

Department of Parks and Recreation

Seattle Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes - March 25, 2010

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
Jourdan Keith
Diana Kincaid
Donna Kostka
Jackie Ramels, Chair

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

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

Commissioner Ramels called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and reviewed the meeting agenda topics. **Commissioner Holme moved approval of the agenda as amended, the acknowledgement of correspondence, and the January 28 minutes. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. The vote was taken, with all in favor. Motion carried.**

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Gallagher reported on the following items. To learn more about Seattle Parks, see the website at <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/>.

Projects and Planning Development (PD&D) Update: PD&D Division Director, Kevin Stoops, and Parks and Green Spaces Levy Manager, Rick Nishi, provided an extensive overview of current projects at the last Board meeting, but a few additional items should be mentioned:

1. The construction contract for the Magnuson Park Wetlands and Athletic Fields projects is now closed - all work is complete and punch list items addressed. In a separate project, the Magnuson Park bathhouse replacement is essentially complete. This project has not only rebuilt this building; it also involved replacement of all the underground electrical distribution system in the original part of Magnuson Park.
2. Parks entered into a job order contract for the Junction Plaza project in West Seattle. This work will start soon and is scheduled for completion before several scheduled summer events occur.
3. Bids were opened this week for the Bellevue Substation project, the park that will be created from a parking lot at John and Summit on Capitol Hill. Parks is evaluating bids and expects to award the construction contract this spring.
4. A series of play area projects will soon go out for bid: Seward Park, Sandel Playground, Beacon Hill Playground, and Fairmount Park Playground. All are planned for summer construction.
5. Design is continuing on a number of other projects and master plan work continues for the West Seattle and Maple Leaf Reservoir projects.

For more information on Seattle Parks' projects, see: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/projects/default.htm>.

Camp Long Master Plan: Nathan Torgelson, Seattle Parks Real Property Manager, and members of the Camp Long Advisory Council are briefing various community groups to receive feedback and ideas about creative partnerships for Camp Long, located in West Seattle. The presentations have focused on the forthcoming partnership with 4-H for the challenge course at Camp Long, and are looking at what other opportunities might exist. Briefings have been presented to Delridge and Southwest District Councils and the West Seattle Men's Golf Group. For more information on Camp Long, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/Environment/camplong.htm>.

First Hill Acquisition: First Hill was identified in the Pro Parks Levy and again in the Parks and Green Spaces Levy to have land acquired for a neighborhood park in the urban center village. The site at the corner of Cherry & Terry was identified in the neighborhood plan, but was only 4,800 sq ft and Parks was unable to acquire it. After 8 years of planning and evaluating a wide variety of sites, Parks has submitted legislation to the City Council seeking authority to acquire two connected lots (currently used for parking) between 8th & 9th and Marion & Columbia Streets. Councilmember Bagshaw asked staff to look at ways to improve the pedestrian environment on First Hill before proceeding.

Parks Projects and Programs Honored at State Conference: At the recent Washington Recreation and Park Association, Magnuson Park and the Seattle Conservation Corp. were selected as the WRPA 2010 Class II-Spotlight Facilities and Parks and Program award winners. A ceremony is scheduled for Thursday, April 15, at the Greater Tacoma Convention Center. For more information on WRPA, see <http://www.wrpatoday.org/>

Volunteer Park Encroachments: Elimination of encroachments along the west boundary of Volunteer Park continues with generally good cooperation from neighbors. Eleven of the 13 neighbors who had some level of encroachment are complying and a few have already completed their work. The two remaining neighbors are considering their options; the annual fee for a Revocable Use Permit in each case would be in excess of \$10,000. Parks landscape and maintenance staff walked the boundary with Property Management staff two weeks ago to discuss restoration needs. Some undesirable vegetation will be removed (e.g., laurel, parts of other hedges) and some will be pruned to allow greater visibility from the park (for public safety and to discourage camping or other illegal activity) as well as allowing more light to encourage growth of new plantings. New plant materials, primarily Northwest native varieties, will be selected to provide a buffer between the private property and the park, to reduce need for continuing maintenance, and to complement the overall landscape of Volunteer Park. Replacement planting will begin in Fall 2010. For more information on Volunteer Park, see http://www.seattle.gov/parks/park_detail.asp?ID=399.

Washington Park Encroachments: Survey work on the 26th Avenue East boundary of the Arboretum is nearly completed and letters will go out to all the 45 adjacent property owners in April. Thirty-one neighbors have extended their private improvements or personal space into the park. In many situations, it appears the owners are maintaining lawns considerably beyond the property line, with some enclosed by fences.

Magnuson Park – Building 41: The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) approved final design of the new building. Parks staff is working on the Memorandum of Understanding for mitigation between SHPO and Seattle Court Sports Unlimited. Parks has completed the SEPA checklist which will then go to the Historic Preservation Office. It will take at least two weeks for their determination of whether to allow demolition or not. Because the former gasoline station is not an historic building, but only contributes to the historic district, demolition with mitigation likely will be the outcome. Staff is aiming to get this legislation (amendment) on the Park and Seattle Center Committee's May calendar. For more information on Warren G. Magnuson Park, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/Magnuson/>.

Artists at Magnuson Park. Parks staff continues to evaluate buildings at Magnuson Park for artist space. *Building 2* - is not an option for relocation due to high cost of renovation - hazmat abatement (\$72,000) and significant roof failure. Also, the Navy has scheduled abatement work for Building 2 during summer 2010 which would interfere with occupancy of the artists' spaces. *South side of Building 47* – renovation costs range from

\$189,851 (8' walls) to \$268,322 (full height walls). Even by raising rental fees slightly to keep below current market rate it would take between 5.9 years to 8.3 years for Parks to begin to realize revenue. This space can only accommodate 8 of the 17 interested artists and the City's Department of Planning and Development has only given permission for temporary occupancy of up to two years.

Outside relocation sites – A number of private developers have approached the artists with potential rental space, and artists are visiting these locations. One site located in the South of the Dome (SODO) is very attractive to several of the artists, as the rent is \$1 sq. ft. Parks staff asked the artists to keep them informed of any decisions they make regarding these community sites.

