

Board of Park Commissioners  
Meeting Minutes  
June 8, 2006

***Board of Park Commissioners:***

Present:

Angela Belbeck  
Jack Collins  
Terry Holme, Acting Chair  
Jackie Ramels  
Amit Ranade

Excused:

Debbie Jackson  
Kate Pflaumer

***Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:***

Ken Bounds, Superintendent  
B.J. Brooks, Deputy Superintendent  
Susan Golub, Coordinator

Acting Chair Holme called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. **A motion was made and approved for the Acknowledgment of Correspondence, and the approval of the June 8 agenda and the May 25 minutes, as amended.**

**Superintendent's Report**

Superintendent Bounds reported on the following:

Tragic Loss. Yesterday afternoon at about 3:00pm, Patrick Fraser Recreation Program Specialist in the Youth Scholarship Office succumbed to apparent heart failure. Staff applied CPR until EMT teams arrived. The EMT's tried to no avail to revive him. Patrick will be sorely missed.

New computers at South Park. Twelve new computer workstations, provided through a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, were installed in the technology center. The workstations will assist students with homework and support WASL preparation.

Meet us on the beach. Explore beaches at low tide with Aquarium Beach Naturalists. Trained naturalists will be at seven local beaches on July 8, 9, 11, 22 and 23. Look for signs at the entrance to these beaches: South Alki, Golden Gardens, Carkeek Park, Lincoln Park, Richmond Beach, Des Moines, and Seahurst.

SPLASH 2006 fundraiser a success. Students from Seattle Girls School did an outstanding job at the Seattle Aquarium Society's 2006 SPLASH fundraiser on June 2. The girls clearly demonstrated the importance of conservation education to the fundraiser guests and helped drive the record 2006 contributions made to education at the Seattle Aquarium. Preliminary numbers show \$785,000 was raised at the fundraiser, beating last year's figure by \$75,000.

Magnuson Park Wetland and Habitat Master Plan. We briefed the PELL committee on plans for Phase 2 of this project. They delayed action on the proposed ordinance approving Phase 2 until the next PELL meeting because they started receiving input from community members. The speakers at the public comment period all expressed appreciation for the work of parks staff and the design team in developing the plans for Phase 2. The public comments and question from the Committee members centered around the athletic fields and the split of funding between the athletic fields and the wetland habitat. We explained that the majority of the funding comes from the parks levy and 75% was allocated for athletic fields and 25% was allocated for wetland and habitat development.

Langston Art in Parks. In partnership with Seattle Parks Youth Programs, Langston Hughes will provide two Central Area parks, Judkins and Pratt, with arts-based curriculum throughout the summer. This free summer camp will engage youth with dynamic activities in dance, visual art, poetry and fun.

Activities for youth in SE Seattle. Parks and ARC are collaborating with the Seattle Housing Authority, Police and community partners to provide the free drop-in activities for youth ages 8-16. The summer program is scheduled to begin on June 26, to September 1, Monday-Friday, from 11:00 am-7:00 pm.

Greater Seattle Senior Games. The Greater Seattle Senior Festival Games were held June 2-4 at Southwest CC, Chief Sealth High School, West Seattle Stadium and Castle Ice. The partnership between the Greater Seattle Senior Games Board and Parks offered eight athletic events including; track and field, tennis, table tennis, badminton, ballroom dance, pickleball, swimming, and ice hockey. Approximately 150 people attended the Senior Games banquet.

Citywide Skatepark Planning. Starting on Wednesday, June 14, Seattle Parks will hold a series of three public meetings to solicit comments on draft criteria for siting future skateparks, and to hear ideas for potential sites. Comments will also be taken at a June 24 skate tournament and open house hosted by the skateboarding community at the Ballard Bowl.

Pro Parks Green Spaces. Thornton Creek acquisition. On May 31, Parks completed another acquisition along Thornton Creek. The combined Thornton Creek acquisitions will provide citizens with more than a half-mile of continuous ownership and control along this reach of the creek.

Upcoming Events:

Magnuson Park Northshore Dedication. Saturday, June 17th from 1:00 – 2:30pm.

Northgate. The Grand Opening celebration for the Northgate Park, Library and Community Center is Saturday, July 15, from 12:00 noon – 4:00pm.

Occidental Park: Early August opening planned

Olympic Sculpture Park: October 28 opening

## **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.

Stan Burriss talked about the importance of hope and the responsibility of those who can to make a difference for those in need.

Ken Shaw is a volunteer in Schmitz Park helping to restore the forest and has helped with graffiti removal. He has tried to reduce the frightening aspect of graffiti and noted there are lots of varied opinions about whether graffiti is good or bad. He expressed a concern that Parks staff, in art classes, are teaching kids how to do graffiti lettering.

Jude Kavalam lives in the Roanoke neighborhood and talked about the beauty of Roanoke Park and described it as a vibrant neighborhood center. He expressed a concern about new park benches that are being installed in the Park, questioning whether the proper public notification occurred and noting that the community does not want the benches.

John Barber expressed his appreciation to the Starbucks Corporation for the \$550,000 donation and renovation help given to Powell Barnett Park. He stated that the change to the Park has been radical and a significant improvement. He also thanked the Sonics/Storm for their renovation of the basketball court and for building a new small one for kids. Parks project manager Andy Sheffer was thanked for his efforts.

Commissioner Holme suggested the Park Board Chair send a thank you letter to Starbucks.

## **Briefing: City Hall Park**

Cathy Tuttle and David Goldberg, Parks Project Managers, presented a briefing to the Commissioners on proposed improvements to City Hall Park.

### *Written Briefing*

#### **Requested Board Action**

A public hearing and Parks staff briefing on City Hall Park Improvements will be held on June 8. On June 22, Park staff will return for a Park Board recommendation to the Park Superintendent on the improvements defined during in the schematic design phase.

