

Department of Parks and Recreation

Seattle Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes
July 9, 2009

Web site: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/parkboard/>
(Includes agendas and minutes from 2001-present)

Also, view Seattle Channel tapes of meetings, June 12, 2008-most current, at
<http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/watchVideos.asp?program=Parks>

Board of Park Commissioners:

Present:

Neal Adams, Vice-chair
John Barber
Terry Holme
Diana Kincaid
Donna Kostka
Jackie Ramels, Chair

Absent:

Jourdan Keith

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

Tim Gallagher, Superintendent
Christopher Williams, Deputy Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Coordinator

Commissioner Ramels called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and announced that the Board's July 23 meeting will be held at Langston Hughes Performing Arts Theater. At 4:00 pm, the Board will tour some of the Department's partners in the Youth Violence Prevention Initiative, beginning at 4:00 pm. The public is welcome and should provide own transportation.

Commissioner Ramels next reviewed the meeting agenda topics. **Commissioner Adams moved approval of the agenda as presented, the June 25 minutes, and the record of correspondence received by the Board since its June 25 meeting. Commissioner Holme seconded the motion. The vote was taken, with all in favor. Motion carried.**

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Gallagher reported on several park items. For more information on Seattle Parks and Recreation, visit the web pages at <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/>.

Fourth of July Celebration: The weather was great for the Fourth of July weekend, with lots of visitors to Seattle's parks and to view the fireworks at Gas Works Park. Superintendent Gallagher noted that, earlier this year, the grounds maintenance staff started a 7-day per week coverage. This new schedule resulted in a high number of Parks staff on duty during the busy weekend, cleaning restrooms and collecting garbage. The Department only received one complaint about park operations during the weekend, and that complaint concerned fireworks in a park. The Department received a number of compliments from the public and City officials.

Upcoming Groundbreakings: There are a number of groundbreakings coming up in the near future:

- Woodland Park synthetic fields, July 23, noon-12:30 pm. Commissioner Barber asked if Parks staff are doing the testing on these fields. Michael Shiosaki and Eric Friedli responded that the Department has hired a testing company from its contractor roster list.
- Jefferson Park August 1, time to be determined
- Northgate Park (Hubbard's Homestead): September 26, time to be determined
- Magnuson Park Wetlands & Ballfields Dedication: September 26, time to be determined
- Bell Street kickoff public meeting Not scheduled yet
- In addition, a number of small playground and other levy projects will be under way in the near future.

Dahl Skatespot: Superintendent Gallagher stated that the Department made a major mistake in this project when it sent the redesign out to bid. He has put the project on hold and scheduled a community meeting on Tuesday, July 21, to try to get buyoff from the community on this project. He also instructed the design team to re-visit the design.

Commissioner Kostka stated that she lives near Dahl Playfield and attended the recent community meeting. She thanked the Department for re-visiting this project and attending the community meeting. She appreciates that the Superintendent will attend the July 20 community meeting.

Magnuson Park Committee: Superintendent Gallagher and Parks staff are developing a proposal for a formal advisory group for Magnuson Park. Parks staff presented a formal proposal to the Magnuson Communications Committee on July 8, which was well received. The 15-member advisory group would include one Park Board Commissioner. The Board will hear a briefing on this committee at its September 10 meeting.

Magnuson Park Operations: Parks staff had a good discussion with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), whose property adjoins Magnuson Park on the north side. The discussion focused on allowing park users to use NOAA's north end access road to access Building 2 and some other sites. NOAA staff seemed to like the proposal; however, it is not yet approved.

Bell Street: The City Council has now approved the funding for this Green Street project. Patrick Donahue is Seattle Parks' project manager working with the design team.

Budget Update: The City's Department of Finance will release its revised revenue project in August, which may result in adjustments to Seattle Parks' 2009 budget.

Mayors Youth Violence Prevention Initiative: Seattle Parks has three new positions for this initiative and 115 people applied. Interviews are under way.

Pool Drains: The Department has completed replacement of four more pool drains, in compliance with the Virginia Graeme Act.

U.S. Obesity Rates Increasing at Rapid Pace: Superintendent Gallagher referred to 2008 obesity rates information from the Center for Disease Control. There has been a dramatic increase in the past 20 years, with only one state, Colorado, remaining under a 20% rate of obesity. Mississippi has the highest rate, with 32.5% of adults and 44% of the kids in that state now obese. In Washington State, 25.4% of adults are obese. There is a significantly higher increase for obesity in kids than adults. One study in Los Angeles found that fast food chains are more prevalently located in low-income section of the City. The Superintendent stated that the obesity rates have gone beyond being a crisis.

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 two minutes each and will be timed, and are asked to stand at the podium to speak. The Board's usual process is for 10 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. Five people testified.

Julie Doblewski: Ms. Doblewski is a graduate student at the University of Washington and is a Mayor's Fellow with the City's Department of Finance this summer. She is attending various meetings and taking information from these back to her fellow UW graduate students.

Jim Anderson: Mr. Anderson stated that it is a challenge to communicate effectively with the Board of Park Commissioners. The public may attend the Board's meetings and testify, but it can't question the Board members. The public can send e-mails to the Board, via Sandy Brooks. He is aware that she forwards all public correspondence to the Board, but the e-mails then go into an abyss and the Board doesn't write back. He believes this is an empty process and hopes it will be evaluated and changed. The community councils are a portal for public input and he wants to know how he can sit down and discuss issues with the Park Board.

Kris Fuller: Ms. Fuller seconded Mr. Anderson's comments and believes this is a public process in name only. She believes that the neighborhoods are bullied by the Parks Department and there is an overall feeling that the Department does not engage with the communities. Many people feel they receive no meaningful response.

Commissioner Ramels responded that the Board receives a great deal of correspondence and Commissioners read and listen to all the public's testimony.

Gary Gaffner: Mr. Gaffner has attended all Park Board meetings as an observer for several years and agreed that the Board reads all the correspondence.

He next commented on the Park Classification system briefing. He believes this is really fine work and will be the basis for many future policies.

Sharon Levine: Ms. Levine complimented the Department for its protection of the Queen Anne Bowl synthetic field. Two years ago, in 2007, vandals set fire to the field at the Fourth of July. The following year, the Department posted sentries to protect the field from further vandalism. She called the Department a couple days prior to July 4 and learned that the Department would, once again, have staff on hand to protect the site. She thanked the Department for this great service and hopes it will continue in the future.

Briefing: Friends of Olmstead Parks

Earlier this year, Commissioners requested that Parks staff schedule a briefing from the Friends of Olmstead Parks and members of the organization agreed to present a briefing. Brooks Kolb, President of Friends of Seattle's Olmstead Parks, gave a briefing on the history and efforts of the organization. Prior to the meeting, Commissioners received a written briefing, included in these minutes below. Copies were also available to the public at the meeting.

Written Briefing

The Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks (FSOP), an all-volunteer organization affiliated with the National Association for Olmsted Parks (NAOP), was founded in 1983 with a mission to raise awareness of and preserve the legacy of Seattle's Olmsted Brothers-designed city-wide system of parks and boulevards. This legacy began with John Charles Olmsted's first visit to Seattle in 1903, when he produced the first comprehensive park and boulevard plan and report to the Seattle Board of Parks Commissioners, which was later expanded in 1908 to include the newly annexed areas of the city (Rainier Beach, Columbia City, West Seattle, Ballard and Ravenna). Both plans proposed a system of parks, both larger parks and neighborhood parks and playgrounds, and interconnecting boulevards that became the core of Seattle's current park system.