Seacrest Dock: The new dock is almost complete at Seacrest. Regular King County Water Taxi service on the West Seattle/Downtown Seattle route resumes on Monday, April 5, 2010, with the same sailing schedule as in 2009. The King County Ferry District will host a community celebration for the new season on Sunday, April 11, 2010, from noon to 2 p.m. at Seacrest Marina Park. For more information on the Water Taxi, see <http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/WaterTaxi.aspx>.

Public Health Grant: Seattle & King County were recently awarded two highly-competitive federal grants totaling \$25.5 million over two years to address obesity and tobacco use. Although there were over 250 applicants nationally, King County received two of approximately 40 federal grants that are part of the federal Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) Initiative. The grant will focus on strategies at a population level such as reducing second-hand smoke, increasing access to healthy foods, improving physical education in schools, promoting physical activity through supportive built environments, and/or reducing unhealthy foods in communities. The emphasis will be on supporting activities that can create systems and environmental change in a short timeframe. Parks and Recreation is currently working with partners to develop projects that meet the criteria and will help change policy for the better in these specific areas. For more information on the grants, see <http://www.hhs.gov/recovery/programs/cppw/granteesbystate.html#w>

Space Planning for Parks Facilities: Parks is looking at various options for the move of Parks, Parks Foundation and ARC staff currently located at the Armory building. Options being explored include locating these staff to existing City facilities at 100 Dexter, the RDA building or private space. Long-term plans for the 100 Dexter Building are for staff to vacate it and renovate it to a community center/childcare facility.

Washington Park Arboretum, Gateway to Chile Project: The project team recently completed additional public outreach on "The Gateway to Chile Project" to ensure the community is aware that 34 trees will be removed as part of this project, with 80 Chilean species planted in the area. The following public meetings were held:

1. March 9: press conference scheduled; no one from the press attended
2. March/April: ran project descriptions in the Daily Journal of Commerce, as well as the Madison Park, Capitol Hill, and other community blogs.
3. March 10: Staff scheduled public walk-through #1 with 5 members of the public in attendance. Comments received were all positive.
4. March 16: Staff held a second walk-through with Parks Open Space Advocates (POSA.) Four POSA members attended and voiced strong opposition to the tree removal portion of the project.
5. March 16: A public meeting was held after the POSA walk-through. POSA member Cheryl Trivison read a letter, which she will also send to the Parks Superintendent. Minutes from the meeting may be viewed at <http://seattle.gov/parks/projects/arboretum/>.
6. March 18: Staff made a presentation to City Council.

Deputy Superintendent Williams next reviewed the earlier outreach on the tree removal, including:

1. Jan 2001: Final Environmental Impact Statement mentions proposed eco-geographic exhibits at South End and impacts to existing canopy and understory.
2. Sept 2004: Public Meeting for Pacific Connections Garden design charrette: Included considerations

- for tree removal.
3. Nov 2004: Public Meeting for overview of Proposed Schematic Design for Overall Pacific Connections Garden.
 4. May 2006: Public Meeting for presentation of Overall Pacific Connections Project. Included discussion of tree removals.
 5. April 2007: State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) Review. Mentions removal of 550 trees for eco-geographic exhibits (Pacific Connections Garden). For more information on SEPA, see <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sepa/e-review.html>.
 6. April 2007: Determination of Non-Significance (DNS). Mentions removal of 550 trees for eco-geographic exhibits (Pacific Connections Garden).
 7. May 2007: Public Meeting which included Description of Pacific Connections Phase I: Announced removal of 150 trees associated with Pacific Connections Phase I.
 8. Jan 2010: Public Meeting to announce the removal of 20-30 trees associated with Pacific Connections Phase II.

University of Washington staff will oversee the removal of the 34 trees by ISA Certified Arborists with the work being completed over the next couple of week. For more information on the Washington Park Arboretum and its Pacific Connections gardens, see <http://depts.washington.edu/uwbg/gardens/wpa.shtml>

The Superintendent's report concluded. The Chair asked Commissioners to e-mail any questions to the Board's Coordinator for follow up.

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. No one signed up to testify.

Briefing: Green Seattle Partnership

Mark Mead, Seattle Parks Senior Urban Forester, briefed the Board on the Green Seattle Partnership. Joanna Nelson of Green Seattle Partnership assisted with the briefing. Prior to this meeting, Commissioners received a written briefing, included below, and posted to the Board's web page for public review.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

This briefing will introduce the Park Board to the Green Seattle Partnership, a Park-wide volunteer effort to restore the 2,500 acres of Parks forested area to sustainable native forests. No Board action is requested

Project or Policy Description and Background

The Green Seattle Partnership is collaboration between the City of Seattle, the Cascade Land Conservancy, and our residents to restore and maintain 2,500 acres of forested parkland by 2025. These precious areas are failing as existing trees are reaching the end of their natural life and invasive plants are choking out the next generation of native tree. We estimate that over 40% of the forest is heavily infested with English ivy, Himalayan blackberry, and other invasive plants. Seattle's deciduous trees – big leaf maple and red alder – are dying of old age, while native evergreens cannot reseed nor compete with the invasive plants. Without a massive, coordinated community effort, we estimate that 7 out of 10 trees in these natural areas will be dead within twenty years.

In response to this community need – and building on the existing and ongoing work of committed volunteers – the City of Seattle and the Cascade Land Conservancy launched the Green Seattle Partnership in 2004. The Partnership's 20-year effort to restore and maintain the 2,500 acres of Seattle's forested parks is enhanced by

two major goals of building community support for long-term park stewardship and passing on a legacy of community service to future generations. By mobilizing Seattle residents to donate 2 million volunteer hours and plant 200,000 trees by 2025, the Green Seattle Partnership will create healthier and more livable communities and pass on a legacy of community service to future generations.

Since the program's inception, over 500 acres have entered restoration with the support of over 300,000 hours of community volunteer support. The Cascade Land Conservancy has leveraged the model created with this program to launch similar programs in other cities in the region: Green Kirkland Partnership (2005), Green Tacoma Partnership (2006), Green Redmond Partnership (2008), and the Green Kent Partnership (2009). The Green Seattle Partnership is charting the course for a more livable community which cities around the country can follow.