#### **Project Description and Background**

In 2005-2006, the Mayor's office proposed \$100,000 for planning and initial design and \$400,000 for final design and construction of improvements to City Hall Park in REET II funding for capital improvements. Council modified this proposal and approved \$100,000 for initial planning and design work in 2005 and \$50,000 to continue planning and design in 2006. Construction is not yet funded.

City Hall Park improvements are being reviewed by the Pioneer Square Preservation Board and the Seattle Design Commission, as well as by a Project Advisory Team (PAT), the Board of Park Commissioners, and City and King County staff and elected officials.

#### **History**

In 1911, Seattle Mayor George W. Dilling asked the Park Department to "improve and maintain" the City's first downtown park. City Hall Park, located at 450 3rd Ave., was originally designed as the grand public green in front of the main entry of City Hall. When City Hall moved north, King County took over the building as its Courthouse and the park continued to function as a "forecourt" lawn. In 1967, the County moved the Courthouse entrance to Third Avenue. Now, City Hall Park functions as the side yard of the County Courthouse, and the lawn of this 1.3-acre park is often used for sleeping, while park users are frequently arrested for public drinking and drug dealing.

Despite a lack of public open space in south downtown, City Hall Park is underused by neighborhood residents, office workers, and tourists.

Several elements of City Hall Park have been landmarked by the Secretary of the Interior including Dilling Way that bisects the park north-south, the Battle of Seattle boulder, and brick tunnel walls that line the underground entry to the King County Courthouse in the south end of the park.

City Hall Park Improvements are part of the Mayor's Downtown Parks Initiative and are in keeping with the recommendations recently released by the Downtown Parks and Public Spaces Task Force. This project improves City Hall Park so that it is again an attractive southern gateway to downtown Seattle. A revitalized City Hall Park will provide much needed usable public open space in the renaissance of south downtown.

### **Design Elements**

#### **1. Demolish Dilling Way, sidewalks, vegetation**

- Remove asphalt, bricks, concrete, lawn, and protect utilities
- Remove eight or nine selected trees and protect specimen trees

#### **2. Regrade and refurnish the park**

- Grade and furnish new level plaza areas with utility hookups that can be suitable for gathering and vending activities
- Grade several small level lawn areas with new irrigation and drainage systems to serve multiple needs
- Reconfigure pathways to allow Universal access and better reflect current circulation patterns

#### **3. Add park features that attract new users**

- Highlight the rich history of this park site using existing landmarked park elements and new interpretive elements
- Add decorative plant beds to add visual interest
- Install low fences in selected areas to define park functions, highlight decorative planting beds, and direct park use
- Build a stage area or "belvedere plinth" to be used for special events programming as well as for daily use
- Add a "learning landscape" play feature that is attractive to families visiting or living in the neighborhood
- Purchase new furnishings and light fixtures will serve park users and be consistent with requirements of the Pioneer Square Preservation Board

#### **4. Install a small unisex comfort station building**

- Add a small, permanent comfort station designed for maximum safety and ease of maintenance as a bid alternate.

### **Design and Programming Issues**

**Comfort station.** Currently City Hall Park has two temporary and heavily-used port-o-lets. Parks proposes to add a permanent comfort station in City Hall Park. Alternatively, the Seattle Human Services Department has opened a new facility across the street from City Hall Park that has feeding programs that serve 80 to 100 people daily and bathrooms that are open to the public from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. that could be used by park patrons.

**Trees.** All trees in the park are oak. Most are 40 years old or older. The schematic design proposes the removal of eight trees from the park, including two that the Park Arborist determined were unhealthy. The design saves and showcases significant anchor trees. A 2:1 replacement of trees will be required in the downtown sector. Parks is researching possible areas where these 16 new replacement trees can be planted.

**Fences.** The schematic design proposes low fences to define the lawn areas, highlight decorative planting beds, and direct park use. Some fences may be closed to limit park use at night.

**King County connections.** City Hall Park originally served as the entry courtyard to the King County Courthouse before the building entry was moved around the corner to the west. Jefferson Street currently separates the building from the park. It is not a through street and is used by the County for maintenance and service truck loading and parking. The King County Council is now considering whether to reopen the south entry and find an alternative truck loading area. The County Courthouse is also cut off from City Hall Park by shuttered windows that face park, particularly those at ground level. Parks is working with the County to increase connections from this adjacent property into the park.

**Park activity.** Many of the proposed City Hall Park improvements were designed to increase “positive” park use. Flat areas for vending activity, an open sunny plaza, active areas that might include play and learning, and a visible comfort station are all intended to activate the park. Discussions at community meetings, and stakeholder and PAT meetings often centered on activities and programming that would welcome all park users without excluding any group of users.

**Maintenance and Operations.** Parks expects to fund expanded maintenance and operations activities in all downtown parks as part of the Center City Parks Initiative. In addition to enhanced maintenance, Parks staff for programming and vendor coordination, and park rangers will be assigned duties in City Hall Park. Parks is also now exploring management and funding partnerships with King County.

#### **Public Involvement Process**

A Project Advisory Team (PAT) with community and agency representatives assisted by making recommendations and evaluating proposed improvements. Eight PAT meetings were held and open to the public. Several stakeholders’ meetings were also held, but not advertised to the public. City Hall Park Improvements were also featured in the public discussions for the Downtown Parks Initiative held early in 2006. Three community meetings were held in 2005-6 to review and comment on proposed improvements during the schematic phase. The Seattle Design Commission also approved the schematic design and the Pioneer Square Preservation Board Architectural Review Committee recommended that the project return for a certificate approval during the design development phase. All community meetings were publicized using Parks public involvement protocol of mailed notification to adjacent neighbors and interested parties, signs, press releases, and web site updates.

#### **Budget**

City Hall Park improvements will have a complete project cost of \$3.6 million for regrading and refurbishing the park, adding park features such as a play area and historic elements to attract new users, and adding a comfort station.

