Fiestas Patrias at South Park Community Center: SEAMAR, in partnership with South Park Community Center, sponsored Fiestas Patrias on September 17, a festival celebrating Mexican Independence Day. Participating organizations included Public Health, Seattle Police, Seattle Public Utilities, Department of Neighborhoods, private health care providers, banks, and local businesses. Senior adult staff surveyed seniors on the possible development of class offerings. Over 2,000 people enjoyed arts, crafts, food, entertainment, and activities for kids.

New Northgate Park Announced: On September 21, Mayor Greg Nickels announced plans to buy a Metro Park and Ride lot for a new park in Northgate. Located north of Northgate Mall, on Fifth Avenue Northeast, the 3.75-acre property has been eyed by the community for years as a possible park.

City Council Updated: Parks staff recently briefed City Council on the Department's Comprehensive Plan and business plan. A future briefing to the Commissioners will be scheduled.

Summer Nights on the Piers Update: Parks staff have been working with One Reel on the future location of the "Summer Nights on the Piers" concerts. The concerts moved this summer from Pier 62/63 to the South Lake Union Park. Pier 62/63 will be under construction for the next three-to-four years. In 2006, South Lake Union Park goes under construction for several years.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

The Chair explained that this portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had, or are not scheduled for, a public hearing. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and will be timed. The Board's usual process is for 15 minutes of testimony to be heard at this time, with additional testimony heard after the regular agenda and just before Board of Park Commissioner's business. One person signed up to testify; a brief summary of his testimony follows.

Lou Novak: He is a member of Friends of Judkins Park and urged that Ursula Judkins Park, named after a Magnolia resident and located at the top of the Magnolia Bridge, be designated as an official viewpoint. The park has a sweeping view of the mountains, lake, downtown, and Space Needle; however, vegetation is now obscuring the view. He described how recent out-of-town visitors had to resort to standing on a tree stump in their efforts to enjoy the view. The Friends of Judkins Park have hired an arborist and are going through the permitting process to remove invasives in the park. They look forward to the view from this park being restored.

Briefing/Public Hearing: Betty Bowen Viewpoint Vegetation Management Plan

Mark Mead, Seattle Parks' Senior Urban Forester, gave an update briefing on the Betty Bowen Viewpoint Vegetation Management Plan (VMP), immediately followed by a public hearing. The Commissioners were previously briefed on the Vegetation Management Plan on August 12, 2004: http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2004/08-12-04_minutes.pdf. On January 27, 2005, the Commissioners heard a briefing on Betty Bowen Viewpoint Vegetation Management Plan: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2005/01-27-05.pdf>.

The Board received both a written and verbal briefing; both are included in these minutes. The Board plans to discuss the Betty Bowen Viewpoint VMP plan and make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation at its October 13 meeting.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

This is a public hearing and request for acceptance and submittal to the Superintendent for approval for the Plan.

Introduction and Background

This project is the restoration of the Betty Bowen Viewpoint at Marshall Park on the southwest corner of Queen Anne hill. This project will implement a vegetation management plan for this viewpoint, as outlined in the document Vegetation Management for Seattle Parks Viewpoints created by Parks Urban Forest Restoration Program in spring 2004.

Betty Bowen Viewpoint was identified as a top priority site for restoration among the 25 Department-managed viewpoints included in the plan. Priorities were based principally on the percentage of designated viewshed obscured, as well as the level of visitation, quality of original view, and community partnership opportunities. Betty Bowen is the first viewpoint being restored under guidance of this multi-site Vegetation Management Plan.

The objectives of this project are, above all, to restore the lost vista, as well as to rebuild healthy native forest, to remedy vegetation-related safety concerns, and to improve habitat quality. These objectives will be achieved by converting site vegetation to a primarily native, self-sustaining plant community low enough to prevent future view obstruction and vigorous enough to discourage re-establishment of invasive plants.

Site-specific restoration plans are being developed as a precursor to implementation at each individual viewpoint, with concurrent environmental review and public involvement process. Responding to down slope neighbors' concerns, in late summer 2004 the Department contracted a Geotechnical study of slope stability in relation to proposed changes. Findings were that restoration would not reduce, and could improve, slope stability.

Restoration is currently in design development in-house, based on a preferred option that completes work in three phases over six-ten years. A project-level environmental checklist was prepared and submitted to for review on September 5th, 2005. A detailed project timeline for this project and Viewpoints VMP adoption has been in place since last fall. Our hope and intention was to begin on-the-ground restoration by summer of 2005, but we will be now delayed until spring of 2006.

Public Involvement

The first public information meeting was held on December 9, 2004, and provided the project background and presented three implementation options for comment. In addition, Urban Forestry staff made presentations in June and July 2004 at two Queen Anne Community Council meetings to introduce and discuss the project. There have also been multiple meetings, e-mail exchanges, phone conversations, and two public disclosure requests involving individual and small neighborhood constituencies and Parks staff.