Strategic Action Plan

The Green Seattle Partnership is directly identified in several elements of the Strategic Action Plan. The Partnership directly addresses:

Goal 1B: Increase restoration of Seattle's natural ecosystem;

Goal 1E: Develop and maintain partnerships to enhance Seattle's parks and open spaces; and

Goal 3C: Provide volunteer opportunities and community stewardship projects.

Public Involvement Process

Over 800 volunteer work events are held annually for the Green Seattle Partnership. Public outreach is managed by a committee of the partners and includes development of advertisements, materials, posters, and attendance at local festivals and events. The annual Mayor's-decreed Green Seattle Day has been held on the first weekend of November since 2004. It is estimated that over 18,000 citizens participated in a volunteer event in 2009.

Issues

The two greatest challenges facing the program are sustaining and expanding volunteer support and financial support. The 300,000 volunteer hours and financial investments made over the last five years have been significant. Sustaining the effort will continue to build on the momentum generated as well as to ensure that the progress made is not lost. Restoration is a multi-year process and the value of these investments will quickly diminish as invasives will rapidly reclaim areas we have cleared. Careful prioritization as we move forward during these difficult economic conditions is critical.

Similarly, we know that forested "natural" areas in the middle of an urban city require ongoing maintenance to ensure their long term sustainability – the lack of this stewardship many decades ago is why we are facing this challenge now. As acres are restored, they need ongoing monitoring and maintenance to ensure that they are environmental community assets for generations.

The demand for this work came from and is supported by our citizens. Parks commitment to this work has created a trusting working relationship with our citizens. Over 60 volunteer Forest Stewards are actively engaged in their local community and elicit support and understanding for the Green Seattle Partnership and Parks and Recreation. A large part the Green Seattle Partnership's success can be directly linked to the citizen advocacy for this type of work over the last 20 years. The Green Seattle Partnership is the culmination of the Capital Funded Forest Restoration Program begun in 1994 by Parks and Recreation which was in response to this citizen demand.

No major issues of conflict have been raised or encountered during the first five years of the Green Seattle Partnership. In consideration of the broad citywide impact of the program, there are potential issues of conflict, such as working in or around encampments, slope stability, worker safety, losses of privacy and potential view conflicts. These issues are or have been successfully resolved through existing Parks procedures.

Environmental Sustainability

The intention of the Green Seattle Partnership is to positively impact the overall environmental and community health of Seattle by investing in a sustainable program that directly improves the sustainability of our forest resources, creates the management infrastructure to support these efforts, and builds a community of knowledgeable and engaged stewards.

Budget

Capital funding for the Green Seattle Partnership was originally estimated at \$53 million over the 20-year life of the initial restoration process. The goal was that there would be a gradual ramping up through the 20 years to a sustainable General Fund budget of \$1.5 million annually for ongoing maintenance as forest acres are restored. Limited capital funds due to the recession (partially from significantly lower Real Estate Excise Tax funds) have reduced the capital contribution to the budget and the General Fund contribution has been generally in the \$300,000 to \$400,000 range.

Cascade Land Conservancy, our principal outside partner, is raising \$3million in private funds and federal grants to directly support the Green Seattle Partnership. In addition, funding from grants and donations has supplemented the budget, notably a \$1.0 million donation for the restoration of Seward Parks' forest and \$630,000 from the Coleman Park Illegal Cutting settlement. In addition, Seattle Public Utilities, the Seattle Office of Sustainability, and the Department of Neighborhoods are contributing in-kind resources and staff time to the work of the Partnership.

Schedule

The Partnership was originally developed as a 20-year plan. Budget reductions and changes in capital fund availability have potentially increased the timeline to reach the Partnership goals. Current estimates are that the restoration process could be extended from 20 to 25 or 30 years if funds are not completely restored.

Additional Information

Information about the Green Seattle Partnership can be found at www.greenseattle.org.

Mark Mead: mark.mead@seattle.gov

Verbal Briefing & Discussion

Mr. Mead introduced both himself and Joann Nelson of Green Seattle Partnership. He showed a Powerpoint presentation and reviewed the following: accomplishments to date, community resources, Cascade Agenda, Urban Green Spaces, "No Management" paradigm, development of urban forest sustainability model, building community support for the effort, partners in the effort, fun events, planning for sustainability, long-term monitoring and maintenance; forested parkland restoration and sustainability model, and the multi-generational legacy of this partnership.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Kostka on how budget cuts may impact this partnership, Mr. Mead responded that the most important focus will be to protect what has already been planted. The Parks and Green Spaces Levy has dedicated 2011 and 2012 funds. That funding should ensure that the 2011 and 2012 goals will be met, as well as maintaining the plantings. Superintendent Gallagher added that, unfortunately, the Department relies heavily on Real Estate and Excise Taxes (REET) to fund its staff and the Natural Resources Unit, which oversees much of this work, is in jeopardy due to likely budget cuts.

Commissioner Kincaid asked about plans to convert 5% of the deciduous trees to evergreen plantings and whether there are considerations to plant more natives, such as aspens and madrones. Mr. Mead responded this depends on how climate changes are affecting these natives. Ms. Nelson added that many of the sites already have Vegetation Management Plans and the types of trees have already been determined.

Commissioner Jourdan asked about the racial makeup of the stewardship program, especially in Southeast Seattle. Ms. Nelson responded that the stewards are not as racially diverse as staff would like; however, they are tracking new steward groups and focusing on this. She is hopeful that many of the youth currently involved in the "custodial" portion of the planting will eventually become stewards, which could increase the racial

diversity of the stewards. Mr. Mead added that staff are working with the schools to educate students about the program and this is a great source of future diverse stewards. Ms. Nelson and Mr. Mead welcome the Board's suggestions for additional outreach and will keep the Board updated on these efforts. They will next address community councils and emerging groups that haven't been involved with restoration efforts.

Commissioner Holme noted that the effort is 20% complete and asked what are the future plans and how the initial efforts were determined. Mr. Mead responded that the focus initial work involved a great deal of input from the communities on water issues, riparian areas, etc. Staff will evaluate this approach and adjust as necessary.

Commissioner Ramels recognized volunteer Ken Shaw, who averages 70 volunteer hours each week. Mr. Mead agreed and added there are many other volunteers who donate an extraordinary amount of their time, including Commissioner Barber. Ms. Nelson added that Mr. Shaw and others mentor younger volunteers and this encourages the next generation to continue this effort.