City Hall Park will reference the rich history of Seattle and King County embodied in the park as well as showcase nearby new developments of both the City and the County. The improved park will support vendors, special events programming, interpretive “learning landscape” play features, as well as create spaces that can be comfortably used by all.

#### **Schedule**

The schematic design will be presented to City Council in June 2006 before proceeding to Design Development and Construction documents later in 2006. Pending funding, park improvements will be constructed in 2007 and be completed in 2008.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

Parks staff recommends the Board of Park Commissioners approve the uses defined in the schematic design. Parks staff will return on June 22 for a Park Board recommendation to the Superintendent.

### **Additional Information**

Cathy Tuttle, Seattle Parks Planner, 684-7033; or [cathy.tuttle@seattle.gov](mailto:cathy.tuttle@seattle.gov) A project-related web site at: [www.seattle.gov/parks/maintenance/CityHallPark.htm](http://www.seattle.gov/parks/maintenance/CityHallPark.htm) provides information about the project, photos, and pertinent updates.

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

Cathy Tuttle pointed out several changes which had occurred since the written briefing was submitted to the Board, including a change in name for the Downtown Parks Initiative to the Center City Initiative, and the fact that additional Project Advisory Team (PAT) meetings occurred since the paper was written. Also, the paper refers to “decorative, low fences” and now the thinking is that the fences may not be low. The briefing paper mentions possible use by park patrons of the Department of Human Services new facility, but this will not occur because Parks has learned that this facility will not be open to the public. The paper says there will be a June 2006 presentation to the City Council and this will now be scheduled for some time later in the summer.

Ms. Tuttle reported that the proposed renovations to the City Hall Park will change the ratio of grass to hardscape from the current ratio of 60% grass and 40% hardscape to about a 50/50 ratio. Eight of the existing oak trees will be removed: 2 are in bad shape and the remaining 6 are being removed to bring more light to the center of the park.

Fences have been a big issue during the renovation planning. They are used to define park areas and will be decorative type fences. There currently are fences along the Jefferson Street alley; the new fences will be an extension of the current fence concept. The plan includes a comfort station which will include some services – a shelterhouse with services. Currently there is just a porta-potty at the park.

Maintaining connections between City Hall Park and the King County Courthouse has been another issue during the park planning process. Discussions have occurred regarding the County building providing storage for park vendors, and about the County helping with maintenance and security. There has been great cooperation between the City and County for this project.

One goal of the project is to develop and maintain strong partnerships with park neighbors, including several existing and planned residential buildings. The hope is that the park will serve a wide number of users in a variety of ways. There was a Project Advisory Team (PAT) for this project and 8 to 9 meetings were held. There were additional meetings with stakeholders and with City and King County officials and staff.

Commissioner Collins spoke about Millennium Park in Chicago and the significant impact of the flower beds in that park, suggesting flowers be added to the City Hall Park project. Ms. Tuttle replied that the Center City proposal adds funding for maintenance which could be used to maintain flowers. Parks Project Manager David Goldberg remarked that the initial planning for City Hall Park included formal flower gardens but they were replaced by the plaza and circle in the current proposed design.

Commissioner Belbeck asked about the demolition of Dilling Way which has landmark status. Ms. Tuttle replied that the form of Dilling Way is landmarked and that the proposal retains the form as a pedestrian way, and the Pioneer Square Preservation Board has approved this design. Deputy Superintendent Brooks noted that one goal of the project is to translate park elements into historical learning pieces, to include history in the play fixtures planned for the park.

Commissioner Belbeck asked about the existing King County Courthouse service area. Ms. Tuttle replied that it could be located under the park plaza because an underground service area currently exists. However, it would need a major retrofit because it is not suitable for trucks.

Commissioner Ramels asked what type of vending service is being considered. She noted that parks in Chicago and New York have restaurants in some parks. Ms. Tuttle responded that one thought was for a low cost coffee cart, perhaps operated by the non-profit Fare Start. Also under consideration are book, flower and news stalls.

David Goldberg commented that Courthouse staff were surveyed regarding their vending preferences and food was the number one request. Superintendent Bounds noted that Center City parks provide more opportunities for vendors than neighborhood parks.

Commissioner Ramels questioned the function of the fences, stating that Parks should be clear about where fences will be located and requesting a schematic design showing the proposed fence sites. Ms. Tuttle replied that no decisions had been made yet regarding fences, noting that other cities have successfully used fencing to direct traffic flow and establish park boundaries. Initial thinking about the fences is that there would be a decorative fence around the grassy areas, possibly with gated access. The fences will be used to frame the design in a European plaza style. Also under consideration is closing part of the park with a fence at night.

Commissioner Holme asked how the public was notified of the proposal. Ms. Tuttle commented that instead of the general practice of mailing to addresses within a 300 foot radius of the park, mailings were sent well beyond, including all of Pioneer Square and north to Westlake. Approximately 11,000 to 12,000 notices were mailed.

Commissioner Holme asked about the future of homeless feeding programs. Ms. Tuttle responded that all food service in parks requires a permit, and that if proper permits were in place, food service could occur in City Hall Park. Deputy Superintendent Brooks noted that Parks has supported feeding programs that go through the permit process, but the challenge has been for groups that don't go through that process. Health, cleanliness, and clean-up issues arise with non-permitted programs.

### *Public Hearing*

The public hearing began. The Chair reminded speakers that they have up to three minutes to speak and will be timed. Seven speakers signed up and testified. A very brief summary of their testimony is included below.

Anitra Freeman: She was once homeless, continues to work with the homeless community and currently lives close to City Hall Park. She appreciates Parks consideration of homeless concerns in the proposal and offered additional suggestions in this regard, including having an attendant for the comfort station. The attendant should be trained to be sensitive to the homeless. She expressed concern regarding the proposed fencing and questioned whether its purpose was to keep people from lying on the grass, and noted that it is not just the homeless who like to sit or lie on grass. She stated that negative activity at the park can be countered by providing other services, such as the hygiene center planned for across the street.