Our mission dovetails with the Parks Department's Strategic Action Plan Goal #1C, titled "Olmsted Park and Boulevard System." Goal #1 C reads as follows:

1. Communicate the Olmsted Vision and Plan, including the location and current status of Olmsted parks; i. Develop a promotional plan to identify the locations, features, and benefits of Seattle's Olmsted Plan parks; 2. Evaluate Parks and Recreation's progress in managing the Olmsted Plan; i. Identify and implement management standards for historic Olmsted parks; ii. Evaluate possibilities to enhance park and open space linkages that strengthen connections consistent with the 1903 Olmsted Plan; 3. Continue to work with other City departments on a plan for the development of green streets and parkways."

To carry out our mission, we have concentrated on three objectives or activity areas:

1. Raising public awareness of the Olmsted legacy in Seattle;
2. Serving as a project review board for projects that would restore, enhance or alter the historic character of the Olmsted parks and boulevards, and
3. Advocating for protection measures to preserve the legacy.

Here is a brief overview of our accomplishments and on-going work in each of these 3 activity areas:

1. Raising public awareness:
 - In the spring of 2003, we celebrated the centennial of John Charles Olmsted's first visit to the Pacific Northwest, coordinating a year-long series of events, exhibits and information products including a national conference with speakers from across the United States, a series of guided parks tours and a Seattle Channel documentary on the Olmsted Park Legacy, accessible at: www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.ASP?ID=1080.
 - Currently, we are celebrating the centennial of the Olmsted-designed Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition of 1909, with monthly walking tours; lectures to the Historians' Guild and the Historic Seattle/Museum of History and Industry A-Y-P Centennial symposium; and a panel discussion on the significance of the A-Y-P for the future of the UW campus, as part of the public Olmsted legacy, tentatively scheduled for October 15, 2009.
 - Every year, we conduct monthly walking tours of the Olmsted parks and boulevards, usually beginning in April and concluding in October, with an additional walk on New Years' Day. These walks are advertised in the "Seattle Times" and in our own quarterly newsletter. This year, the usual walks have been replaced with A-Y-P/UW Campus walks.
 - We have produced a number of graphic panels and materials, including the Olmsted design history panels that have been in permanent display at the top of the Volunteer Park water tower since 1997; the companion *Guide to the Olmsted Interpretive Exhibit*; the 2003 "Olmsted Centennial News" and its companion, the 2009 "Olmsted A-Y-P Centennial News;" and the recent *Guide to the Olmsted Legacy at the UW Campus*.
 - Our goal for raising public awareness has recently been given an important boost by the publication of "Greenscapes: Olmsted's Pacific Northwest," by FSOP board member, Joan Hockaday.
 - In addition to these activities, we continue to propose and advocate for installing brown street name signs on the park boulevards to highlight them as part of the Seattle park system, under the management of the Parks Department. Accomplishment of this objective is under way along Queen Anne Boulevard.
2. Serving as a project review board:
 - Our Executive Board meets once per month to review any and all projects proposed within the boundaries of the Olmsted parks and boulevards. Sometimes these projects are proposed by the Parks Department; sometimes they are listed as Parks Levy projects; and at other times they are proposed by citizens' groups, such as the Friends of Seward Park.

- In the past, one of the most significant successes we had with design review was our collaboration with the Parks Department, Seattle Public Utilities, Berger Partnership Landscape Architects and Groundswell off Broadway to develop the award-winning design of Cal Anderson Park along design principles originally proposed by Olmsted for the park (then known as Lincoln Park.)
 - Examples of recent design review activities and actions by our board include: the Lake Washington Boulevard Vegetation Management Plan of 2008; the Hiawatha Park and Playground sports field improvement project; the Sound Transit alterations to the northwest corner of Cal Anderson Park; and the Jefferson Park (and reservoir lid) master plan.
 - Examples of current and on-going design review activities include (but are not limited to): the Seward Park Play Area design; neighborhood street and pedestrian improvements proposed by Safeway along the northern edge of Hiawatha Park and Playground; SPU's storm drainage tank facility along the southern edge of the Washington Park Arboretum at Madison Street; the city-wide parks boulevard closure proposals, and in particular, the Arboretum Drive closure program; and most significantly, review of the design proposals for the State Route 520 bridge replacement program as they would impact the Arboretum and Lake Washington Boulevard.
 - We are also often asked and are happy to comment on design proposals for other parks that have only a tangential connection to the Olmsted Parks and Boulevards, and Superintendent Tim Gallagher has specifically requested this of our board. Recent examples of such design review or parks advocacy activities include cooperation with the Seattle Parks Foundation on promoting South Lake Union Park, which was originally proposed by John Charles Olmsted, and design review of proposed alterations to City Hall Park next to the King County Courthouse.
3. Advocating for preservation, protection and implementation measures:
- Currently, four parks and boulevards designed or proposed by the Olmsted Brothers have been designated as City of Seattle landmarks. These are: Hiawatha Park and Playground; Kinneer Park; Cal Anderson Park; and Cheasty Boulevard. We would like to see that number increased in the future and we are currently preparing a nomination for Volunteer Park. Volunteer Park is the Olmsted park for which the largest number of detailed drawings were prepared by the Olmsted Brothers firm. We hope that designation of Volunteer Park will lead to designation of other Olmsted parks and boulevards as city landmarks.
 - In advocating for preservation and protection, we have several on-going concerns:
 1. Segmentation of the Boulevard System
 2. Loss of historic character and intent
 3. Lack of use/enforcement of existing standards for Olmsted Parks
 4. Private encroachments on park and boulevard property
 5. Tree cutting and loss
 6. Impacts of SR 520 on Lake Washington Boulevard and Washington Park
 - We are supportive of continuing efforts to implement the Olmsted vision for a comprehensive open space system for Seattle and for the region. Projects which developed out of our 2003 Olmsted Centennial include Seattle Open Space 2100 and the Cascade Agenda. We are also supportive of efforts which continue to implement Olmsted's recommendations such as South Lake Union Park, efforts to continue to green our city such as the Green Street proposals, and efforts to locate parks within walking distance for all Seattle citizens.

Verbal Briefing/Discussion

Mr. Kolb introduced himself and reviewed the information in the written briefing paper. Commissioners thanked Mr. Kolb for attending this meeting and asked a number of questions.

Commissioner Barber commented on the thoroughness of the briefing. He added that Leschi Park will celebrate its Centennial on August 15. He asked if the proposed Option A for the SR520 bridge has any chance of being accepted as the preferred alternative of Washington State Department of Transportation. Mr. Kolb answered that Larry Sinnott, who is on FSOP's Board of Directors, is closely monitoring the SR520 project. He urged that Mr. Sinnott attend the next Park Board briefing on this project. Commissioner Holme

requested that the Board be briefed soon on the project and that Larry Sinnott present part of the briefing to the Board. Commissioner Kostka agreed. [The briefing has since been scheduled for September 24.]

Commissioner Holme asked about the FSOP design review group. Mr. Kolb responded that the group is not a formal review team – it is a “friends of” group and has a good relationship with Seattle Parks, especially the Superintendent and several staff from the Planning and Development Division. The Superintendent added that he believes it is important to run some non-Olmstead designs by this group. Mr. Kolb added that it is part of FSOP’s job to be aware of whatever is happening in Olmstead-designed parks and they also work closely with Pamela Kliment of the Neighborhood Matching Fund staff and Seattle Public Utilities staff.

Commissioner Ramels noted that she met Anne Knight of Friends of Olmstead Parks at a conference in New York City and Ms. Knight spoke for approximately two hours about Seattle’s Olmstead park designs. She asked what draws people so strongly to these designs. Mr. Kolb responded that the Olmsteads invented landscape architecture in the United States. He believes that Frederick Law Olmstead was the most talented landscape visionary ever and park designers still try to live up to his vision.