Sentiment has ranged from 100% for doing the full project immediately, to making no change at all (trees themselves are the view). The clear majority of meeting attendees on December 9 supported a phased restoration approach, with varying opinions on timeframe and certain specifics.

A second public meeting for the project occurred in April 2005. The completed plans and environmental review were presented to the public and have been available since that date. An onsite visit and review of the project with the Mayor occurred in May of 2005.

Two significant issues have been raised by the public. First, concerns regarding the impacts of the project to the stability of the slope. The second is that the project has been significantly delayed and the view potential for this site has been lost.

Schedule and Environmental Review

Restoration is currently in design development in-house, based on a preferred option that completes work in three phases over six-to-ten years. Detailed restoration plans were completed in March 2005. A project-level environmental checklist was prepared and submitted in September 2005. The public comment period ends on September 23, 2005.

Delays in process have delayed implementation until May-June 2006. Full completion depends on the level of funding and community support (volunteer and financial), as well as the need to insure slope protection during all phases of work.

Environmental review for the Department-wide Viewpoint Vegetation Management Plan is completed and the Plan has been approved by the Superintendent. Subsequent viewpoint restoration projects will proceed under the environmental review of the Department-wide document. However, as noted, we are doing a project specific review for Betty Bowen.

Budget

Money for this project comes from the Department's Cumulative Reserve Fund (CRF), through an ongoing Urban Forest Multiple Viewpoints Restoration project. 2005 funding is \$60,000 to be split between this and other top priority sites, with up to 50% of the total for the Betty Bowen project. Future restoration phases will tap this funding at two-to-three year intervals. The Urban Forest Plant Establishment program also may contribute to the project during the restoration period (part of \$40,000 or more annual funding). In-house tree crew and resource staff contributions will incur no direct cost. Significant leveraging via private match is anticipated through the Parks Foundation, as well as donated materials and volunteer labor.

Additional info

Mark Mead, Senior Urban Forester, mark.mead@seattle.gov, (206) 684-4113.

Verbal Briefing

Mr. Mead introduced himself and began a PowerPoint presentation. Betty Bowen Viewpoint is located three blocks due west of Kerry Viewpoint, at 7th Avenue West and West Highland Drive on Queen Anne Hill, and was named after Ms. Bowen in 1977. He described the history of the park and showed a photo of the view from 1960, as well as photos of current conditions of the park and drawings showing proposed results. Next, the public process was reviewed. The State Environmental Policy Act Determination of Non-Significance (SEPA DNS) ended on September 21 and the appeal period ends on September 29. He also discussed the geotechnical conclusions, as well as hazard trees and invasive types of trees and vegetation. Mr. Mead next described the three restoration options: (1) minimum maintenance; (2) single project restoration; and (3) phased restoration. (For more information on the restoration options and geo-technical study, please see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/parkspaces/MarshallPark/vmp.htm>)

Public Hearing

The Public Hearing began. The Chair reminded the audience that each person has up to three minutes to speak and will be timed. A total of 18 citizens testified; a very brief summary of their comments follows.

Traci Goodwin: She is President of Queen Anne Park Stewards and submitted a comment letter and copy of letter from Lorilla Engineering Geotechnical Consulting whose findings differed somewhat from the Department's Zipper-Zehman geotechnical report. The Commissioners had previously received this information from Ms. Goodwin. She is concerned about the geo-technical plan for this site, as it is a 50-75% slope. She requested that a conference on concerns between Parks and the geo-technician be scheduled and if there are still concerns after this conversation, the Board should re-address this issue to protect both the park and neighbors in this project. The Board is here to offer policy guidance to Seattle Parks and she urged it to take a cautionary approach.

Joel Mulder: He is a 20-year resident living directly below the park. He loves the park and wants to see the trees and wildlife protected. He believes this is an overly-ambitious plan. Nothing has been done at the site for 50 years. He believes Lorilla Engineering's report is very serious and he urged that the DNS be pulled and the plan be revised to be less ambitious.

Brian Livingston: He lives at 1132 8th Ave W and just heard of the new geo-technical study by [referred to by Ms. Goodwin], while many others aren't yet aware of it. The proposed foliage removal in Options 2 or 3 increases the risk of slides. If the foliage is cut, as in Options 2 or 3, and the ground is scraped bare there is an increased risk of erosion and slides in the park. This is a steep cliff. He urged Parks to pull the DNS and delay this project.

Margie Livingston: She lives on 8th Ave and is concerned with storm water control, slides, and erosion. She loves the view and would like selective tree trimming, while being careful of the slope.