Stan Burriss: Mr. Burriss has lived for 19 years near the park and enjoys this very central location. He expressed the need not to forget people, noting that people have stories that we do not want to lose. Mr. Burriss read a poem he wrote titled "Stretch."

Wes Browning: He was once homeless and now works for the Real Change Newspaper and lives near City Hall Park. He commented that he was not thrilled by the plan. His first introduction to City Hall Park was when he was 6 years old and his father proudly pointed out to visitors that in Seattle down and out people are allowed to sleep in parks and that Seattle is a City that cares about its poor. He doesn't like the fences or flower beds, noting that the park is the last place people have to go to sleep.

Lisa Easter: Currently living on Capital Hill, Ms. Easter noted that she was once homeless. She questioned why planners were comparing Seattle to New York or Chicago, stating that Seattle is smaller, better and more caring about people. She doesn't want more concrete, thinking we need more green spaces, and also does not want any trees removed from the park because the trees provide shelter from rain. She thinks the proposed plan will push people out to other areas.

John Barber: Mr. Barber agrees with other speakers and asked Parks to think of the people who will use the park when we design it; for City Hall Park, we need to consider the transient use. Homeless people are safer in City Hall

Park than in alleys and doorways. He has concerns about fences that they could be a tripping hazard and could discourage people from sitting on the grass. He urged Parks not to cut trees.

Stephanie Brendler: She spends a lot of time in Pioneer Square. Her concerns include the loss of green space, impact on the homeless population, the fences and the issue of food providers being able to use the park.

Jose Ornelas: He was once homeless and knows that parks by accident become home to the homeless. While it is not the purview of Parks to solve the homeless problem, it is important for a downtown park to reflect the values of the community. Open spaces are important; fences are not good because it is important for the space to be open and that there be room for a First Amendment gathering space. He hopes the City doesn't penalize food providers, while recognizing that the providers need to respect laws.

The public hearing concluded.

Commissioner Ranade told the Board that he is a member of the City Hall Park Project Advisory Team. He asked staff how new vendor services in the park would effect the free food programs. Would they be mutually exclusive? Superintendent Bounds stated that vendors and free food service are not mutually exclusive. The issue is that the free programs need to get permits. One permitted program has moved from City Hall Park to a nearby church; other programs come to the park whenever they choose and do not have permits. Commissioner Ramels asked whether this would be allowed in the future. The Superintendent responded that food programs are only allowed with a permit so that they comply with health and safety rules. He noted that the design issues are separate from the feeding program permit issues.

Commissioner Holme and Commissioner Collins asked about the tree cutting. Ms. Tuttle responded that the trees were coming out because of the new design – removing the trees allows for the plaza regrading to occur and brings more sun into the park. Also, 2 of the trees are distressed. The trees will be replaced on a 2:1 ratio; therefore, 16 new trees will be planted. Ms. Tuttle will provide the Board with a specific plan showing which trees are proposed for removal.

Commissioner Ranade stated that criminal activity in the park is not committed by the homeless; the park has become a destination for people to come to, do crime, and leave. Ms. Tuttle concurred and noted that reducing crime was one of the reasons for removing Dilling Way from the park and improving sight lines.

## **Update Briefing/Discussion/Recommendation: Viewpoint Designation Policy**

David Graves, Parks Project Manager, presented a briefing to the Commissioners regarding the Viewpoint Designation Policy.

### *Written Briefing*

#### **Requested Board Action**

On June 8<sup>th</sup>, Parks staff will present the attached Viewpoint Designation procedures, based on previous Parks Board comments and input, for the Board's review, discussion and recommendation.

The central issue is that while the Parks' Policy & Procedures Manual contains procedures for naming a new park, there are no procedures or decisional criteria to assist Parks staff and community members in designating a park as a viewpoint. Currently a park could be named as a viewpoint, such as Ursula Judkins Viewpoint, without any analysis as to the cost of creating the viewpoint and the long term operation and maintenance costs.

#### **Project Description and Background**

Seattle Parks and Recreation owns and manages a number of parks which are named as viewpoints or overlooks, that contain developed viewpoints or view areas, 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 of new viewpoints. Existing viewpoints such as Betty Bowen Viewpoint at Marshall Park have also suffered from a lack of vegetation management over the past several decades. Due to a lack of such maintenance, recapturing the view is much more expensive in time, resources and capital outlay than ordinary ongoing maintenance. A viewpoint, once designated, raises expectation in the general public that the view will be maintained in perpetuity, which has potentially significant budget implications for the department.

### **Public Involvement Process**

Preliminary analysis of viewpoints was presented to the Board of Parks Commissioners on September 22, 2005 with an outline of decisional criteria as to how a new viewpoint could be designated. I have also met with Parks' Senior Urban Forester (Mark Mead) to review the criteria. I have also met with the Magnolia Community Club, and their Executive Committee, to discuss these criteria as they have an interest in the Ursula Judkins Viewpoint. Finally, revised criteria were presented to the Board of Park Commissioners on January 26, February 9 and May 11, 2006, and your feedback has been incorporated.

### **Issue**

The challenge was to determine where in the Policies and Procedures Manual the Viewpoint Designation procedures should be located. Given the topic, Chapter 1.0, Community Relations, seemed the best fit. Other chapters deal more with personnel issues, maintenance, administration and active recreation policies.

### **Budget**

Adoption of the Viewpoint Designation procedure will give the public easily understood criteria to evaluate whether the site has the potential to be designated a viewpoint, and Parks staff tools by which to estimate the short term and long term costs associated with a potential viewpoint. Staff time to undertake the analysis will have budget impacts but they are anticipated to be small in comparison to the value of the information that will be provided to the community and decision makers regarding any new park and/or viewpoint.