Commissioners thanked Mr. Kolb for the informative briefing.

Briefing: Park Classification System

Michael Shiosaki, Seattle Parks’ Deputy Director of the Project and Planning Division, briefed the Board on the Department’s draft Park Classification System. Commissioners received a written briefing and two attachments. The information was posted to the Board’s web page and hard copies made available at this meeting.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

No action is requested of the Board. This briefing is intended to provide an overview of the proposed system to classify all parks and open space land in Seattle’s parks system. The briefing is set for the July 9 meeting of the Board.

Project Background

The proposed Seattle Park’s Classification system presents a method for grouping parks and facilities in Seattle’s parks and open space system based on similar characteristics. The descriptors and characteristics for each park type are based roughly on the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) park classifications and Seattle Parks’ 1974 Recreation Standards, and then modified to reflect the combination of descriptors typically found in different types of parks in the Seattle system. The classifications are generally driven by each park’s

- physical characteristics (size and setting),
- built environment (amount of developed land and assets),
- natural environment (size natural areas and environmental benefit), and
- programming.

Attachment 1 provides a detailed summary of the proposed Seattle Park’s Classification system. Attachment 2 provides a list of all Seattle parks grouped according to the classification system.

This classification system serves the following purposes:

- The classifications will provide a general guideline for future development options. The combination of descriptors for each park type represents what has generally been successful on a certain sized plot of land located in a certain type of physical environment. These guidelines can help to set community expectations for a given site.
- These classifications may serve as a basis for policies around appropriate programming in different park types.

- These classifications may inform functional planting design standards and other design standards.

Park Classifications - The following park classifications have been identified:

- Triangles/Circles/Squares
- Pocket Park
- Downtown Park
- Neighborhood Park
- Community Park
- Recreation Area
- Natural Area/Greenbelt
- Boulevards/Green Streets/Trails
- Special-Use Park

Strategic Action Plan

The need for a Park Classification system is specifically called out as an action strategy in the Strategic Action Plan, Goal 1. The plan states,
"Create and adopt a consistent land classification system that defines appropriate uses to identify the capacity of each land resource

- i. Classify all Seattle parks and open space land
- ii. Communicate these categories effectively and consistently, defining what the land classification system means in terms of intensity of use, kinds of use, and potential future development."

Public Involvement Process

This system has been developed with input from staff members throughout the Department. No public involvement has been undertaken.

Environmental Sustainability

As new parks are developed or changes to existing parks are proposed, use of the park classification system may allow for better alignment of a park site that has specific environmental attributes with appropriate development and programming options.

Budget

No budget impacts are anticipated.

Schedule

The system will be put to use over time as new parks are planned and changes are proposed to programming of existing parks.

Additional Information

For more information, please contact me via phone at 206.684.0750 or by e-mail at michael.shiosaki@seattle.gov

[Note: A second attachment, showing park name and general classification, is not included in these minutes.]

Attachment 1

Seattle Park's Classification

April 28, 2009

Table of Contents

<u>1)</u>	<u>PURPOSE.....</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>2)</u>	<u>DESCRIPTORS</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>3)</u>	<u>PARK CLASSIFICATIONS.....</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>A)</u>	<u>TRIANGLES/CIRCLES/ SQUARES</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>B)</u>	<u>POCKET PARK</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>C)</u>	<u>DOWNTOWN PARK.....</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>D)</u>	<u>NEIGHBORHOOD PARK.....</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>E)</u>	<u>COMMUNITY PARK.....</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>F)</u>	<u>RECREATION AREA</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>G)</u>	<u>NATURAL AREA/ GREENBELT.....</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>H)</u>	<u>BOULEVARDS/GREEN STREETS/TRAILS.....</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>I)</u>	<u>SPECIAL-USE PARKS.....</u>	<u>20</u>

Developed by Malia Langworthy,
consultant to Seattle Parks and Recreation.

Seattle Park's Classification

1) Purpose

This document presents a method for classifying the parks in Seattle's system. The classifications are driven by park use, purpose and size. These classifications are not grouped by maintenance frequency or the presence of a particular asset. This document is to be viewed in conjunction with the parks classification spreadsheet, in which all Seattle parks are classified according to the schema described in this document.

This classification schema serves the following purposes:

- These classifications will provide a general guideline for future development options. The combination of descriptors for each park type represents what has generally been successful on a certain sized plot of land located in a certain type of physical environment. These guidelines can help to set community expectations for a given site.
- These classifications may serve as a basis for policies around appropriate programming in different park types.
- These classifications may inform functional planting design standards and other design standards.

This classification scheme is not intended to be used for the following purposes:

- These classifications are not to serve as an inventory of individual of assets (e.g. total acres of natural area or total number of athletic fields) because different combinations of the same assets appear in each park type. For example, total natural area in the system is not derived by adding up the acreage of parks designated as "natural areas" because many other park types contain natural areas.
- These classifications should not serve as the basis for estimating maintenance hours. Each park classification contains a diverse collection of parks that are used at different levels of intensity and have different levels of visibility, which correspond to various levels of maintenance.

2) Descriptors

Each park type is defined by a set of descriptors, which reflect its size, assets, programming, and environmental benefits. Park use, purpose and size are the primary descriptors defining each park classification. The descriptors for each park type are based roughly on National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) park classifications and Seattle Parks' 1974 Recreation Standards, and then modified to reflect the combination of descriptors typically found in different types of parks in the Seattle system.

Table 1 lists and defines the descriptors used to designate each park type. This is followed by a separate table for each park type. The descriptors are applied to every park in the system to determine which park classification it matches most closely. All parks will not fall perfectly into a park type. The descriptors for each park type represent the majority of parks in that classification and the ideal for that park type. If descriptors are broadened so as to fully encompass every park that falls into that classification, each classification will become less distinct and the classification system will lose the ability to serve as a guideline for potential development. This document also should not solidify a park in a particular classification forever. If a park is significantly altered to respond to changing needs, its classification should be reevaluated.

In cases where distinct parks lie side-by-side to create a contiguous property (such as the Jefferson Park area which includes the Golf Course, Park, Community Center and East Duwamish Greenbelt), the entire property will be treated as one park.

Table 1
Descriptor Definitions

DESCRIPTOR	EXPLANATION
<i>Physical</i>	
Size	Acreage range given for each park type
Setting	Type of neighborhood (Single Family Residential, Hub Urban Village, etc.) and immediate surroundings where each park type might be found.
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Whether or not the park type meets the <i>2005 Seattle Comprehensive Plan</i> Usable Open Space standard defined as primarily green open space for drop-in use over 10,000 square feet