Bill VanWalkenberg: He is the former President of Queen Anne Little League and had three points to make: (1) change brings conflict; however, restoring a view to a view park is a fulfillment of the park's purpose; (2) he supports option #2 and believes it to be the most comprehensive solution; and (3) viewpoints are important to the City and this one is especially important.

John Furtado: He is a 25 year resident of Queen Anne and walks and drives by this park often. Over the years he has watched the view disappear. He supports restoration of the view.

Frank Ward: He has attended the various community meetings and believes Parks has done a beautiful job in presenting the options. He supports restoration of the view.

Rick Spoonemure: He distributed a handout to the Board. He talked about the history of the park as a viewpoint and Mr. Marshall's wishes for it to be a viewpoint. He urged the Board to honor and effectuate the donor's intent.

Bill Laprade: He is a licensed geologist and authored the landslide study for Seattle Public Utilities. He lives on Queen Anne and has observed the park. He believes the Zipper-Zehman study is a valid report and he agrees with its conclusion that Option 3 be adopted. This is a very measured approach. He has seen trees on slopes all over Puget Sound act as projectiles during slides — implementing Option #3 will lessen the risk of this to homeowners below the park. The plan does not call for any ground to be scraped bare, as heard in earlier testimony. Seattle Parks uses good environmental practices.

Robert Bonnevie: He lives ½ block away on 7th West and has watched at least half of the view disappear. He agrees with Mr. Laprade.

Mike Nelson: He lives near the park and stated that Parks can open up the view at 1/3 the cost and not make the park ugly. He suggested that Parks take out some of the trees and leave the greenery. Slow down the tree cutting and prune. This will save money, restore the view, is not dangerous, and not ugly. A silver poplar behind his house is holding up his bulkhead and is slated for removal — his bulkhead may fall as a result.

Kenneth Block: He lives at 618 West Highland Drive and doesn't want a handful of selfish citizens to deprive the city of this view. Currently it is a joke as a viewpoint. Parks has a responsibility to restore the viewpoint. Honor the donor's gifts.

Mary Ann & Tom Kofler: He agrees with Mr. Blocks' comments to restore the viewpoint.

Bill Henson: He also agrees with comments to restore the viewpoint.

Marjory Willkens: She asked that Parks not only safely restore the view, but maintain the view afterwards. The park has sat for 30 years and now some people treasure the trees that have grown tall during that time.

Roger Belanich: He presented a petition signed by 112 people in support of Option 3 which reads, "We support the proposed Restoration Project. We believe that it is necessary to restore the Marshall Viewpoint which has been compromised by tree and plant growth. We support the plan which requires the obstructing trees to be removed and

substituted as proposed in Option 3, Phased Restoration as well as Phased Groundcover. We also request that Phase I additionally include the removal of “X4 Holly on 7th W side, “K” west Chestnut tree, and “5+t” large protruding evergreen trees. We advise accelerating the phase work of trees to completion in 2007 as private and city funding allow.” He also distributed a second document containing copies of both legal and historical documents pertaining to the Park. He stated that this is a magnificent site, but the view is missing. Since 1903 it has been a viewpoint. He appreciates that the 8th Ave neighbors have concerns. He supports the phasing, but does have concerns about it.

Karen Bonnevie: She hopes the restoration goes forward and wants citizens to sit in quiet and peace and once again enjoy the view.

The Public Hearing concluded. Written testimony will be accepted through October 12.

Board Discussion

Commissioner Holme had several comments. He asked if there are any storm water mains going through this site or any storm water-related issues in the Zipper-Zehman study and Mr. Mead answered there are not. Commissioner Holme asked if the private citizen’s bulkhead [referred to by Mike Nelson during the public hearing] is addressed in the study. Mr. Mead answered not under the parameters of this plan. Commissioner Holme referred to earlier testimony that the invasives are currently aiding erosion control. The Department’s policy is to remove the invasives — what is the downside of removing these invasives? Mr. Mead answered that the primary advantage in removing the invasives is the long-term maintenance of the park. Blackberry, ivy and clematis are traveling up the slope and impact the health of the trees. Once the vegetation management plan is complete, much less maintenance will be required as trees won’t need topping and invasives won’t need removing.

Commissioner Jackson asked if the authors of the two geo-technical studies are scheduled to meet and how will the difference in their findings be resolved. Mr. Mead answered that he will schedule this meeting and will bring the outcome of that meeting to the Park Board’s discussion and recommendation of this plan.

The Board thanked Mr. Mead for the presentation.

Briefing: Viewpoint Study

David Graves, Seattle Parks’ Senior Planner, briefed the Commissioners on the Department’s Viewpoint Study. The Commissioners received both a written and verbal briefing. In addition to the written briefing included in these minutes, Commissioners also received a copy of the Viewpoint Management Policy, which includes an Introduction, Discussion, Issue Statement, Purpose, Study Methodology, Analysis, Recommendations, and Appendices listing the 44 parks visited during this study and a complete description and analysis of each site including views and amenities.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

The following briefing is for informational purposes and to get further direction.