Commissioners thanked Mr. Mead and Ms. Nelson for the briefing.

Briefing: Viewpoint Management Policy

Mark Mead, Seattle Parks Senior Urban Forester, presented a briefing on the Department's Viewpoint Management Policy. Prior to this meeting, Commissioners received a written briefing, included below.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

This is an informational briefing on viewpoint vegetation management, covering the recent history of managing park viewpoints, the findings of a 2009 review of viewpoints, and the current management of vegetation at viewpoints. No recommendation by the board is requested.

Project or Policy Description and Background

Seattle Parks and Recreation manages trees and vegetation at 16 parks designated public viewpoints and manages an additional 12 parks to provide and protect views. (See list, Attachment A) Parks traditionally managed viewpoint vegetation by topping or cutting down trees that would block views from the established viewing area. This work was done irregularly and eventually the demand to maintain trees for risk and health elsewhere in the system overtook the maintenance of viewpoints.

In an effort to develop more sustainable landscapes at viewpoints and thereby reduce maintenance, and to clarify viewpoint priorities, Parks and Recreation developed the Tree Management, Maintenance, Pruning and/or Removal Policy. Critical elements of this Policy are the prohibition of cutting trees solely for the preservation of private views and the prohibition of topping trees as it can cause permanent damage to trees.

Implementation of the Tree Management Policy began in 2002 with a series of landscape conversion projects funded by capital funds. Viewpoint work has been done at Kerry Viewpoint, Magnolia Boulevard, Admiral Viewpoint, Commodore Park, Hamilton Viewpoint, and Plymouth Pillars Park (Boren Pike Pine Park).

In response to the varied success of the individual projects a more comprehensive plan was completed in April, 2005, titled Vegetation Management for Seattle Parks Viewpoints. The primary goal of this program is to create a prioritized methodology that includes tree removal and replacement with tree or shrubs species that would not grow into views, thereby reducing maintenance costs and sustaining the highly valued public views. As landscape conversion requires significant resources, the intention of the program is to rely on capital project funding for initial landscape conversion and operations funding to support long term upkeep of the sites. The first project under this program was the re-establishment of views at Betty Bowen Viewpoint on Queen Anne. The new landscaping at this Viewpoint is in the fourth year of establishment.

A similar project along Magnolia Boulevard has been underway since 2002 and has had substantial support from neighbors. The neighbors will be seeking Parks Levy Opportunity Funds to support the full scale landscape conversion in conjunction with larger stewardship efforts by the neighbors. Vegetation management for views has been part of the development of new parks such as Fremont Peak Park and Mt. Baker Ridge Viewpoint. Also, tree management to preserve views will be a critical issue for the development of Urslua Judkins Park.

In 2006 Parks developed the Viewpoint Designations Policy which defined how a park would be selected to become a designated public viewpoint. In 2009 a review of the status of vegetation blocking views at the 28 view-important sites was completed by Parks staff. This report was used to create the Viewpoints 2009 Review document. (Attachment B) Management recommendations are included in the chart. Some of the recommendations are to stop maintaining the site as a viewpoint, as the trees and vegetation have precluded reasonable landscape transition work to reestablish the view. Montlake Playfield and Riverview Playfield Park are two examples where continued management for views is impractical.

Goals and Objectives for Vegetation Management at Viewpoints

In finding a balance between natural resource conservation and view preservation, the primary goals for developing a Vegetation Management Plan for viewpoints are:

- to protect designated public views;
- to protect steep slopes *and neighboring properties* from erosion and surface water run-off;
- *to protect and provide maximum native wildlife habitat, as is possible;*
- to provide consistent, pragmatic management direction to establish and maintain sustainable and appealing vegetation for all viewpoints;
- to provide a baseline for the development of specific plans that address both neighborhood and citywide needs and concerns; and
- *to develop VMPs that are consistent with applicable practices and policies.*

Strategic Action Plan

The viewpoint vegetation program directly addresses how Parks will promote healthy native landscapes while maintaining the much treasured views across the city. Therefore it will directly address Goals 1B and 1B2 in the Strategic Action Plan (SAP). Partnerships with viewpoint neighbors address Goal 1E of the SAP.

- 1B Increase restoration of Seattle's natural ecosystem.
- 1B2 Plant and maintain trees to promote a healthy urban environment and reforestation.
- 1E Develop and maintain partnerships to enhance Seattle's parks and open spaces.

Public Involvement Process

A minimum of three public meetings were held for each of the six landscape conversion projects mentioned above. Two citywide meetings were held regarding the creation of the Vegetation Management for Seattle Parks Viewpoints in 2003 and the SEPA review process continued through 2004.

A majority of the public comment has been positive regarding viewpoint re-establishment. At Betty Bowen Viewpoint and Kerry Park, there was significant concern from downhill neighbors regarding potential slide issues and impacts on their privacy. Overall attendance for meetings has been low with no meetings having more than 20 attendees. When resources are available for major landscape conversion, Parks will hold site specific meetings to address concerns. Louisa Boren Park is the next planned project for this level of effort and public meetings will be held.

Issues

Generally stakeholders are uphill and downhill neighbors. The typical concern from uphill neighbors is that the definition of the intended view be expanded to include enhancements to their private views. The downhill neighbors' concerns are for the impact of the work on slope stability and on their privacy. In limited cases there has been concern for the loss of tree canopy and its impact on wildlife.

Environmental Sustainability

Parks has done preliminary studies on the stability of the slopes at each viewpoint. As part of the Vegetation Management for Seattle Parks Viewpoints program a process was developed to identify the slopes requiring further geotechnical investigation prior to major landscape changes and methods were developed to address a list of potential concerns. The impact of viewpoint conversion has been reviewed for impacts to wildlife. The movement toward more stable native species composition on the sites is seen as a net positive impact on wildlife.

Budget

CIP funding for the major viewpoint landscape conversion projects varies annually. Regular tree work at the viewpoints is funded by the operations budget, at between 50,000 to \$120,000 annually.

Schedule

Operations maintenance tree trimming and removal is done when the schedule allows. The schedule for the Louisa Boren Viewpoint landscape conversion will be determined when the CIP funding for the work is established.