Built environment	
Percent developed land	The percent of land area of each park type that is expected to be developed (includes all landscaped areas) rather than natural
Assets (desired)	Examples of major defining assets such as sports fields, picnic tables, comfort stations, benches, play areas, lighting, etc. that each park type is expected to have. <i>Assumption: It is common understanding that a park of a particular size and in a particular location would have the amenities listed in this category. This list does not include non-defining assets such as garbage cans, drinking fountains, bike racks, etc.</i>
Assets (optional)	Examples of major defining assets that would be appropriate, but is not expected for each park type <i>Assumption: While residents might not expect these amenities in a park of this size or in this location, the inclusion of these amenities is not expected to cause conflict among nearby community members, given past experience and other neighborhood uses. This list does not include non-defining assets such as garbage cans, drinking fountains, bike racks, etc.</i>
Parking	The parking expectation for each park type (street parking, off-street parking, no parking).
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	Whether or not a natural area of forest, wetland, riparian area or shoreline might be found within each park type
Environmental Benefits	The types of environmental benefits each park type should be designed to yield. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil ecosystem services: support vegetation, regulate water, water treatment, nutrient cycling, soil-based habitat • Hydrology: regulate water supply and runoff close to natural hydrology [e.g. green stormwater infrastructure, as defined in the Seattle Stormwater Code], water-based habitat • Vegetation: climate moderation, CO2 reduction, pollutant filters, erosion control, pollinator and plant-based habitat, green stormwater infrastructure, habitat, native plants • Habitat: wildlife, marine preserves, riparian corridors
Programs	
Programming (desired)	Programming such as sports practice, sports games, nature programs, concerts, food vendors, etc. that each park type is expected to have. <i>Assumption: It is common understanding that a park of a particular size, design and location would offer these programs.</i>
Programming (optional)	Programming that would be appropriate, but is not expected for each park type <i>Assumption: While residents might not expect these programs in a park of this size or in this location, the inclusion of these amenities will not cause conflict among nearby community members, given past experience and other neighborhood uses.</i>
Geographic range of users	The radius from which each park type is expected to draw its primary users.

3) Park Classifications

The park types presented in this document include:

- a) Triangles/Circles/Squares
- b) Pocket Park
- c) Downtown Park
- d) Neighborhood Park
- e) Community Park
- f) Recreation Area

- g) Natural Area/Greenbelt
- h) Boulevards/Green Streets/Trails
- i) Special-Use Park

**a) TRIANGLES/CIRCLES/
SQUARES**

These small sites are typically composed of traffic islands or leftover pieces of land. They are often dedicated to Parks in the original plat rather than purchased for use.

Physical	
Size	Generally under 10,000 square feet (0.25 acres)
Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages, Urban Center Villages • Generally constructed on unused land between roads
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	No
Built environment	
Percent developed	100%
Assets (desired)	None
Assets (optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benches • Lighting for safety • Public Art
Parking	Street, none
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	No
Environmental Benefits	Possible green stormwater infrastructure
Programs	
Programming (desired)	None
Programming (optional)	None
Geographic range of users	People in the immediate vicinity (pedestrians, cyclists, drivers)

b) POCKET PARK

These are typically smaller developed sites that have been acquired to serve the immediate neighborhood as a small multi-purpose park. These parks are generally not large enough for significant programming or activity. They may incorporate utility infrastructure or a viewpoint.

Physical

Size	Generally between 2,500 sq. ft. and 10,000 sq. ft. (0.25 acres) – this refers primarily to the usable area of the park
Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages • Generally surrounded by residences, small commercial, non-arterial streets
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	No, unless it exceeds 0.25 acres

Built environment

Percent developed	70-100%	
Assets (desired)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benches • Improved paths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plaza or grassy area for informal activity (no sports field)
Assets (optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed Landscape • Lighting for safety (rare) • Picnic table 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Play area • Public art • Viewpoint
Parking	Street, none	

Natural Environment

Natural Area	None
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants

Programs

Programming (desired)	None
Programming (optional)	Small community gatherings
Geographic range of users	Immediate neighborhood – less than ¼ mile in distance

c) DOWNTOWN PARK

These are typically smaller developed sites located in Seattle's Center City and other neighborhood centers. These areas provide a landscaped respite from busy downtown streets and often offer places to sit and space for performers and vendors. The 2006 Seattle Downtown Parks & Public Spaces Task Force report identifies 24 downtown parks in three categories: 1) downtown destination parks, which are "signature parks of interest to the broad community"; 2) downtown neighborhood parks, where "neighborhood involvement in activities and programming...is most appropriate;" and 3) small public spaces or beauty spots, which are "small islands within the urban environment that present opportunities to enhance the city's character and identity, and the public's enjoyment of downtown, but are not large enough for substantial park facilities."

Physical	
Size	Between 0.1 and 5 acres
Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2006 Downtown Parks & Public Spaces Task Force Report defines "downtown" as the area bounded by South Lake Union Park to the north, the International District to the south and Interstate 5 to the east. This document currently reflects those boundaries, although in the future the area defined "downtown" may shift as the city changes Generally surrounded by commercial, government or multi-family buildings
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Only those over 10,000 square feet
Built environment	
Percent developed	100%
Assets (desired)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benches Improved paths Designed landscapes Lighting for safety Plaza or level grassy area for informal activity (no sports field)
Assets (optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Picnic tables Play area Public art Stage
Parking	Street, none
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	None
Environmental Benefits	Possible green stormwater infrastructure, native plants
Programs	
Programming (desired)	Buskers, food vendors (carts), small concerts, special events
Programming (optional)	
Geographic range of users	Immediate business community, downtown visitors and residents, tourists

d) NEIGHBORHOOD PARK

Neighborhood parks are larger than pocket parks and serve the surrounding neighborhood for multiple uses. Typical park development may include play areas, small fields, benches, picnic tables, and improved paths.

Physical

Size	Between 0.25 and 9 acres
Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages • Generally surrounded by residences, small businesses, small or arterial streets
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Yes

Built environment

Percent developed	30-100%
Assets (desired)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benches • Designed landscape • Improved paths • Level grassy area for informal activity • Picnic tables • Play area
Assets (optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basketball court • Boat launch • Comfort station • Garden • Lighting for safety • Picnic shelter or small shelter house • Public art • Sports fields • Stage • Tennis courts • Wading pool • Viewpoint
Parking	Generally just street parking; may have off-street parking

Natural Environment

Natural Area	May have natural area, creek, lake
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat (if natural area), CO2 reduction

Programs

Programming (desired)	community gatherings, children and family activities
Programming (optional)	Light scheduling for athletic teams, small concerts
Geographic range of users	Surrounding neighborhood – between ¼ and ½ mile

e) COMMUNITY PARK

A community park meets the recreational needs of several neighborhoods and may also preserve unique landscapes and open spaces. These parks serve multiple uses and provide recreational facilities and accommodate group activities not provided in neighborhood parks. Community park sites should be accessible by arterial and/or collector streets.

Physical

Size	Between 5 and 60 acres
Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages • Should be next to an arterial, institution, or natural area rather than surrounded by homes on all sides
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Yes

Built environment

Percent developed	25-100%	
Assets (desired)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basketball court • Benches • Comfort station • Designed landscape • Improved paths • Level grassy area for informal activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting for safety • Picnic tables and shelters • Play area • Sports field(s)
Assets (optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boat launch • Community Center • Concessions • Community or specialty garden • Lifeguarded beach • Lighting for specific facility use • Natural Area • Off-leash area • Public art 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pool • Recreation complex (lighted sports fields with designated parking away from residences) • Skatepark • Stage • Tennis courts • Wading pool • Viewpoint

Parking	Off-street parking and street parking
---------	---------------------------------------

Natural Environment

Natural Area	May have natural area, creek, lake
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat (if natural area), CO2 reduction

Programs

Programming (desired)	Community gatherings, scheduled for athletic teams, small concerts
Programming (optional)	, naturalist activities, food vendors (cart)
Geographic range of users	Several surrounding neighborhoods – between 1/2 and 3 miles; citywide if park contains a recreation complex

f) RECREATION AREA

Recreation areas supplement neighborhood and community parks, serving broader citywide recreation needs. Each of these parks contains various assets, often for active recreation, and is programmed accordingly. Many also have designated natural areas. Restroom facilities and off-street parking are generally provided for users.