Description and Background

Seattle Parks and Recreation owns and manages a number of parks which are named as viewpoint or overlooks, that contain developed viewpoints or view areas and/or which merely afford views of prominent natural and man-made features. Views and viewpoints receive unique status under the City of Seattle’s regulatory framework. However, we as a Department don’t have a consistent policy and procedure for the designation and maintenance of a named viewpoint. During the course of the summer, over fifty (50) parks were visited to assess the quality and character of the views. All of the parks visited are listed in some way as having views and/or a viewpoint. The attached Viewpoint Management Policy report, with appendices, provides a more complete discussion of the parks visited and what makes an area a “viewpoint.”

Public Involvement Process

There will be opportunities for public involvement if staff proceeds based on the recommended actions. Future work will be presented to the Board as briefings and for the Board's review and recommendation.

Issue

The central issue is what does the designation *viewpoint* (or overlook) mean from a Parks maintenance and operation perspective. More specifically:

- How does a park or portion of a park become a viewpoint?
- Once designated, how is the viewpoint maintained?
- Once designated, how is the *view* maintained?

Budget

There will potentially be budgetary impacts. However, that would be part of the discussion surrounding the designation of any area as a viewpoint. For the purposes of this briefing, the only budgetary impacts would be staff time to further the analysis based on the staff recommendations.

Schedule

Staff would undertake the recommended analysis during fall 2005 and return to the Parks Board late 2005 for a subsequent presentation.

Staff Recommendation

1. A comprehensive list of named viewpoints should be prepared, listing both SEPA protected and non-protected, and parks with view opportunities. Some of the parks with view opportunities are included in the SEPA protected list. Parks with viewpoints should be distinguished from parks with view areas. This list would be prepared for the Parks Board's review and adoption, with the opportunity to revisit the list on an as needed basis. The Parks' website (<http://www.seattle.gov/parks/parkspaces/Viewpts.htm>) should be updated accordingly.
2. A draft procedure should be developed for establishing or designating a viewpoint based on factors including on the quality and character of the view; long-term maintenance and operation issues; and, accessibility and amenities. The beginning of this procedure is contained within the attached Viewpoint Management Policy report. The draft procedure would be presented to the Parks Board for review and subsequent adoption into the Policies and Procedures Manual.

Additional Information

David Graves, AICP, Senior Planner, Major Projects & Planning, Seattle Parks & Recreation. ph.: 206.684.7048; david.graves@seattle.gov

Verbal Briefing

Mr. Graves reviewed the written information and stated that a purpose of this policy is to help citizens know what to expect when they visit a viewpoint. Another goal is to develop a policy so that, as new parks come online that are designated as viewpoints, the Department has a clear and established maintenance policy. He referred to testimony heard earlier in the evening regarding Ursula Judkins Park and stated that it may be the first pilot of this policy.

Board Discussion

Commissioner Pflaumer asked for clarification on yearly maintenance at the viewpoints and whether the Board is being asked to vote on a recommendation tonight. Mr. Graves answered that staff will look at what vegetation is there now that most likely will grow taller and block the view in the future. Horticulture staff can then look at the site in a comprehensive manner for future maintenance needs. Staff are looking to the Board for input on the policy and, after refining, will bring back to the Board for a recommendation.

Commissioner Holme commented that he found the appendices somewhat confusing, due to a formatting problem. Mr. Graves will revise the appendices and send a new version. Commissioner Holme commented that Magnolia Bluff is a very lengthy view area and suggested that, as the policy is further along, it be defined in a separate category.

The Commissioners thanked Mr. Graves for the briefing.

Briefing: Sustainable Building Program Accomplishments

Richard Gelb, Seattle Parks Project Manager for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), briefed the Board on this program. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing; both are included in these minutes.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

The intent of this briefing is to keep Board members informed of key programmatic achievements of the Planning and Development Division so Board members can offer feedback, suggest improvements and inform others about this initiative.

Program Description and Background

The Park's Sustainable Building Program extends beyond the requirements of the City's Sustainable Building Policy to ensure that non-building (site development) projects also include sustainable features and attributes that:

- lower operating and maintenance costs,
- enhance the health, safety and comfort of park visitors and building occupants, and
- improve environmental performance

Public and Stakeholder Involvement Process

Internal and external stakeholders have been consulted several times to help determine the key opportunities for improving the performance of our capital projects. External groups included Project Advisory Teams, the Healthy Building Network, Thornton Creek Alliance, Cascadia Green Building Council and the Seattle Eco-building Guild. Internal stakeholders include Facilities Maintenance (Westbridge Shops), Enterprise, Operations, Grounds Maintenance, and the Environmental Management Team.