### **Schedule**

If this draft designation procedure is recommended for adoption, it would be incorporated into the Policy and Procedure Manual and applicable to new parks upon adoption.

### **Staff Recommendation**

The Board should recommend the adoption of the proposed Viewpoint Designation procedure and incorporation into the Policy and Procedure Manual.

### **Additional Information**

If you any questions, contact David Graves at 684-7048 or e-mail to [david.graves@seattle.gov](mailto:david.graves@seattle.gov).

## DRAFT VIEWPOINT DESIGNATION POLICY

### 1.0 Community Relations

#### 1.11 Viewpoint Designation

- 1.11.1 Purpose: Viewpoints raise expectations of the general public; i.e. if a Park or portion of a Parks is named as a "viewpoint" or "overlook" or other similar moniker, the public expects to be able to go to that viewpoint in perpetuity and see significant natural and developed features such as Mount Rainier, the Space Needle and/or the City skyline, Lake

Washington, Puget Sound or the Olympic or Cascade mountain ranges. From the Department's perspective, this public perception has potentially significant budgetary and staffing implications. Once designated as a viewpoint, the Department is responsible for the long-term vegetation management to ensure that the designated view remains and for the overall operations and maintenance of the site.

- 1.11.2 Procedure: Proposals for new viewpoints, overlooks or other such designation shall be forwarded to the Board of Parks Commissioners for their consideration as part of the park naming process. If a new park name is to include "viewpoint", "overlook" or other such designation, the below criteria contained in § 1.11.3 must be met. A staff recommendation shall be forwarded to the Board of Park Commissioners for their consideration prior to any final decision of the Superintendent. The Board shall then make a recommendation to the Superintendent on any viewpoint designation in conjunction with the Parks & Recreation Naming Committee's recommendation to the Superintendent regarding any new park name (Policy & Procedures Manual § 1.4.1).
- 1.11.3 Criteria: The following criteria must be met.
  - 1.11.3.1 The object of the view shall be a significant natural and/or developed feature(s) such as Mount Rainier, the Space Needle and/or the City skyline, Lake Washington, Puget Sound, or the Olympic or Cascade mountain ranges;
  - 1.11.3.2 The view shall be the central focus of the park such as at Kerry Park or Hamilton Viewpoint;
  - 1.11.3.3 The view shall be unique and not duplicative of any other nearby viewpoint; and,
  - 1.11.3.4 The site should serve a broader population and not be predominantly a neighborhood amenity.
- 1.11.4 Staff Recommendation: The staff recommendation shall include the following considerations and shall be performed in cooperation with Parks staff including but not limited to the Senior Urban Forester, Senior Planner and the District Manager and/or Crew Chief. The above criteria and following considerations shall form the basis of the staff recommendation to the Board of Park Commissioners and shall include a discussion of the value of the project to the Department and to the City balanced against any potential loss of urban forest as well as the short-term and long-term costs of the development.
  - 1.11.4.1 Description of the view and the object of the view, e.g. Mt. Rainier, Space Needle; either existing or potential after vegetation removal. Note that the description of the view should include the horizontal and vertical viewshed and the location *on the site* where the view is taken from;
  - 1.11.4.2 Existing site amenities (if any);
  - 1.11.4.3 Surrounding amenities, e.g., proximity to a neighborhood business district, on-street parking, nearby Metro bus access;
  - 1.11.4.4 What improvements are needed, e.g. on-site parking, ADA access pathway;
  - 1.11.4.5 Extent of vegetation removal needed to open and/or maintain the view, now and/or in the future; Potential impact(s) to existing urban forest of vegetation removal; Any proposed vegetation removal must be consistent with the Department's Tree Management, Maintenance, Pruning and/or Removal Policy;

- 1.11.4.6 Is the vegetation to be removed on Parks property, other public property, or private property; what are the potential impacts associated with the vegetation removal, such slope stability,
- 1.11.4.7 Description of surrounding existing and potential land uses and zoning which could impact views;
- 1.11.4.8 Estimated cost of vegetation removal;
- 1.11.4.9 Estimated annual maintenance costs; and,
- 1.11.4.10 Estimated needed improvement costs.

1.11.5 The following is a list of the designated Viewpoints:

Charles Richey Sr. Viewpoint	1702 Alki Avenue SW
Bagley Viewpoint	E. Roanoke St. and 10th Ave. E
Banner Place/Rainbow Viewpoint	Banner Way NE/5 <sup>th</sup> Avenue NE
<b><i>Beach Drive Viewpoint</i></b>	<b><i>Beach Drive SW &amp; 60<sup>th</sup> Ave SW</i></b>
Belvedere Viewpoint	S.W. Admiral Way and S.W. Olga St
Bhy Kracke Park	End of Comstock Pl. off Bigelow
Emma Schmitz Memorial Overlook Park	4503 Beach Dr. SW
Hamilton Viewpoint	California Ave. S.W. and S.W. Donald
Highpoint Viewpoint (Myrtle Street Reservoir)	35 <sup>th</sup> Avenue SW & SW Myrtle/Willow Streets
Jose Rizal Park	1111 12 <sup>th</sup> Ave S
Kerry Park & Viewpoint	211 W. Highland Dr
Kobe Terrace	Main St. and Maynard Ave. S
Lakeview Park	Lake Washington Blvd. E. and Hillside Dr
Louisa Boren Park & Lookout	15 <sup>th</sup> Ave. E. and E. Olin PL
Marshall Park - Betty Bowen Viewpoint	7th Ave. W. and W Highland Dr
Mt. Baker Ridge Viewpoint	1403 31 <sup>st</sup> Avenue S
Plymouth Pillars (Boren-Pike-Pine) Park	Boren Avenue & Pike Street
Rotary Viewpoint	35th Ave. S.W. and S.W. Alaska
Seacrest Park/Pier (Harbor Vista Park)	1660 Harbor Ave. SW
Sunset Hill Park/Viewpoint	7531 34 <sup>th</sup> Avenue NW
Twelfth Avenue South Viewpoint	12th Ave. S. and S. McClennan
Ursula Judkins Viewpoint	

### *Verbal Briefing*

David Graves reminded the Board that when he briefed them in May he received specific feedback on the draft Viewpoint Designation Policy and is returning now with the changes the Board suggested. These include having the new Policy included in the Park Naming section of the Policy Manual, and changing 4 criteria to become “staff guidance.” Decisions on individual viewpoint designation will come to the Park Board.