Physical	
Size	Between 20 and 500 acres
Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages • Accessible via public transit and urban trail system and arterial streets • Usually next to an arterial, commercial building, other institution, greenspace, or waterfront, rather than surrounded by residences on all sides
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Yes
Built environment	
Percent developed	20-100%
Assets (desired)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benches • Comfort station • Designed landscape • Improved paths • Level grassy area for informal activity • Lighting for specific facility use • Picnic tables and shelters • Play area • Sports field(s) • Stage
Assets (optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration Building • Basketball court • Boat launch • Community Center • Concessions • Lifeguarded beach • Off-leash area • Natural area • Pool • Recreation complex (lighted sports fields with designated parking away from residences)Skatepark • Tennis court • Unique garden areas or conservatory • Wading pool • Viewpoint
Parking	Multiple off-street parking lots to allow for access to different parts of the park and maybe street parking
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	Yes – forest, lake, creek, riparian area
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat, riparian corridor (possible), CO2 reduction
Programs	
Programming (desired)	Community gatherings, scheduled for athletic teams, nature programs, special events, sporting events
Programming (optional)	, concerts, large special events, , fairs
Geographic range of users	Citywide, regional, tourists

**g) NATURAL
AREA/
GREENBELT**

Natural Areas are park sites established for the protection and stewardship of habitat and other natural systems support functions. Some natural areas are accessible for low-impact use. Minimal infrastructure may include access and signage, where it will not adversely impact habitat or natural systems functions. Larger natural areas may have small sections developed to serve a community park function.

Physical

Size	Any
Setting	Where tracts of undeveloped land are available. Natural areas may include, but are not limited to, forest, meadows, riparian areas, beaches, tidelands and wetlands. Non-accessible natural areas are generally found on steep slopes or in riparian zones or wetlands. Natural area often serve as a buffer between incompatible land uses. See 1993 Greenspaces Policy (Resolution 28653) for details about natural areas.
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Only parks with usable open space over 10,000 square feet

Built environment

Percent developed	Limited to infrastructure for support services
Assets (desired)	None (Parks Design Standard 02900-01 "Site Restoration of Natural Areas" shall apply)
Assets (optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comfort station (in more heavily used natural areas such as Carkeek and Discovery Park) • Environmental Learning Center • Picnic tables • Play area • Signage • Trails (internal and connecting with external urban trails) • Viewpoint
Parking	Street parking, off-street parking for natural areas with more amenities

Natural Environment

Natural Area	Yes
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat, riparian corridor (if there is a creek or shoreline), erosion control

Programs

Programming (desired)	Environmental education
Programming (optional)	Plant restoration service projects, research
Geographic range of users	Citywide, regional, tourists

h) BOULEVARDS/GREEN STREETS/TRAILS

Boulevards, green streets and trails are linear parks that typically serve as an aesthetically-pleasing transportation corridor. A boulevard is legally designated in SMC 15.02.046, defined as an extension or expansion of a dedicated street which continues to serve as a right-of-way in addition to being park land. Many of Seattle's boulevards are part of the Olmsted plan. Boulevards and green streets often provide safe pedestrian routes as well as recreation opportunities.

Physical	
Size	Any
Setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages • Along an arterial road • In places with attractive views
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Those with usable open space over 10,000 square feet
Built environment	
Percent developed	25-100%
Assets (desired)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed landscape • Improved Path • Regular street lighting
Assets (optional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benches • Decorative lighting • Flat grassy area for informal activity • Play area • Public gathering place • Viewpoint
Parking	Street parking, off-street parking
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	May have shoreline, riparian area
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, riparian area, CO2 reduction
Programs	
Programming (desired)	None
Programming (optional)	Bike and pedestrian-oriented activities
Geographic range of users	Citywide, all travelers using the street

i) SPECIAL-USE PARKS

This category refers to stand-alone parks that are designed to serve one particular use. Examples of parks that fit into this category include stand-alone golf courses, marinas, boat ramps, and community or specialty gardens. These parks may serve a second or third use (e.g. picnic tables at a marina or walking paths at a golf course), but the primary use is prioritized with regard to design, maintenance and funding decisions.

For each special-use park type, the descriptors will differ depending on industry standards and best practices for the intended activity. For each type of special-use park, a more detailed list of descriptors should be developed by a design expert in that particular field.

Physical	
Size	Whatever size is necessary for the intended use
Setting	Depends on intended use
Contributes to planning area	In some cases
Usable Open Space requirement	
Built environment	
Percent developed	70-100%
Assets (desired)	Depends on intended use
Assets (optional)	Depends on intended use
Parking	Depends on intended use
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	None
Environmental benefits	Golf courses contribute to CO2 reduction, native plants, habitat, and green stormwater infrastructure; environmental benefits of other special-use parks depends on development
Community	
Programming (desired)	Depends on intended use
Programming (optional)	Depends on intended use
Geographic range of users	Citywide

Verbal Briefing/Board Discussion

Mr. Shiosaki introduced himself and recognized Parks' consultant, Malia Langworthy, who drafted the park classification system. He next reviewed the information in the written briefing and answered the Board's questions.

Commissioner Ramels complimented the briefing and asked if any of the parks are designated as regional parks. Superintendent Gallagher and Mr. Shiosaki responded that the parks are not designated as regional. Instead, they are classified based on the primary use of the park.

Commissioner Kostka noted that she didn't see wildlife included on page 11 of the designations and urged that this designation be included. She next asked how this classification works with the City's Department of Planning and Development's (DPD) zoning classifications. She noted that Discovery Park is zoned as a single family zone. Why doesn't DPD call a park a park? Mr. Shiosaki stated that park lands are zoned the same as the property the adjoining property. Superintendent Gallagher added that Seattle has chosen not to designate property as zoned park land. He added that having park land designated single-family zone, etc., can limit what can be built in a park.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Kincaid on whether the Department has solicited public input, Mr. Shiosaki responded that the Department can certainly hold a public process on this designation system. This is a new, working document and is not static. Commissioner Kincaid asked if Parks staff is looking at what percentage park land is used for a specific use – and how that uses compares in percentage to other

uses. Mr. Shiosaki answered that each park is so unique that it is difficult to do that. The designations have not gotten that detailed.

Commissioner Holme asked what is meant by "soil-based habitat" in the natural area designation, on page 3. Superintendent Gallagher responded that this refers to bugs, voles, grubs, worms (the decomposers of the world.)

Commissioner Holme had several suggestions: in the program section add "concessionaires" along with the word vendor; add the word "downtown" to the classifications for triangles and circles; remove the wording that parking isn't allowed at viewpoints as there are some existing exceptions to this; and remove the wording that a desired asset of trails and boulevards is street lighting, as this isn't always the case. He gave a portion of Lake Washington Boulevard as an example. He also asked that the classification list of parks be alphabetized when it becomes accessible to the public. He believes the park classification designation is a great tool and the most significant idea from the Strategic Action Plan.

Commissioner Adams commented that this is a very powerful document, which he found fascinating. He asked Mr. Shiosaki to use pocket parks as an example and explain how the classification system will work. Mr. Shiosaki responded that if a request is made to add a skate park in a pocket park, the park classification designation would show that skate parks aren't allowed in pocket parks.

Superintendent Gallagher used Discovery Park as an example. If a request is made for an off-leash area, the park designation can clearly show that use is not allowed. The same applies if a request is made to add a golf course. The park classification designation will give clear guidance to the Department and the public on what uses are appropriate, or not, at a particular park and what can and cannot be added to a park.

Commissioner Barber is interested in the greenbelt designation and how the department conveys the intent of a park to the public. He believes the classification system will be beneficial for this purpose.