Issues

- Are there further strategies we should be exploring to advance the program goals?
- Is the emphasis on revenue generation (or other areas) a concern to Parks Board members?
- Should we more formally introduce this program at the first meeting of Project Advisory Teams?
- Are there other ways we should communicate our project and program achievements?

Additional Information

Website: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/sustainable/>
Richard.gelb@seattle.gov or 206-684-0631

Verbal Briefing

Mr. Gelb presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Department's sustainable building program and distributed two additional handouts: "Sustainable Park Development: A beyond-LEED approach to capital program management Version 9-15-05"; "Draft 2005/2006 Parks environmental management System (EMS) Scorecard Version 5-16-05"; and "Seattle Parks and Recreation Planning and Development Division Sustainable Development Scorecard Version 5-19-05."

The program has four goals: reduce the lifecycle cost of Park operations; build community and enhance wellness by promoting participation, equity, and stewardship – especially in the historically underserved areas; protect and restore ecological resources; and reduce resource consumption and waste generation – especially hazardous substances.

Photos of several of Seattle Parks' LEED buildings were shown: Carkeek Park Environmental Learning Center, High Point Community Center, and Yesler Community Center. (For more information on these buildings and the program, please see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/sustainable/default.htm>)

Mr. Gelb reviewed the top ten goals for 2005 as operations and maintenance cost reduction; revenue generating capacity; engage potential new users in design; enhance neighborhood character; improve health, safety and comfort of park users and building occupants; improve multimodal access; improve habitat and ecological function; improve quality and quantity of storm water; minimize waste, emissions, and resource extraction; and improve efficiency of energy and water use. Commissioners Holme and Pflaumer asked about roof codes and specifications on rainwater runoff and Mr. Gelb gave information on these aspects of the program. He stated that staff are looking ahead to the Northgate Civic Center, currently being built, and plan for a 148,000 gallon rainwater harvest capacity to use for irrigation needs. This building will have a solid LEED certification.

Commissioner Holme asked how the upcoming projects are impacting the Department's budget. Mr. Gelb answered that it is a struggle to stretch the upfront costs; however, doing careful hiring in the design stage can help get the desired features without additional costs.

The Commissioners thanked Mr. Gelb for the briefing.

Briefing: Late Night Statement of Legislative Intent

Michele Finnegan, Seattle Parks Strategic Analyst, briefed the Commissioners on the Department's Late Night Program. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing

Written Briefing

STATEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT

During the deliberations over the 2005-2006 Budget, the City Council issued the following Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI):

The Council directs the Parks Department to conduct an evaluation of the changes proposed to the Late Night Recreation Program and to report to the Parks, Neighborhoods and Education Committee on the following: 1. Numbers and types of youth served at each of the locations for the Late Night Program (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, neighborhood, etc.); 2. Evaluation of the types of programming that worked and did not work as expected; 3. Outcomes achieved in the redesigned offerings in the program; and 4. Recommendations for any additional changes needed, if any.

The Department's response to the SLI includes some history and background of the Late Night Program, an assessment of the programming Late Night offers, and future changes.

LATE NIGHT PROGRAM HISTORY

During the 1980s, Seattle experienced a surge in violent juvenile crime. In 1989, the Seattle Team for Youth (a consortium of recreation professionals) and a Mayor's task force met with youth representatives to determine what activities most interest young people. The result was new after-school and late night programs embracing recreation, academic assistance, job training and cultural activities. The first program to be implemented was the Late Night Recreation program at Garfield and Rainier community centers. Beginning in 1990, these sites operated from 10 p.m. to 1 a.m. on Friday nights and from 8 p.m. to 1 a.m. on Saturday nights. This program began as a partnership between Seattle Parks and Recreation and the Seattle Police Department, which assigned two uniformed officers each evening at each site with the goal of building relationships with young people and enhancing mutual understanding. After the program's first year, the police reported a 30% reduction in juvenile crime in the Garfield and Rainier communities, attributing it to various efforts in these neighborhoods, including the Late Night Program and enhanced community policing efforts. By 2004, Late Night had expanded to five sites operating each Friday and Saturday evening from 8 p.m. to midnight.

PROPOSED 2005/06 BUDGET CHANGES

The Mayor's 2005/2006 budget included a General Fund reduction to the Late Night Program. In order to preserve the program while reducing funding from the General Fund, the Mayor's budget reflected a transfer of program implementation from general-funded temporary positions to Teen Development Leader positions funded by the Pro Parks Levy. In addition to providing a budget reduction, this change met another of the Executive's goals by reducing the use of temporary workers in the delivery of the program.

The Proposed Budget reduced General Fund funding by \$162,000 and provided Late Night programming at five geographically distributed sites: Garfield Teen Life Center, Southwest Teen Center, North Teen Life Center, Golden Gardens Bathhouse, and a site in Southeast Seattle that was to be determined.