Additional information

- Mark Mead, 684-4113, mark.mead@seattle.gov
- Please see : <http://seattle.gov/parks/horticulture/VMP/Viewpoints.htm>

**Attachment A
List of Designated Viewpoints and Parks Managed for Views
(Excerpt from Viewpoint Designations Policy)**

Viewpoints	
<i>Park</i>	<i>Address</i>
Bagley Viewpoint	10 th Ave E & E Roanoke Street
Banner Place/Rainbow Viewpoint	Banner Way NE/5 th Ave NE
12 th Avenue South Viewpoint	12 th Ave S & S McClellan St
Belvedere Viewpoint (Admiral Viewpoint in Belvedere Park)	SW Admiral Way & SW Olga St
Betty Bowen Viewpoint (Marshall Park)	7 th Ave W & W Highland Dr
Charles Richey Sr. Viewpoint (Alki Beach Park)	1702 Alki Ave SW
East Portal I-90 Overlook	1400 Lake Washington Blvd.
Hamilton Viewpoint	1531 California Way SW
Kerry Viewpoint (Kerry Park)	211 W Highland Dr.
Louisa Boren Lookout (Louisa Boren Park)	15 th Ave E & E Garfield St
Mt. Baker Ridge Viewpoint	1403 - 31st Ave. S
West Seattle Rotary Viewpoint	35 th Ave SW & SW Alaska St
Emma Schmitz Memorial Overlook	4503 Beach Dr SW

Sunset Hill Viewpoint (Sunset Hill Park)	NW 77 th St & 34 th Ave SW
Ursula Judkins Viewpoint	W Galer Street & 26 th Ave W
NW 60 th Street Viewpoint	6001 Seaview Ave NW

Parks Managed for Views

<i>Park</i>	<i>Address</i>
Bhy Kracke Park	1215 - 5 th Ave N
Commodore Park	3330 W Commodore Way
Dr. Jose Rizal Park	12 th Ave S & S Judkins St
Fairview Park	2900 Fairview Ave E
Fremont Peak Park	4357 Palatine Ave N
Kinnear Park	899 W Olympic Pl
Kobe Terrace	221 - 6 th Ave S
Lakeview Park	340 - 37 th Ave S
Mt. Claire Park	Mt Claire Drive S
Plymouth Pillars Park (Boren Pike Pine Park)	Boren Ave & Pike St
Victor Steinbrueck Park	2001 Western Ave
Volunteer Park (Water Tower)	1247 - 15th Ave E

Verbal Briefing/Discussion and Recommendation

Mr. Mead introduced himself and showed a Powerpoint presentation. Included were photos of the viewpoints at Kinnear, Kerry, and Betty Bowen Viewpoints, both before and after Parks staff performed viewpoint management. He reviewed the Viewpoint Management's objectives, goals, and findings, as well as information on projects in progress, those needing review, those in restoration, or those being reconsidered.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Kincaid on whether the work is based on location, Mr. Mead responded that it is based on the needs of each viewpoint. Commissioner Kincaid noted that large parks are not included. Mr. Mead agreed, as the policy is only for designated viewpoints.

Commissioner Holme referred to the Volunteer Park Water Tower and noted its once spectacular view has greatly diminished over the past few years by the height of the nearby trees. Mr. Mead responded that some lead abatement at the bottom of the Water Tower must be addressed at the same time the viewpoint is addressed, which complicates the work and makes it more costly.

Commissioner Holme asked for an update on the new Urban Forestry Commission, created by the Seattle City Council. For more information about the Commission, see <http://www.seattle.gov/trees/UFcommission.htm>.

Commissioner Adams asked if there is any community/individual pushback to the viewpoint management process. Mr. Mead responded that there was a 2 year process with Betty Bowen. Some who live below the viewpoint did not want people looking down into their backyards, those above were concerned that the view be maintained, and the area is a wildlife habitat. Louisa Boren and Kerry Viewpoints also had controversial elements.

Commissioner Barber noted that the viewpoints were designated 40 years ago and asked if there is a process to drop existing ones or add new ones to the list. Mr. Mead responded that the Department's long-term Comprehensive Plan makes it difficult to change a viewpoint designation and there are no plans to do so.

Responding to references from Commissioner Barber on the view area at Leschi Natural Area, Mr. Mead explained that the site is not a designated viewpoint.

Commissioners thanked Mr. Mead for the briefing.

Briefing: Seattle Parks' Budget Update

Carol Everson, Seattle Parks' Finance Director, presented a verbal briefing on the current state of the Department's budget. Following the March 13 Park Board meeting, Commissioners submitted a number of budget-related questions and Ms. Everson responded in writing to those, with Ms. Everson's responses shown in *italics*:

Commissioner Adams:

- (1) Much has been publicized about priorities and areas of concern by the Mayor and the City Council. Is there a reconciled set of priorities or directives that will guide City Departments in the process of developing budget cuts for mid-year 2010? For 2011?
We have not received a reconciled list of priorities. In February, we turned in to City Budget Office (CBO) a list of our 2010 budget prioritized by function. This was discussed with the Mayor's Office on Monday, March 22. At the beginning of April we should get an indication of whether or not the Department must make mid-year cuts and there may be some indication of priorities in those instructions. Around the beginning of May, we expect to receive instructions on the required reductions in the level of General Fund (GF) support in 2011-2012 and that may also include some direction from the Mayor's Office on their priorities.
- (2) Historically, budget cuts have been almost impossible to recapture in later budget cycles. Will there be any intentional identification of 2010 – 2011 implemented cuts that should or could be recaptured in later cycles in a priority/rank order fashion based on some reconciled set of City (both Mayoral & City Council) goals/objectives?
The Mayor has indicated that he prefers that departments identify ongoing savings rather than one-time reductions. He wants to have a "sustainable" budget at the 2011 and 2012 levels of revenue. Then, as revenues improve along with the economy, he will have a chance to expand programs that are most closely aligned with his priorities. We hope that some of those priorities will be supported by Parks programs.