Commissioner Ramels commented that some park users like sports areas and others prefer a natural setting. With this classification system in place, park users can see the dichotomy of a park and not feel that use decisions are made in an arbitrary way.

A member of the audience called out comments during the Board's discussion. The Chair asked her to submit her comments in writing to the Commissioners.

The Board has tentatively scheduled an update briefing on the classification system at its October 8 meeting, followed by a public hearing. Commissioners thanked Mr. Shiosaki for the briefing.

Discussion/Recommendation: Park Operating Hours

Eric Friedli, Seattle Parks' Policy and Business Analysis Manager, briefed the Commissioners on a park operating hours proposal at the February 26 meeting, followed by a public hearing at the May 14 meeting. To read those minutes, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/02-26-09.pdf> and <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/05-14-09.pdf>. The Board discussed the proposal at its June 25 meeting and tabled the discussion to the July 9 or 23 meeting. To read the minutes of the June 25 meeting, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/06-25-09.pdf>.

Following the June 25 meeting, at the Board's request Mr. Friedli forwarded a summary of the motion to the Commissioners, as follows:

The motion would be to endorse the staff recommendation as presented below.

Proposal for Park hours:

1. *Maintain the current standard operating hours per Ordinance 117645 – open at 4 a.m. and close at 11:30 p.m., and continue to allow for exceptions following the existing process.*
2. *For parks where an exception to the standard hours has been approved, the hours would be standardized to 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. Parks would then review each of these parks to assess whether or not the exception is still appropriate. This would not apply to parks that are established in Parks Policy 060-P-7.13.0 as being open to the public 24 hours a day, or to boat ramps.*
3. *Amend the Parks Operating Hours Exception Policy 060-P-7.13.0 so that exception requests would only be granted for opening at 6 a.m. and closing at 10 p.m.*
4. *Amend the Parks Operating Hours Exception Policy 060-P-7.13.0 so that the Superintendent -- in response to neighbor or Police concerns about threats to public safety, public peace or the potential for injury to the public and after consultation with the Board of Park Commissioners --can close a park earlier than 10 p.m. for up to a nine-month period.*
5. *Establish a protocol and procedure by which the Seattle Police Department is delegated the authority to temporarily close any city park during the hours of darkness when an officer discovers, or has been dispatched to investigate, a suspicious situation or disturbance and the investigating officer, in the interest of resolving the issue, needs to immediately close and clear the park.*

Commissioner Holme moved that the Board accept the staff recommendation as presented by Mr. Friedli above. Commissioner Kincaid seconded. The vote was taken with all in favor. Motion carried.

Commissioner Holme commented that the parks operating hours are a work in progress. Commissioner Adams added that this summary provided everything the Commissioners needed to know on this proposal. He appreciates getting a big picture summary of proposals first, then the details. He thought the process was somewhat out of order on this briefing. Mr. Friedli thanked him for the comment and will note this for future briefings.

Discussion/Recommendation: Use of Synthetic Turf Policy

At its April 23 meeting, the Park Board heard a briefing on the Use of Synthetic Turf Policy by Eric Friedli, Seattle Parks Policy and Business Analysis Manager. This was followed by a public hearing at the May 28 meeting. To read the minutes from those meetings, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/04-23-09.pdf> and <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/05-28-09.pdf>. Commissioners also submitted a number of questions to Mr. Friedli, as did City Council. The questions and the Department's responses were sent to all the Commissioners, posted on the Board's web page, and hard copies were available to the public at Park Board meetings. Several Commissioners also redlined the draft policy and submitted their proposed changes to Mr. Friedli. Mr. Friedli also added other proposed changes, based on Commissioner's recommendations. The Board began its discussion of this draft policy at the June 25 meeting. To read the minutes from that meeting, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/06-25-09.pdf>.

At the June 25 meeting, Commissioners spent a substantial amount of time discussing the policy. During the discussion, Commissioner Kostka presented a copy of the draft policy showing a number of changes she would like included in the policy. The other Commissioners had not seen her proposed changes prior to that time. She submitted the recommendations in writing because there was no time for discussion. The June 25 discussion was then tabled until either the July 9 or 23 meeting. Following the meeting, Mr. Friedli sent the Board a revised version of the draft policy that included changes resulting from the June 25 discussion. Commissioners were asked to send proposed changes in a redline version so the Board's coordinator could distribute them to the rest of the Board and staff.

Tonight the Board plans to complete its discussion and vote on a recommendation to the Superintendent.

The Chair stated that the Board of Park Commissioners is advisory to the Superintendent and has a mutual relationship with the Department. The Board advises on the Department's policies and its members are asked

to do this based on their knowledge and research, public input, and staff briefings. The Board's role is not to write policy for the Department. She has strong concerns with Commissioners redlining the Department's draft Use of Synthetic Turf policy and believes this is a dangerous precedent for the Board to set and an insult to Parks staff. A better procedure is to discuss policy suggestions and ideas at the Board's public meetings. She asked that the Board handle policy discussions differently in the future in order to be credible and respected.

Commissioner Adams commented that it is not the role of the Park Board to write policy for the Department; however, he appreciates that Parks is open to suggestions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Barber disagreed with the Chair and believes it is the Board's responsibility to advise the Department on its policies. Commissioner Kostka stated that she has enjoyed working with Mr. Friedli on this policy and meant no insult to staff by redlining the policy. Commissioner Kincaid agreed with Commissioner Kostka's sentiments. Commissioner Kostka suggested a better process be developed for future policy presentations to the Park Board.

[The following version shows proposed changes to the draft policy by Mr. Friedli, and Commissioners Barber, Kincaid, and Kostka. Note: This is not the final draft that resulted from the July 9 discussion.]

Your City, Seattle
 Department Policy & Procedure –

Subject: Use of Synthetic Turf		Number
		Effective
		Supersedes
Approved:	Department: Parks & Recreation	Page 1 of

1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this Use of Synthetic Turf Policy is to ~~(Kostka) outline for staff and the public certain elements to be considered as the future use of synthetic turf is contemplated by the Department~~ adopt the highest level of safety for park users, their families, and the public at large.

(Friedli) proposed revision: 1.1 The purpose of this Use of Synthetic Turf Policy is to outline for staff and the public certain elements to be considered as the future use of synthetic turf is contemplated so that we maintain the highest level of safety for park users, their families, and the public at large.

2.0 ORGANIZATIONS/INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED

2.1 Staff who design, construct, and maintain Seattle Parks and Recreation athletic fields.

2.2 Consultants, landscape architects and park designers hired by the Department to design park athletic fields.

2.3 Athletic field users, ~~and~~ park neighbors, (Kostka) and the public at large.

3.0 POLICY

- 3.1 Seattle Parks and Recreation aims to provide high quality facilities for a variety of athletic endeavors. Seattle Parks and Recreation recognizes that synthetic turf is a reasonable alternative to natural grass surface on athletic fields. It is important to Seattle Parks and Recreation that the use of synthetic turf is done in such a way as to maintain the highest level of safety for our park users (Kincaid), protection of the environment and nearby habitat.

4.0 DEFINITIONS

5.0 RESPONSIBILITY

- 5.1 Planning and Development division staff are responsible for the planning and design of athletic fields and completing cost benefit analysis of synthetic, (Friedli), ~~versus~~ natural grass fields (Friedli) or other alternative fields surfaces.
- 5.2 Planning and Development staff is responsible for maintaining documentation, completing water and environmental quality analysis, and keeping up-to-date on the new synthetic turf materials and their safety considerations.
- 5.3 Park Maintenance Division staff is responsible for maintaining synthetic turf fields in a way that is consistent with manufacturer's specifications and industry standards.
- 5.4 City-wide athletics unit staff is responsible for communications with users, (Kostka) ~~and~~ user groups, (Kostka) and the public at large about safety and health awareness related to play on athletic fields.