The City Council was concerned with the re-distribution of sites, and provided an additional \$152,000 in funding to continue the operation of two sites in Southeast Seattle, the shared Delridge/High Point program.

LATE NIGHT PROGRAM BACKGROUND

This section provides additional information about Late Night Program locations, hours, attendance and demographics.

Locations

In 2004, the Late Night Recreation Program operated at five sites: Rainier Community Center (Friday and Saturday nights), Rainier Beach Community Center/Asa Mercer Gym (Rainier Beach, Friday night; Mercer, Saturday night), High Point Community Center/Delridge Community Center (High Point, Friday night; Delridge, Saturday night), Garfield Teen Life Center (Friday and Saturday nights), and Meadowbrook Community Center (Friday and Saturday nights).

The 2005 Proposed Budget included a modification of the five sites: a Southeast site to be determined (Friday and Saturday nights), Southwest Teen Center (Friday and Saturday nights – see note 1 below), Garfield Teen Life Center (Friday and Saturday nights), North Teen Life Center (now known as Meadowbrook Teen Center, Friday and Saturday nights – see note 2 below), and Golden Gardens Bathhouse (Friday and Saturday nights – see note 3 below).

Following the City Council's budget review and changes, Parks' budget proposal was accepted with the funding and direction to operate two additional sites (seven total): Rainier Community Center (Friday and Saturday nights), Rainier Beach Community Center (Friday and Saturday nights), High Point Community Center/Delridge Community Center (High Point Friday night, Delridge Saturday night), Southwest Teen Center (Friday and Saturday nights), Garfield Teen Life Center (Friday and Saturday nights), North Teen Life Center (Friday and Saturday nights), and Golden Gardens Bathhouse (Friday and Saturday nights).

NOTES:

1. Southwest Teen Center was part of the Southwest Community Center expansion project funded through the Pro Parks Levy. It opened in May 2005. Late Night opened at this site on May 28, 2005.
2. North Teen Life Center was closed for construction beginning in October 2004, and was scheduled to re-open in March 2005. Late Night programming was suspended during the closure. A water pipe break and the discovery of asbestos delayed the opening until May 28, 2005 under the name Meadowbrook Teen Center,
3. When the 2005 proposed budget was developed, renovation of the Golden Gardens Bathhouse was not completed. Upon completion, Parks determined that the facility was not be a viable Late Night program location for winter due to the expense of the oil heating system and the limited nature of Metro bus access to the site during the program's hours. As a result, Late Night operated at Green Lake Community Center on Friday nights and at Bitter Lake Community Center on Saturday nights. Beginning in mid-June, the program switched to Golden Gardens on Friday nights, and continued at Bitter Lake on Saturday nights.

Attendance and Demographic Data

Attendance Data

	Rainier	Rainier Beach	High Point/ Delridge	Southwest TLC	Garfield TLC	North TLC	Green Lake (GG) Bitter Lake
Friday Avg Attendance	132	105	61	11	63	40	17
Saturday Avg Attendance	118	31	95	3	62	36	37
Minimum Attendance	62	35	24	0	30	18	2
Maximum Attendance	180	220	220	17	180	55	74

Ages Served (based on average attendance)

	Rainier	Rainier Beach	Delridge/ High Point	Southwest TLC	Garfield TLC	North TLC	Bitter Lake/ Green Lake (GG)
Under 13	18%	35%	2%	27%	6%	16%	4%
13-15	46%	35%	47%	52%	43%	44%	31%
16-17	39%	18%	45%	16%	39%	33%	50%
18-19	7%	4%	5%	5%	10%	7%	15%
20 and over	15%	8%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%

Ethnicities Served (based on average attendance)

	Rainier	Rainier Beach	Delridge/ High Point	Southwest TLC	Garfield TLC	North TLC	Bitter Lake/ Green Lake (GG)
Caucasian	12%	5%	6%	No data	7%	12%	15%
African American	76%	32%	79%	No data	82%	70%	17%
Asian	25%	25%	4%	No data	6%	5%	6%
Pacific Islander	13%	24%	7%	No data	2%	1%	4%
Other	9%	14%	4%	No data	3%	11%	58%

Transportation Access (based on average attendance)

	Rainier	Rainier Beach	Delridge/ High Point	Southwest TLC	Garfield TLC	North TLC	Bitter Lake/ Green Lake (GG)
Walk	15%	34%	33%	No data	39%	53%	37%
Bus	62%	22%	40%	No data	46%	18%	17%
Drive Self	9%	12%	13%	No data	6%	12%	14%
Ride w/ other participant	17%	12%	9%	No data	6%	15%	21%
Parent Drop-off	21%	20%	5%	No data	3%	2%	11%

LATE NIGHT PROGRAMMING

One of the benefits of having Teen Development Leaders staff this program is the integration of Late Night Recreation with other teen programs. In addition, the Teen Development Leaders have been trained in the theories and development of “outcome-based” programming.