### **Commissioner Collins moved, and Commissioner Ranade seconded, a motion to adopt the proposed Viewpoint Designation Policy and include it in the Policy and Procedure Manual.**

Commissioner Collins noted that this issue turned out to be more complex than first thought and thanked staff for a great job. He stated that Parks now has a straight-forward system to designate viewpoints.

Commissioner Ramels asked about the list of viewpoints in the Policy, noting that some on the list are not called viewpoints. Mr. Graves agreed, stating that the list is all-inclusive and some are not named viewpoints. Commissioner Collins suggested that only designated viewpoints be included in the list. The Commissioners concurred and Mr. Graves said he would delete Section 1.11.5 from the Policy and return with a definitive list at a later date.

Commissioner Holme questioned the criterion which states designated viewpoints serve the larger community, and noted that Fremont Peak Park is primarily a neighborhood amenity with limited parking. Mr. Graves responded that the criterion says “should” not shall in order to provide flexibility in such cases.

### **Commissioner Collins revised his motion to adopt the Viewpoint Designation Policy, with Section 1.11.5 removed. The vote was 4-0 and the motion passed.**

### **Update Briefing/Discussion: Central Waterfront Master Parks Plan**

David Graves, Parks Project Manager, provided the Commissioners with an update briefing on the Central Waterfront Master Parks Plan.

### *Written Briefing*

#### **Requested Board Action**

On June 8<sup>th</sup>, Parks staff will present an update on the status of the Central Waterfront Master Parks Plan. No action of the Board is requested, the presentation will be an update.

#### **Project Description and Background**

Seattle Parks and Recreation is undertaking the study of three alternatives for the removal and/or reconstruction of Piers 62/63 and improvements to Waterfront Park; a maintenance alternative for the piers; and a no action alternative. The outcome of the study will be the adoption of a master plan, based on the chosen preferred alternative, for the central waterfront park spaces west of Alaskan Way, from Waterfront Park to Piers 62/63 and including the Seattle Aquarium.

The Feasibility Study, which was presented to the Park Board in December 2005, provides the foundation for the Master Plan. A preliminary presentation on the EIS process was made to the Board in January 2006 and the Scoping meeting was held in February 2006. Three people attended the Scoping meeting. Currently, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is being prepared and we expect to issue it for public comment in mid June. There will be a thirty day public comment period. A public hearing will be held the week of July 17<sup>th</sup>. Following the close of the public comment period, staff will review the comments and issue the Final EIS.

Attached hereto are the three action alternatives and the maintenance alternative.

### **Additional Information**

If you any questions, contact David Graves at 684-7048 or e-mail to [david.graves@seattle.gov](mailto:david.graves@seattle.gov).

The project website is:

<http://www.seattle.gov/parks/maintenance/Pier62-63/default.htm>

### ***Verbal Briefing***

The feasibility study for the Central Waterfront Parks Master Plan was expanded to include the issues regarding Piers 62/63 and a lid over the viaduct. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will be issued in 2-3 weeks and looks at habitat opportunities on the waterfront, visual impacts of alternative plans, potential programming impacts in the use of Piers 62/63, and issues related to Waterfront Park. There are 4 action alternatives in the DEIS and 1 no action alternative. In the no action alternative, it is assumed that eventually Piers 62/63 will degrade and be removed. The DEIS includes a table which rates the 5 alternatives with a plus or a minus for several criteria. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) will have a staff preferred alternative; this has not been selected yet.

Regarding the DEIS, staff met with representatives of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Washington State Departments of Ecology and Fish and Wildlife. These agencies expressed support for all of the alternatives because of their habitat improvements.

Commissioner Collins asked when the Board gets to weigh in on this issue, noting that the Board has been briefed several times and would like to make a recommendation on the project before it is too late. Mr. Graves stated that the plan has been for staff to come to the Board with a staff recommendation in October. After some discussion it was concluded that staff would come back to the Board in September after public comments have been received on the DEIS, and before a preferred alternative is chosen. The Board will make a recommendation to the Superintendent on which of the alternatives should be preferred in the FEIS analysis.

Commissioner Belbeck asked how noise and the opportunity for large concerts is being reviewed in the DEIS. Mr. Graves responded that the Summer Nights concerts that were previously held on the piers were not a noise issue. The possibility of concerts returning is being assessed in the DEIS. Staff's issue regarding concerts is that they do not want single use piers: Summer Nights monopolized the space from June through August so that there were basically no other users.

### **Update Briefing/Discussion: Associated Recreation Council**

Bill Keller, the Director of the Associated Recreation Council (ARC), provided the Board with a semi-annual update on the ARC.

### ***Written Briefing***

**Purpose of Briefing:** Regular briefing of Board of Park Commissioners on the current status of the Associated Recreation Council system, projects and activities.

### **Background:**

Advisory Councils (AC) are a vital part of the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation's (DPR) program delivery system. DPR relies on hundreds of volunteer AC members for advice, assistance and representation of the many Seattle communities. Currently there are 37 advisory councils operating within the City of Seattle. Over 400 advisory council members volunteer their time throughout the system.

Advisory Councils have been part of the citizen involvement process with the Seattle Department of Park and Recreation for many years. Original advisory councils were primarily concerned with recommending activities, programs and classes to be offered in their respective communities. They served as volunteers for recreation events, and reviewed programs and project plans with their Department counterparts. Their financial activities were very limited.