Commissioner Barber:

- (1) I'd like to have a budget broken down two ways – (1) program and (2) type of expense.
See the Table "Summary of 2010 Adopted Budget" that has been distributed to the commissioners at the March 25 meeting. This table shows the budget broken into programs (the rows of the table). Each program is associated with an SAP Goal and is given a priority ranking based on the criteria shown below the table. The expenditures on each program are broken into personnel and non-personnel and the number of FTE and senior management FTE associated with the program are also shown. Finally, the revenues associated with the program are shown and taking the total expenditures minus the revenue equals the amount of GF support going to the program.
- (2) Since there is much discussion about metropolitan park districts, please provide the Board copies of the State Code sections on this.
*RCW 35.61 is the appropriate statute (<http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=35.61>)
Here is a summary of its provisions that we've pulled together:
Summary – MPD Enabling Legislation (RCW 35.61)*
 1. *City Council adopts Resolution placing the formation of the Metropolitan Park District (MPD) on the ballot 60 days prior to the election date OR Citizens petition signed by 15% of the registered voters*
 2. *District is created upon certification of the vote*

3. *City Council could be the governing board – called the Metropolitan Park District Board of Park Commissioners*
4. *Can issue general obligation up to bonds one-quarter of one percent of the value of the taxable property in the MPD without a public vote and up to two and one-half percent with a public vote.*
5. *May sell revenue bonds*
6. *Can buy, sell, condemn, manage, property*
7. *Public works contracting process required*
8. *May establish civil service for its employees, employee counsel, employee police officers, and any necessary staff*
9. *The county treasurer of the county within which the MPD lies shall be the ex officio treasurer. A MPD may designate someone other than the county treasurer to act as its treasurer if the MPD Board has received the approval of the county treasurer*
10. *The MPD Board of Park Commissioners (City Council) may levy a general tax on all the property located in the district each year not to exceed seventy-five cents per thousand dollars of assessed value of the property in the district*
11. *Can levy additional tax above the seventy-five cents limit if approved by the voters*
12. *Can create local improvement district for funding specific projects*
13. *City may transfer property and debt obligations to the MPD*
14. *The MPD can be dissolved by a majority vote of its governing board*
15. *MPD may commission police officers*
16. *State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review is required*

Other:

- *Ten MPD's have been formed since 2002 when state law was changed allowing the City governing body to be the MPD governing board*
- *Normandy Park, Des Moines (Pool), and Port Angeles formed MPD's in 2009*
- *Tacoma MPD has existed since 1909*

(3) What is the amount of revenue that could be expected from a metropolitan park district, plus other expected revenues, as compared to expected expenses?

<p>MPD Rate:</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>\$0.1774 per thousand A.V.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>\$25,545,006 Total revenue</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>\$80 on a \$450K house</i></p>
<p>\$.01 change in tax rate results in:</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>\$1,440,135 additional revenue</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>\$4.50 on a \$450K house</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>\$0.0100</i></p>

Commissioner Holme:

Revenue side questions:

(1) For each 1% increase in fees, if applied to all fees in the Department, how much revenue is generated annually?

The Department receives about \$8.1 million from fees for recreational programs (excluding Golf). A 1% increase in all fees except Golf would raise about \$81,000. Golf revenues total about \$10.1 million but of any increase in revenues from Golf only 5% goes to general Parks programs. Thus a 1% increase in golf revenue would raise \$5,000 for general Parks use. The other \$95,000 would go toward Golf capital work.

- (2) Identify programs where Department offerings may be under priced for the market place. Quantify additional revenue, if fees are increased to be more in line with the norm. A list of potential program groupings would be helpful.

We are currently reviewing all of our fees and charges. They are being evaluated for conformity to the new fees and charges policy and comparability with those charged by other jurisdictions. This work will be complete by mid-April and will be used to propose revised fees and charges in mid-May.

Program cuts:

- (1) Identify groupings of services, for example Aquatics, Seafair, which if they are discontinued, will result in significant savings. Quantify the savings.

The column "Net GF Cost" in the table "Summary of 2010 Adopted Budget" (distributed at the Park Board's March 25 meeting) shows what the reduction in General Fund support would be if the program (i.e. the row) were eliminated. For instance, eliminating the entire Swimming, Boating, and Aquatics area would save the GF \$4.4 million. We do not keep track of costs by particular events. The costs of preparing for and cleaning up after Seafair would be included in the Park Cleaning, Landscaping & Restoration group of rows.

Other:

- (1) Are there statutory or contract limits to relying on furloughs in future years? Is this a one-time thing?

There are no statutory limits, but furloughs would have to be negotiated with the unions. This is handled at a City level, so I have limited information on what is planned. I understand that the City is not going to negotiate furloughs again. The idea seems to be that we need to come down to a service level that the current level of general fund revenues can support. Therefore, a department could propose a permanent reduction in hours at community centers but not a temporary reduction in the work week for workers.

- (2) One number used tonight was \$10 million savings = 120 FTE. When you lay off a worker, is the savings 100% of the FTE expense, or is there a loss of savings due to severance pay, or other costs of releasing workers?

The savings is 100% of the salary and benefits. The City does not offer severance pay or other benefits to those laid off. The workers would get unemployment benefits from the State and the use of these would eventually raise the City's premiums. Due to the seasonal nature of our business we already pay more than most City departments towards the City's payments to the State (about \$445,000 in 2010).

Commissioner Keith:

- (3) What are the philosophical priorities during these economic times that will govern line item choices? How will those priorities be reflected in the budget?

We are looking at all of our programs and activities. Highest priority is given to those payments that are contractually fixed and can't be avoided. Next highest priority is the provision of services especially to target populations or with target messages. Target populations are youth, teens, seniors, the disabled, immigrants, and low-income people. Target messages have to do with healthy lifestyles and a healthy environment. Here we really try to keep available services that are provided at no cost or low cost. A slightly lower priority is given to operating and maintaining facilities in which programs are provided. Here we also consider whether the activity preserves an asset (including green assets like trees or turf) and whether the activity leverages non-City funds. In making cuts we consider geographic equity and race and social justice impacts. Our lowest priority goes to back office functions, but we recognize that these efforts must be commensurate with the size and complexity of the department. We won't cut these to a level where they are insufficient to support service delivery.

- (4) How will new initiatives, such as community gardens, be handled?

It will be very difficult to introduce new programs in these economic times. To introduce something new we must eliminate something old.