In early 2004, at the request of the Mayor's Office, Seattle Parks and Recreation and Human Services Department staff contracted with Dr. Paul Heckman, an expert from the University of Washington, to determine the strengths and weaknesses of three programs: teen development programs, Late Night programs, and Community Learning Center programs. After a month of on-site observations and interviews, Dr. Heckman's team compared its findings with the research literature of best practices for this type of programming.

The research shows the **key outcomes** of successful programs are:

- **Metacognition:** when students are aware of what they know, what they think about, and how they do both, they are better able to use their prior knowledge and interests in gaining new understanding.
- **Competence and sense of efficacy:** students' sense of themselves as learners and performers in completing tasks and performing.
- **Voice and choice:** *voice* is the degree to which students are encouraged to express what they think, want, feel, and know; *choice* is the amount of decision-making students have in what they do in their programs.

Research identifies the **key program characteristics** that lead to the above outcomes as:

- **Caring relationships** with adults and each other.
- **Fostering positive social norms, peer relationships, and feelings of safety.**
- **Promoting strong connections** between program activities and parents and community.

Dr. Heckman's team found that Parks programs were strong in building caring relationships and fostering positive social norms and feelings of safety. The team recommended strengthening the connections between program activities and other adults and institutions in the community. A key goal of the integration of the Teen Development Program and the Late Night Program was to strengthen these connections.

The first step in that process was to integrate the staff of these two programs, so that the strengths of the relationships and positive social norms and safety are maintained while teens get to know new staff. Late Night attendance and programming are seasonal in nature, with the summer programs significantly more casual and flexible. This fall, the newly integrated staff teams will be engaging the teens in developing programs that make connections with the community. This will be a gradual process, as we make the transition from the traditional staff-driven programming model to "voice and choice" outcomes with the help of teen participants.

In addition, over the next school year, each Late Night site team will develop at least one significant program per quarter which brings teens and community together, while staff continue to engage the teens in relationships with them and with other teens.

Participant Feedback

In an effort to engage Late Night participants more fully in the "voice and choice" process, Parks hired a consultant to hold a participant focus group at each of the Late Night sites during June and July 2005. A total of 75 youth participated. The general feedback from participants was positive. Most felt that the Late Night Recreation Program was a good alternative to spending the evening at home or hanging out on the streets. However the participants also raised a few areas of concern:

- **Hours:** The youth would like to see Late Night hours extended until midnight. (Note: This issue is addressed in the "Recommendations" section.)
- **Transportation:** Youth noted the infrequency and inconsistency of bus service in the vicinity of Late Night sites. While the youth would prefer staff to drive them home, Parks is not staffed or funded to provide up to 180 youth rides home from Late Night sites. Staff will contact Metro to discuss bus schedules for routes serving Late Night sites.

OVERALL ISSUES

Since implementing this program model, Parks has identified the following operational issues:

- **Police coverage:** When two additional sites were added in the 2005 budget process, the Police Department was not informed or funded to have officers attend the additional sites. This is a very important aspect of Late Night.

Ensuring safety while also allowing youth to have positive interactions with Police is currently not occurring at the Southwest Teen Center or at the Northwest Seattle sites.

- **Backfill for regular staff:** Now that regular staff are assigned to work Late Night instead of intermittent staff, Parks has experienced staffing issues related to the use of sick leave, FMLA leave, etc. associated with these regular, benefited staff. Backfilling Teen Development Leaders is not funded by the Pro Parks Levy. Therefore when a regular Teen Development Leader is unable to work due to illness, vacation, or other FMLA-protected leave there is no funding available to bring in a substitute staff. In these cases, either the Late Night Program is understaffed for an evening or a site manager needs to reallocate funding from another program to cover this cost. (Note: This issue is addressed in the “Recommendations” section.)
- **Non-teen attendance:** Late Night is intended for youth ages 13 to 19. There are sites where other populations also attend Late Night. For instance, Friday nights at Rainier Beach has more of a family feel due to the open swim that is part of the Late Night program at this site. Teens bring younger siblings to the program or parents may accompany middle school teens and young children to this program. At other locations, young adults in the 20 -25 age range attend Late Night to play drop-in basketball This could be a potential issue in that it may not be appropriate to mix young teens with 20-something adults. (Note: This issue is addressed in the “Recommendations” section.)

2006 CHANGES

Based on recent operational experience and participant feedback, Parks is including the following changes to the Late Night Program.