In 1971, DPR expanded the AC's financial role. They became responsible for handling most of the funds generated by the programs they sponsored. These funds that were collected were then expended back into programs without being part of the City's budgetary process. The responsibilities included sponsoring classes, activities and programs; hiring staff as instructors, child care workers, sports officials, etc. and making these decisions in partnership with Parks staff.

**In 1976, Seattle City Ordinance 105655 was passed, authorizing the DPR Superintendent to recognize ACs. (This ordinance allowed the DPR to more directly support ACs' work by opening space at DPR facilities, and made DPR services and supplies available to ACs' programs.) Documents formalized these arrangements, establishing the relationship between DPR and ACs.**

The Associated Recreation Council (ARC) was formed in 1976 as a recommendation from the State Auditor. ARC provides a standardized accounting system for handling the ACs' funds that meets both City and State legal requirements. ARC is comprised of a volunteer board made up of ACs' representatives and at-large members. ARC supports an office staff that handles financial transactions and record keeping for its member ACs.

### **Snapshot for Year-end 2005:**

The Associated Recreation Council system had an active and successful year in 2005. Total support and revenue produced for the year was \$10,172,511. The system invested \$9,547,361 in Program expenses. \$830,205 was fund raised in grants and donations. The system employed 1,200 staff working in over 30 locations throughout the City.

### **Representation:**

In 2005 the Associated Recreation Council system represented 37 advisory councils, 17 fiscal sponsorships and 31 restricted fund accounts.

Of the 48 accounts, in addition to the advisory council operating accounts, we supported the following playground, park and building projects:

- 4<sup>th</sup> & Ward Park
- Annie's Playground
- Art in Ravenna Park Project
- Bayview-Kinear Park
- Beer Sheva Playground
- EC Hughes Playground
- Grand Army of the Republic Cemetery
- Japanese Garden Fountain
- Karen's Playground
- Laurelhurst Community Center Expansion
- Meadowbrook Community Center Annex
- Montlake Community Center Building Fund
- Mt. Baker Building Expansion
- Pinehurst Playground
- Ravenna Eckstein Playground
- Ravenna Playground
- Sand Point Tennis Center
- South Portage Bay Park Project
- Ursula Judkins Viewpoint Development
- Van Asselt Community Center Expansion
- Whale Tail Park

In addition we supported the following community projects:

- Borders 4 Parks
- Step Program (Steps Toward Environmental Partnerships)
- RecTech Community Center Computer Labs
- Heron Habitat Helpers
- Langston Hughes African Conexion Partnership
- Rainier Beach Back to School Bash
- Rainier Beach Project for Community Empowerment
- Puget Sound Alliance for Community Technology

Financial support:

In 2005 the Associated Recreation Council system provided the following financial support to the partnership:

- \$361,607 in Class Participation Fees
- \$75,057 in Child Care scholarships
- \$75,000 support of the Pyramid Project(CLASS Recreation software)
- \$13,400 in support of the Community Learning Centers
- \$59,208 in support of six Summer Playground Projects
- \$90,817 in Opportunity Fund grants
  1. Carkeek Park \$5,000
  2. Delridge \$7,500
  3. Discovery Park \$8,000
  4. High Point \$9,187
  5. Japanese Gardens \$6,500
  6. Langston Hughes \$5,000
  7. Loyal Heights \$6,000
  8. Magnuson \$4,800
  9. Rainier \$5,000
  10. Ravenna Eckstein \$2,500
  11. RecTech \$7,500
  12. South Park \$8,000
  13. Van Asselt \$2,200
  14. Yesler \$8,600
  15. Special Populations \$2,000

In August of 2005 ARC, on behalf of the RecTech Coalition (Advisory councils representing; Rainier, Rainier Beach, Miller, Garfield, Delridge, South Park and Southwest Community Centers), submitted a grant request to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in order to provide Community Technology Centers (CTCs) at each of the sites. A primary purpose of the grant request was to provide academic support to the many youth who use the community centers for recreation. The curriculum was aligned with the Community Learning Centers and the Seattle School District. In March of this year we received the notification of the two year grant award of \$377,950. In addition we received a companion grant award of \$135,000 for the Community Technology Center at Yesler Community Center also from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. As an additional windfall we received \$100,000 from the Microsoft Corporation for software and software upgrades for the CTCs. We are partnering with Americorps through the Fremont Association for seven staff and with the University of Washington as an off-site employer of seven work-study students to deliver the curriculum. The installation of hardware and software is occurring now and we will be operational in September of this year.

**Modernization:**

Currently, we are involved in a process to update and modernize our partnership to better meet evolving needs. A Steering Committee has been created to make recommendations to the Superintendent regarding the Associated Recreation Council system of Governance, Finance, Personnel and Relationship Structure.

In September of 2005 the Steering Committee unanimously made the following recommendation of Values, Mission and Vision for the modernization process to Superintendent Ken Bounds:

**1. Values**

**Citizen Engagement and Participation:** Involved citizens make our community and neighborhoods better places to live, raise our families and recreate.

**Equitable Access:** No matter where they live, who they are or what language they speak Seattle residents deserve to know about and to have a broad range of quality recreation and life long learning opportunities.

**People:** Residents' interaction with dedicated, diverse and caring staff and volunteers are keys to Seattle's quality of life.

**Community:** People thrive as individuals when they have a sense of belonging to their community and have opportunities to come together to recreate, socialize and learn.

**Accountability:** Integrity and transparency of decisions affecting program, finance and people are fundamental to public trust.

**2. Mission**

The Associated Recreation Council, its member Advisory Councils and Seattle Parks and Recreation build community through citizen engagement and participation in recreation and life long learning programs.