6.0 PROCEDURE

- 6.1 The Department will not purchase field products that contain hazardous levels of potentially toxic materials.
- 6.2 The Department will continue to review literature and new studies (Barber) and to consult with the Seattle King County Department of Public Health concerning synthetic fields health effects, injury data, (Barber) standards of toxic levels, and maintenance and design practices as they become available.
- 6.3 (Kostka) ~~Contingent on funding being available~~ The Department will include in its annual work plan an element for testing potential water and environmental quality impacts associated with the use of synthetic turf, including testing for the presence of hazardous levels of potentially toxic materials in the turf materials and the migration of hazardous materials from the field surface. Testing at Magnuson Park should align with the required 10-year Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for the fields and habitat improvements completed in 2009 (Kincaid), including testing of field surfaces. Additional testing will be performed annually years 7-10. (Friedli) ~~Other testing~~ Testing at other fields should include ~~initial~~ testing soon after installation and follow-up testing ~~only if~~ where warranted.
- 6.4 Athletic Field designers will work with the Parks Division Director, Recreation Division Director, athletic field coordinator(s), maintenance staff, (Kincaid) ~~and~~ field users, park neighbors and community groups to assist with site selection.

- 6.5 As appropriate, the Department should work with Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) to encourage turf manufacturers to initiate and implement end-of-product-life recycling programs and purchase those products with the best end-of-product-recycling option.
- 6.6 The Department should share information about health and safety guidelines with athletic field users, (Kincaid) ~~and~~-park neighbors and general park users. (Kostka) This will include advising users not to eat food without thoroughly washing hands.
- 6.7 The Department should periodically request feedback from user groups using new and existing products.
- 6.8 With all new synthetic turf projects, the Department should provide appropriate landscape and irrigation improvements to all impacted areas surrounding the field.
- 6.9 Maintenance of synthetic turf fields should be done consistent with the manufacturer's specifications and current best practices.
- 6.10 When considering the cost of synthetic turf fields a life-cycle cost, including replacement cost (Friedli) and disposal of surface materials will be considered.

7.0 (Kostka) REFERENCES (independent source web sites)

8.0 (Kincaid) APPENDICES

Commissioner Adams moved that the Board accept the policy as provided by staff with Mr. Friedli's redlined additions. After a brief discussion, Commissioners agreed to first review the additions from Mr. Friedli, as well as those proposed by Commissioners Barber, Kincaid, and Kostka. **Commissioner Adams withdrew the motion.**

Commissioners and Parks staff then reviewed individually the proposed redlined changes to sections 1.1, 2.3, 3.1, 5.1, 5.4, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.10, and 7.0. Commissioners came to consensus on the language changes except for sections 2.5, 5.4, and 6.3 which required separate votes.

Discussion:

1.1 Commissioner Kostka had suggested a re-wording of the language to read "The purpose of this Use of Synthetic Turf Policy is to adopt the highest level of safety for park users, their families, and the public at large."

Mr. Friedli suggested a re-wording to "The purpose of this Use of Synthetic Turf Policy is to outline for staff and the public certain elements to be considered as the future use of synthetic turf is contemplated so that we maintain the highest level of safety for park users, their families, and the public at large."

After discussion, it was agreed to reflect Mr. Friedli's new language in the draft policy.

2.3 Mr. Friedli submitted the following language under Organizations/Individuals Affected: "Athletic field users and park neighbors." Commissioner Kostka voiced strong support for changing the wording to "Athletic field users, park neighbors, and the public at large."

Commissioner Kostka commented that not including this additional language is a disservice to the public. Commissioners Barber and Kincaid agreed. Commissioner Holme disagreed and noted that the Purpose Statement already includes the words "and the public at large." He questioned the value of

adding this in additional areas of the policy. Commissioner Ramels asked how the Department would communicate with “the public at large.”

Commissioner Ramels asked Commissioners to voice their inclination for this additional language. Commissioners Barber, Kincaid, and Kostka would support its inclusion. Commissioners Adams and Holme disagreed. It was agreed to vote on this section in a separate motion.

- 3.1 Commissioner Kincaid proposed that the third sentence be changed from “It is important to Seattle Parks and Recreation that the use of synthetic turf is done in such a way as to maintain the highest level of safety for our park users” to “It is important to Seattle Parks and Recreation that the use of synthetic turf is done in such a way as to maintain the highest level of safety for our park users, protection of the environment, and nearby habitat.”

After discussion, it was agreed to reflect the new language in the draft policy.

- 5.1 Mr. Friedli proposed changing the language from “Planning and Development Division staff are responsible for the planning and design of athletic fields and completing cost benefit analysis of synthetic versus natural grass fields” to “Planning and Development Division staff are responsible for the planning and design of athletic fields and completing cost benefit analysis of synthetic, natural grass fields, or other alternative field surfaces.”

After discussion, it was agreed to reflect the new language in the draft policy.

- 5.4 Commissioner Kostka proposed changing the language from “City-wide athletic unit staff is responsible for communication with users and user groups about safety and health awareness related to play on athletic fields” to “City-wide athletic unit staff is responsible for communications with users, user groups, and the public at large about safety and health awareness related to play on athletic fields.”

After discussion, it was agreed to vote on this language in a separate motion.

- 6.2 Commissioner Barber proposed that the language be changed from “The Department will continue to review literature and new studies concerning synthetic fields health effects, injury data, and maintenance and design practices as they become available” to “The Department will continue to review literature and new studies and to consult with the Seattle King County Department of Public Health and other agencies concerning synthetic fields’ health effects, injury data, standards of toxic levels, and maintenance and design practices as they become available.” During discussion, he also added “The Department will make references available to the public.”

After discussion, it was agreed to reflect the new language and the additional language in the draft policy.

- 6.3 Commissioner Kostka proposed changing the first sentence of this section from “Contingent on funding being available, the Department will include in its annual work plan an element for testing potential water and environmental quality impacts associated with the use of synthetic turf, including testing for the presence of hazardous levels of potentially toxic materials in the turf materials and the migration of hazardous materials from the field surface” to “The Department will include in its annual work plan an element for testing potential water and environmental quality impacts associated with the use of synthetic turf, including testing for the presence of hazardous levels of potentially toxic materials in the turf materials and the migration of hazardous materials from the field surface.”

After discussion, it was agreed to vote on this proposal in a separate motion.

Commissioner Kincaid proposed changing the second sentence from "Testing at Magnuson Park should align with the required 10-year Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for the fields and habitat improvements completed in 2009" to "Testing at Magnuson Park should align with the required 10-year Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for the fields and habitat improvements completed in 2009, including testing of field surfaces."

After discussion, it was agreed to reflect the new language in the draft policy.

Commissioner Kincaid proposed adding a third sentence to read "Additional testing will be performed annually years 7-10." Mr. Friedli proposed language to read "Additional testing will be performed if there is evidence of field degradation and/or abnormal test results." He also proposed that the next sentence read "Testing at other fields should include testing soon after installation and follow-up testing where warranted."

After discussion, it was agreed to reflect Mr. Friedli's new language in the draft policy.

- 6.4 Commissioner Kincaid proposed that the language be changed from "Athletic Field designers will work with the Parks Division Director, Recreation Division Director, athletic field coordinator(s), maintenance staff, and field users to assist with site selection" to "Athletic Field designers will work with the Parks Division Director, Recreation Division Director, athletic field coordinator(s), maintenance staff, field users, park neighbors and community groups to assist with site selection."