Changes to sites

- **Northwest Seattle:** The Golden Gardens location has not been effective as a Late Night location due to the small size of the facility, which makes it difficult to have multiple programs running simultaneously; heating expenses; and the limited evening bus service to the site in the non-summer months. During the winter, Parks offered Late Night programming at Bitter Lake and Green Lake community centers on a trial basis. We officially located the Late Night program in northwest Seattle at Bitter Lake Community Center on both Friday and Saturday nights. Parks will continue to use Golden Gardens Bathhouse as a site for teen programs such as the O2 program – a very successful outdoor education and environmental stewardship program for teens. Parks will also work with the teens who currently coordinate the summer music concert series at the bathhouse to find a way to continue providing this kind of programming.
- **Southwest Seattle:** While our data on the Southwest Teen Center is limited due to the delayed opening, we will modify the southwest program locations. Instead of having two Southwest program sites each night, we will have only one program site in southwest Seattle each night. On Friday nights we will locate Late Night at the Southwest Teen Center. This center is close-by Denny Middle School and Sealth High School. The youth tend to come to Southwest Teen Center after school on Friday and stay through Late Night (or possibly attend the football game and then return for Late Night). High Point is currently the other southwest Seattle site on Fridays, and is located only 10 blocks away. On Saturday nights, we will hold the southwest Seattle Late Night Program at Delridge Community Center. This has been a popular location for Late Night with the youth it serves.
- **Southeast Seattle:** We will retain the program at Rainier Community Center on both Friday and Saturday nights. For the program currently operating out of Rainier Beach Community Center, we recommend offering Late Night at Rainier Beach on Friday nights and at Jefferson Community Center on Saturdays. Through 2004, we offered the Saturday night program at Asa Mercer Middle School, which is within blocks of Jefferson Community Center. Now that Jefferson has a gymnasium, we believe this site will serve the youth who previously attended the program at Mercer and who do not seem to be traveling to Rainier Beach on Saturday nights. We will not return to the Mercer site as we are not funded to pay the School District for use of this site and the barrier to using Jefferson Community Center in the past has been lifted with the construction of the new gym in 2004.

Changes to program hours

- Parks will use the funding saved from reducing the number of sites from seven to six to expand hours to 7 p.m. to midnight at the six remaining sites. This will also provide a minimal amount of backfill funding to cover the program when regular staff are absent (also outlined as an issue above).

Changes to Police presence at Late Night sites

- Parks will work with SPD to explore the possibility of providing staffing at Bitter Lake Community Center. Building positive relationships between Police and youth is one of the cornerstones of the Late Night Program.

Changes to participation at Late Night

- Parks will implement a more uniform approach to the attendance at Late Night. A parent or legal guardian who wants to attend with their teen would be allowed. Teens responsible for younger siblings would be allowed to bring them on the condition that they attend to their sibling at all times.
- To help ensure the safety of teenage participants in Late Night, adults not directly responsible for a teen participant in Late Night would not be allowed to attend the program. Since most of the young adults who show up at Late Night sites come to play drop-in basketball, and since they are too old to participate in Late Night, Parks staff would look into offering a fee-based basketball program for young adults on one weekend evening at a non-Late Night location. Currently Parks charges a \$2 fee per session for drop-in adult sports.

Verbal Briefing/Commissioners' Questions & Answers

Ms. Finnegan reviewed the information in the written briefing. Commissioner Holme asked if the program is moved from Golden Gardens Bathhouse to Bitterlake Community Center, would most attendees be new kids. He is concerned that kids using the Golden Gardens site will not have access to the site at Bitterlake. Ms. Finnegan answered that experience has shown that winter programming at Golden Gardens doesn't work well and has had low attendance. Moving the program to Bitterlake would attract new kids and some who use the program at Golden Gardens would follow it to Bitterlake. The strongest part of the program at Golden Gardens is the teen concerts and those will continue at that site. Commissioner Holme suggested that for future briefings of this type, it would be helpful to receive a summary of what is lost/what is gained in an Executive Summary.

The Commissioners thanked Ms. Finnegan for the briefing.

Board of Park Commissioners' Business

- None

New/Old Business

- Zoo Carousel: The Chair received a multi-page letter, with photos, regarding plans to install an antique carousel at Woodland Park Zoo. The letter writer, who lives in Poulsbo, Washington, carves carousels and recommends that a new carousel be installed, instead of the antique one that is proposed. Copies of the letter will be sent to all Commissioners and to Zoo Director Deborah Jensen.
- PowerPoint Presentations: Commissioner Jackson gave kudos to the two PowerPoint presentations shown tonight. She commented that she enjoyed the presentations and staff are doing a good job of beefing up their presentations.
- Upcoming Board Vacancy: Commissioner Grist's term ends on December 31, 2005, and she has decided not to seek a second term.
- Retreat: The annual retreat will be scheduled for January 2006. It is hoped that a new Commissioner will join the Board before the retreat.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

APPROVED: _____
Kate Pflaumer, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____