**3. Vision**

We provide equitable, dynamic and responsive recreation and life long learning programs that are a part of the life of every Seattle resident.

Since that time the ARC Board has worked on Governance issues and updated their By Laws. We have worked to prepare a Memorandum of Agreement and we will begin the process of the draft review and hopefully have the Agreement completed by the end of summer.

In addition, ARC is developing a supervisory infrastructure designed to oversee and operate the Child Care Programs and continue to support programs, classes and activities throughout the system. Included will be a Child Care Systems Director, Field Supervision, and a Human Resources Department to recruit and support staff for ARC positions.

Our hope is to have all positions filled and all partnership agreements signed and in place by year end 2006.

***Verbal Briefing***

ARC provides programs, classes and activities throughout the Parks system. It is also a fiscal sponsor for "Friends of" groups and other organizations for a total of 112 accounts. ARC provides significant financial support for Parks, as shown in the briefing paper section "Snapshot for Year-end 2005."

In October 2003 Superintendent Bounds asked ARC to look at modernizing the partnership. We have been working on a new Memorandum of Agreement between Parks and ARC. Superintendent Bounds noted that the new Memorandum of Agreement will be reviewed by the Park Board, hopefully by year-end. The goal of modernization is to move the relationship into the future and may include building infrastructure within ARC. Positions that may be added to ARC's staff include human resources personnel, program supervision and childcare oversight. The need for childcare oversight is evident through ARC's involvement at 30 locations with over 300 staff, plus an additional 15 preschool sites. Total ARC-related staff is 1,200 at 50 locations.

This year ARC received 2 grants from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and an additional grant from the Microsoft Corporation for technology labs in 8 community centers. The plan is for technology center curriculums

to align with schools and community learning centers to best serve youth in a way that combines a learning component with a recreation component.

Commissioner Holme asked whether ARC had any significant problems since its last report to the Board. Mr. Keller responded that there was nothing out of the ordinary, and Superintendent Bounds noted that ARC and Parks staff that work with ARC are a good problem solving group.

Commissioner Collins asked about ARC's insurance. Mr. Keller responded that ARC has a comprehensive liability policy which covers the first \$1 million for ARC programs, and the next \$1 million is covered by the City's policy.

Commissioner Belbeck asked about ARC's relationship with Borders for Parks. Mr. Keller said that ARC is acting as a fiscal sponsor, helping the organization with its fund raising.

Commissioner Ramels commented that ARC's total revenue is listed as \$10 million and that investments in the Parks system are listed at \$9.5 million. She asked what the difference between these numbers is used for. Mr. Keller said that the difference is for wages and expenses related to delivering programs, with ARC's budget at approximately \$400,000.

#### New/Old Business

- Montlake Playfield Renovation: Susan Golub reported on the Seattle Prep proposal to renovate the ballfields at Montlake Playfield. She provided the Commissioners with a written briefing.

#### *Written Briefing*

#### **Requested Board Action**

This briefing is to follow up on the Board's previous action regarding proposed field redevelopment at Montlake Playfield. No action is requested.

#### **Background**

Last summer the Board considered a proposal to renovate the ballfields at Montlake Playfield. Seattle Preparatory School proposed a project that would slightly move and renovate the existing soccer/football field and track, and enlarge the existing baseball field. There was disagreement in the Montlake community regarding the proposal, and the Board recommended that time be taken for a mediation process to proceed, in an attempt to reach agreement before the Board voted on the issue.

The mediation process, involving Prep, the community and Parks, took place during the fall, 2005. In November the Board was presented with the results: agreement among the parties on the configuration and use of the soccer/football field and track, and no agreement on the baseball field. At the November 10 meeting, the Board recommended approval of the soccer/football field and track plan. Action on the baseball field was deferred to a future meeting.

#### **Current Status of the Field Renovation Project**

Seattle Prep has gone ahead with the environmental assessment of the Montlake fields. The area, including the baseball field, is wetland. Because of the mitigation requirements for redeveloping in a wetland, Seattle Prep is no longer pursuing renovation of the baseball field. They will be proceeding with permit requests for the soccer/football field and track project. The wetland mitigation required for this project complements a wetland restoration project that the Montlake community is pursuing.

#### **Alternative Baseball Plans**

Seattle Prep has begun discussions with Parks regarding their support of a baseball field project at a different location. We are exploring the possibility of a Prep contribution to the development of a baseball field included in the Magnuson Park Master Plan. In exchange for a substantial contribution, Prep is requesting priority scheduling

on the field during the high school baseball season. Total hours used would approximate hours currently scheduled for Prep at Montlake and other Parks fields for the baseball program. Should this alternative development plan move forward, there will be a briefing and public hearing before the Board and a Board recommendation on any Parks/Prep agreement for use of the field.

**Additional Information**

Susan Golub

[Susan.golub@seattle.gov](mailto:Susan.golub@seattle.gov)

206-684-7046

***Verbal Briefing***

Ms. Golub reported to the Board that Seattle Prep was not pursuing any renovation of the baseball field at Montlake. They are in early discussions with Parks about a possible contribution to the development of one of the Magnuson Park Master Plan ballfields. There were no Commissioner questions or comments.

- I-520: Commissioner Collins reported that he participated in a tele-conference with English engineers regarding the tube/tunnel concept for 520. The engineers were confident the idea would work with the tube/tunnel in the land area and a bridge across the lake. The engineers may come to Seattle to further discuss this idea.
- Lake Washington Boulevard Pro Parks Project: Commissioner Holme asked whether this project would come before the Board. Superintendent Bounds replied that because the project is mainly maintenance improvements it is not scheduled to come before the Board, but could if Commissioner Holme requested. Regarding the cherry trees along the Boulevard, Commissioner Holme asked if a private citizen could contribute to replacing the trees. The Superintendent responded that this was possible and the citizen should contact him.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

Kate Pflaumer, Chair  
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE \_\_\_\_\_