- (5) How will new contractors be engaged to meet equity requirements if existing contractors who have a large share of the pie are grandfathered in because of established relationships?
Each year we set specific targets for use of women and minority owned businesses (WMBEs). In 2009 Parks spent \$16.6 million on purchases and consultant contracts. Of this, 16.6% was from WMBE vendors. Parks spend \$29.9 million on construction contracts and 19.4% of this went to WMBE contractors. We have longstanding relationships with many WMBE vendors, consultants and contractors. Furthermore we work with groups such as Tabor 100 and the Contractor Development Competitiveness Center (CDCC) to introduce us to new firms.
- (6) How will the public be engaged so that their sense of priorities can be vetted by staff and Commissioners in a timely fashion?
Good question. I'd be interested in your suggestions. Often the public process doesn't start until after the Mayor submits his budget to Council in September. Given the magnitude of the current problem, this seems to be too late.

Commissioner Kostka:

1. I hear there is a \$300 million backlog of maintenance related to Parks and Recreation activities. Does this include forested areas as well as grounds and buildings? Could the Board please see an estimated breakout?
Every two years we update a list of needed major maintenance work and other capital projects. This list is called the Asset Management Plan (AMP). This year's draft AMP (it is still not final) includes \$241 million of work. Of this \$199 would be funded by the City's Cumulative Reserve Subfund (CRS) and the other \$42 million from Levies, Debt, or other sources. We can expect to get about \$20 million of CRS per biennium, so, at that rate, it would take about 20 years to work through the current list. Of course, during this 20 years, other facilities deteriorate and their needs are added to the list. We don't seem to be making headway. The list does include projects like forest restoration, trail renovations, and landscape replacement. The list is in draft form right now. When it is finalized, we'd be happy to share it. It will probably be finalized in mid-May.
2. I hear there is a City rule that if a facility is shut down for two years, it must be brought "up to code" before it can be reopened. How much additional money will this calculation add on to the \$300 million backlog figure?
This is a City regulation that applies to all structures in the city. If they are vacant for two years they must be brought up to code at the time they are reoccupied. We have not estimated the cost of this. Instead, we are trying to avoid having any facility unoccupied for two years. This would mean that we would do rolling closures of facilities rather than close one set of facilities for both 2011 and 2012.
3. What are options for reversing the maintenance backlog?
Reversing the major maintenance backlog requires more CRS funding which, in turn, depends on increasing Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) revenue. Future levies might also include more projects that renovate current assets rather than build or acquire new ones. To address the need for preventive maintenance, we need to increase the size of the operating budget.
4. I can imagine a number of scenarios on how to shrink Park and Recreation's budget. One is to set priorities and let the low ranked items drop off. Another is to shrink all activities. A third is a combination. What is the best way to get public input on these scenarios? What are pro/con arguments for each?
Good question. We are sure of a couple of things. 1) The fat is gone. 2) To achieve the magnitude of reductions required we will have to close facilities and cut programs. 3) While administrative functions will be cut along with other areas, it is important to maintain back office functions appropriate to a department of the size and complexity of the Parks and Recreation Department

Ms. Everson next gave the verbal update. To watch the video and listen to the full text, see <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=5591030> and scroll to count 73.00.

She gave a Powerpoint presentation and distributed two handouts. She stated that what is definitely known about the City's finances at this point is that an additional \$10 million deficit has been identified for 2010 and an additional \$50 million deficit for both 2011 and 2012. Parks relies heavily on the City's General Fund, which provides 65% of its revenues. What isn't known at this point is whether Parks will take mid-year cuts and, if so, how Mayor McGinn will apportion the cuts between Departments.

Ms. Everson reviewed several events that have helped fund the Department's 2010 budget shortfall: the Associated Recreation Council provided \$881,787; the Pro Parks Levy provided \$883,293; City staff agreed to take 10 furlough days in 2010 to help with the funding gap; some facilities are temporarily closed in 2010 for repairs/remodeling, including Langston Hughes Performing Arts Center; Rainier Beach Community Center and Pool, and some wading pools and indoor pools that are having new federally-mandated drains installed.

Of concern are the aging buildings at Magnuson Park, many of which need extensive and costly repairs. And new facilities are coming online that will require staff and other operating funds. The bottom line is if Parks takes a 5% cut in General Funds during 2011 and 2012, it is significant. Parks staff have been working since January to identify budget options. However, a reduction of an additional \$5-10 million will impact service levels. Initial estimates are that some facilities will have to be closed and as many as 120 full-time employees (FTE) laid off.

Ms. Everson next reviewed events that led to the current situation: voters are generous in their support of park levies – unfortunately, the levies provide for new parks and facilities only and do not include any operation and maintenance funds. Many of these new projects are now coming online, during budget cuts. Other contributing factors are a backlog of un-funded major maintenance and preventative maintenance hasn't been done. The Department's Assets Management Plan shows \$200 million in maintenance needs. This work is funded by the Cumulative Reserve Fund at an average of \$10 million annually. It would take 20 years to fund the current maintenance needs. Ms. Everson noted that the City took over two former military bases (Ft. Lawton at Discovery Park and Sand Point Naval Base at Magnuson Park.) Both parks have a number of buildings in deteriorating condition and these are very costly to maintain. The partnership between the Department and Green Seattle Partnership will also require Cumulative Reserve Subfund monies to keep the momentum going.

Ms. Everson next reviewed some options for getting the Parks Department on a sustainable path: (1) reduce parks and community centers to a size that can be supported by the General Fund by getting out of some lines of business and cutting back on all remaining lines of business; (2) substantially raise fees and charges; emphasize running the Department like a business; (3) and/or find a new source of dedicated revenue. Ms. Everson noted that increasing fees and charges will have a Race and Social Justice impact and affect low-income people most.

These are just an outline of three logical ways to get the Department on a sustainable path and the Mayor will be weighing many things during budget deliberations.

Superintendent Gallagher repeated that Parks staff are looking at the Department's lines of business to determine which ones it should stop providing, and are also looking at the GAP analysis. This could help determine whether community centers located close to each other are overlapping services and whether one of them could be closed.