After discussion, it was agreed to reflect the new language in the draft policy.

- 6.6 Commissioner Kincaid proposed changing the language from "The Department should share information about health and safety guidelines with athletic field users and park neighbors" to "The Department should share information about health and safety guidelines with athletic field users, park neighbors, and the general park users."

After discussion, it was agreed to reflect the new language in the draft policy.

Commissioner Kostka proposed adding the language "This will include advising users not to eat food without thoroughly washing hands."

Commissioner Holme spoke against this and stated that any coach should tell their players to wash their hands after all sports activity, whether they are playing on grass or synthetic turf. Commissioner Adams agreed. Commissioner Barber suggested that the Department instead post safety and health guidelines at the fields. Commissioner Kincaid agreed with Commissioner Barber. Commissioner Kostka disagreed.

Mr. Friedli will change the language to reflect that it will post signage with safety and health guidelines.

- 6.10 Mr. Friedli proposed changing the language from "When considering the cost of synthetic turf fields a life-cycle cost, including replacement cost will be considered" to "When considering the cost of synthetic turf fields a life-cycle cost, including replacement cost and disposal of surface materials will be considered.:"

All agreed with this change to the policy language.

- 7.0/8.0 Commissioner Kostka proposed changing the language from "REFERENCES" to include a list of independent source web sites.

Mr. Friedli noted that the recent native plant policy reviewed by the Park Board included agreed-upon independent source web sites. However, there currently aren't any independent source sites for the use of synthetic turf and the web information changes frequently. Commissioner Barber stated that it would be useful for the Department to list the sources it used as a reference. Commissioner Holme suggested that the Department and the public use Seattle King County Health Department for the most up-to-date information. When decisions are made, staff should record the decision, as well as the list of references it used when it made the decision. It is important to keep in mind that Seattle Parks and Recreation and the Park Board cannot determine the most correct information.

Mr. Friedli will change 7.0 from "REFERENCES" to "APPENDICES".

Commissioner Adams moved that the Board recommend to the Superintendent to approve the draft policy as amended except 2.5, 5.4, and 6.3 and discuss those separately. Commissioner Holmes asked to add "subject to review." After discussion, the friendly amendment was rejected. **Commissioner Kostka seconded the motion as stated by Commissioner Adams. The vote was taken with all Commissioners in favor. Motion carried.**

2.3 Commissioner Barber moved add "and the public at large." Commissioner Kostka seconded. The vote was taken, with Commissioners Barber, Kincaid, and Kostka voting in favor. Commissioners Adams and Holme voted against. The Chair does not vote except to make or break a tie. Commissioner Ramels, chair, voted against the motion, thereby defeating it. Motion failed.

5.4 Commissioner Kostka moved that the words "public at large" be added to 5.4. Motion died for lack of a second.

6.3 Commissioner Kostka moved that the words "contingent on funding being available" be removed. Commissioner Barber seconded. The vote was taken, with Commissioners Barber, Kincaid, and Kostka voting in favor. Commissioners Adams and Holme voted against. The Chair does not vote except to make or break a tie. Commissioner Ramels, chair, voted against the motion, thereby defeating it. Motion failed.

Commissioner Ramels commented that the Board does not always vote unanimously on issues and this was one of those instances. She thanked Mr. Friedli for his good work on this policy and for his responsiveness to the Board's input and suggestions.

#

The draft use of synthetic turf policy to be considered by the Superintendent is shown below, with new language highlighted:

- 1.0 PURPOSE
 - 1.1 The purpose of this use of Synthetic Turf Policy is to outline for staff and the public certain elements to be considered as the future use of synthetic turf is contemplated so that we maintain the highest level of safety for park users, their families, and the public at large.
- 2.0 ORGANIZATIONS/INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED
 - 2.1 Staff who design, construct, and maintain Seattle Parks and Recreation athletic fields.
 - 2.2 Consultants, landscape architects, and park designers hired by the Department to design park athletic fields.
 - 2.3 Athletic field users **and park neighbors.**
- 3.0 POLICY

3.1 Seattle Parks and Recreation aims to provide high quality facilities for a variety of athletic endeavors. Seattle Parks and Recreation recognizes that synthetic turf is a reasonable alternative to natural grass surface on athletic fields. It is important to Seattle Parks and Recreation that the use of synthetic turf is done in such a way as to maintain the highest level of safety for our park users, **- protection of the environment and nearby habitat.**

4.0 DEFINITIONS

5.0 RESPONSIBILITY

5.1 Planning and Development division staff are responsible for the planning and design of athletic fields and completing cost benefit analysis of synthetic, **versus natural** grass fields **or other alternative fields surfaces.**

5.2 Planning and Development staff is responsible for maintaining documentation, completing water and environmental quality analysis, and keeping up-to-date on the new synthetic turf materials and their safety considerations.

5.3 Park Maintenance Division staff is responsible for maintaining synthetic turf fields in a way that is consistent with manufacturer's specifications and industry standards.

5.4 City-wide athletics unit staff is responsible for communications with users and user groups about safety and health awareness related to play on athletic fields.

6.0 PROCEDURE

6.1 The Department will not purchase field products that contain hazardous levels of potentially toxic materials.

6.2 The Department will continue to review literature and new studies **and to consult with the Seattle King County Department of Public Health and other appropriate agencies** concerning synthetic fields' health effects, injury data, standards of toxic levels, and maintenance and design practices as they become available. **The Department will make references available to the public.**

6.3 Contingent on funding being available, the Department will include in its annual work plan an element for testing potential water and environmental quality impacts associated with the use of synthetic turf, including testing for the presence of hazardous levels of potentially toxic materials in the turf materials and the migration of hazardous materials from the field surface. Testing at Magnuson Park should align with the required 10-year Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for the fields and habitat improvements completed in 2009, including testing of field surfaces. Additional testing will be performed if there is evidence of field degradation and/abnormal test results. Testing at other fields should include testing soon after installation and follow-up testing where warranted.

6.4 Athletic Field designers will work with the Parks Division Director, Recreation Division Director, athletic field coordinator(s), maintenance staff, field users, **park neighbors and community groups** to assist with site selection.

6.5 As appropriate, the Department should work with Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) to encourage turf manufacturers to initiate and implement end-of-product-life recycling programs and purchase those products with the best end-of-product-recycling option.

6.6 The Department should share information about health and safety guidelines with athletic field users, park neighbors, **and general park users.**

6.7 The Department should periodically request feedback from user groups using new and existing products.

6.8 With all new synthetic turf projects, the Department should provide appropriate landscape and irrigation improvements to all impacted areas surrounding the field.

6.9 Maintenance of synthetic turf fields should be done consistent with the manufacturer's specifications and current best practices.

6.10 When considering the cost of synthetic turf fields a life-cycle cost, including replacement cost **and disposal of surface materials** will be considered.

7.0 **APPENDICES**

Old/New Business

Aquarium Announcement: Commissioners received a letter from the Aquarium, announcing a \$500,000 grant from the National Aeronautic and Space Administration (NASA) to the Aquarium.

Board Communications: Commissioner Holme referred to several recent e-mails between Board members and reminded that this type of correspondence is considered "rolling dialogue". Commissioners should refrain from e-mailing each other about Park Board business, in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act. This will to avoid the appearance of a quorum meeting or discussing Park Board issues outside the Board's public meetings.

Chair and Vice-Chair to Meet with New Board Members: Commissioners Ramels and Adams are meeting individually, to avoid having a quorum present, with the two new Board members, Commissioners Jourdan and Kincaid.

There being no other new business, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

APPROVED: _____
Jackie Ramels, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____