The Department began looking closely at its financial sustainability when he (Gallagher) became Superintendent in 2007. He credited Ms. Everson for helping reorganize the Department and saving budget dollars. Seattle Parks is the only City department that has reduced its number of managers since 2002. During that time, it opened 42 new parks as a result of the park levies. He asked whether there is a way to find a dedicated source of Park Department funding that would require voter approval.

Deputy Superintendent Williams noted something that isn't immediately obvious in mid-year cuts: A 5% budget cut in the second half of the year equates to a 10% cut, as the cut is based on the Department's entire annual budget. Half the budget was apportioned and spent before the cut was announced. As a result, the 5% cut equates to a 10% cut of the second half of the budget.

Ms. Everson next reviewed the budget schedule and expects that the Department will know by late April or early May what the mid-year cuts will entail. The 2011/2012 budget is due to the Mayor's Office on July 9. He and his staff will review the budget proposals and present a proposed budget to City Council near the end of September. Council will deliberate the proposal during October and November and announce an approved budget in mid-to-late November. Commissioner Adams asked if Departments have any input to the Mayor in what stays and what is removed. Ms. Everson answered that she and Deputy Superintendent Williams met with the Mayor two weeks ago to plead Parks' case.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Barber when the Department will "put the brakes" on its spending, Ms. Everson responded that it has already done so, with a number of vacant positions unfilled. Commissioner Kincaid noted the irony that the parks levies provided for a number of new parks, but provided no funding to operate and maintain them. Ms. Everson agreed; however, the Parks and Green Spaces Levy Oversight Committee met recently with City Budget Director Beth Goldberg to determine what can legally be done at this point, such as sequencing projects and pushing the required dates of completion farther out. The Superintendent added that the Department is looking at whether new projects funded by the Levy's Opportunity Fund can be put on hold.

Commissioner Adams asked how the public can best weigh in on the Department's budget problems. Ms. Everson responded that, in a normal budget cycle, the public isn't usually involved until the Mayor announces his proposed budget. However, the City's budget shortfall is an extraordinary circumstance and there is no precedent to look to. Superintendent Gallagher added that the Department is looking for constructive public input, but not just to lobby for particular interests. Commissioner Adams recommended that the City err on the side of the public knowing as much as possible about the budget shortfall. Commissioner Ramels noted that the Board is comprised of volunteers to advise the Department, Mayor, and City Council on the Parks Department's budget and can make a recommendation.

Commissioner Ramels noted that about 10 years ago she and Commissioner Barber were on a panel to consider a Metropolitan Park District (MPD.) Instead, the outcome of that effort was the Pro Parks Levy. Commissioners voiced interest in scheduling a staff briefing on a Metropolitan Park District. Commissioner Barber would also like the City Attorney's opinion about an MPD, and several commissioners mentioned they would like to hear from Seattle Parks Foundation.

Commissioner Ramels asked that any additional questions be submitted by e-mail and thanked Ms. Everson for the helpful update. Ms. Everson and the Superintendent will continue to give the Board regular budget updates.

Park Board's Response to SR520 Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)

David Graves, Seattle Parks Senior Project Planner and Parks' lead to respond to the SR 520 project and its impacts on Seattle's parks, introduced himself. Mr. Graves has previously presented several briefings to the Board on this project. Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) will issue its Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), with comments due on April 15. He has drafted a response for the Board's purposes and review.

Mr. Graves will attend the Board's April 8 meeting, to answer questions about the project and assist the Board in its final response. In the interim, Commissioners were asked to send any additional comments by April 5. He will incorporate these into the draft response and send a new version to the Board for discussion and approval at the April 15 meeting.

Mr. Graves stressed that the primary goal of the response is to avoid any impacts from this project to Seattle's parks; to minimize any impacts that are unavoidable, and to mitigate those impacts. The Department's perspective is that the biggest way to minimize the impacts is to avoid having SR 520 ramps into the Arboretum.

Commissioners thanked Mr. Graves for his excellent briefings and assistance with this response.

Old/New Business

Upcoming Conferences and Attendance:

- Commissioners Adams, Barber, and Ramels will attend a one-day conference on developing new sources of funding for park systems. This April 9 conference was arranged by the Washington Recreation and Parks Association (WRPA.)
- In April, Superintendent Gallagher will travel to Australia, speaking on the Parks Department's "Healthy Parks, Healthy You" initiative.

Arboretum's Pacific Connections and Tree Cutting: Commissioner Kostka noted that, although a great deal of public process occurred prior to the tree cutting for the five new gardens, she believes that times have changed. While she realizes that new young trees will be planted in the area, it will take them a long time to replace the 50 mature trees that are being cut down.

Magnuson Park Advisory Committee: Commissioner Adams represents the Board on this committee and recently asked Parks staff to arrange a tour, with a focus on the Historic District. He will send the date to the Board's coordinator and he invited other Commissioners to attend.

Metropolitan Park District (MPD): Commissioner Barber attended last night's Leadership Conference, sponsored by Seattle Parks Foundation, where Councilmember Conlin stated that the City must solve the Library's budget problems first and that there are problems with an MPD. Consultant and former Deputy Mayor Tom Beyers gave Councilmember Conlin additional information. Superintendent Gallagher added that Washington State passed legislation in 2002 and 10 MPDs have since been created. Tacoma is the largest MPD in Washington state, and was formed in 1909. Three new ones were established just in the last year and Councilmember Conlin was unaware of this. Commissioner Barber asked if an MPD is independent of the City and the Superintendent stated that it isn't. Commissioners repeated their strong interest in a briefing on the Board wants good solid information. It falls on the Park Board to explore this issue and help determine what best serves the public for parks.

Parks and Green Spaces Levy Oversight Committee: Commissioner Holme reported that much of the focus of the most recent meeting was the Department's budget and impacts from the Levy.

Signage in Parks: Commissioner Holme recently spoke to a former Park Board commissioner who voiced concerns with the number of "high car prowl areas" signs in Seattle's parks and that these signs make visitors feel unsafe. Superintendent Gallagher has directed Parks staff to work with Seattle Police Department, which arranged for the signs to be installed, to inventory the signs. SPD arranged for youth, working through Goodwill and United Way, to install the signs to give them work. If there have been recent car prowls, the signs will remain. If not, they are to be removed. There isn't a policy about these types of signs.

There being no other new business, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

Jackie Ramels, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____