

**Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes
January 8, 2004**

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

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

Note: Archived agendas and minutes from 2000 to present may be viewed online at
<http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkboard>

Chair Bruce Bentley called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. **Kate moved and Sarah seconded that the January 8 agenda, December 11 minutes, and acknowledgment of correspondence be approved. Motion passed unanimously.**

Superintendent's Report

Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds reported on the following:

Hat 'n' Boots Successfully Moved: The Hat 'n' Boots was successfully moved from the corner of East Marginal Way and Corson Avenue to their new home at Oxbow Park. This new park will feature the Hat 'n' Boots, an amphitheater, and P-Patch community garden. The media turned out in force to document the move. The Georgetown Community Council owns the structures. For more information, click on <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/proparks/projects/oxbow.htm>

Me-Kwa-Mooks Natural Area Celebration Planned: Parks staff and West Seattle community members are planning an April celebration for the acquisition of a 2.1 acre property in the Me-Kwa-Mooks Natural Area. (Me-Kwa-Mooks is Duwamish for "head of the bear.") This park is located just south of the Emma Schmitz Viewpoint in West Seattle. The seller is making a generous donation to Seattle parks and this generosity will be acknowledged at the event.
<http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkspaces/me-kwa-mooks.htm>

Swimmers Chill Out to Greet New Year: Over 350 people joined in this cool celebration at Matthews Beach, which was double the number of 2003 participants. The event was staffed from the Meadowbrook Pool and the Parks Department's Aquatics Program. Media coverage included local television news, as well as print media.

Department Meets Winter Storm Challenge: Staff throughout the Department responded well to the several days of snowy weather and kept facilities open to the public despite many and varied challenges. Only minor damage was reported at Parks facilities from the storm.

On two consecutive snowy days, January 6 and 7, the Department's 23 community centers offered a special Snow Day Camp for elementary school-age children. Located throughout the city, the centers were open from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. for the Camp. Parents were asked to check in with staff before dropping off their children.

A press release was sent out advertising the Snow Day Camp. Park Board members asked if this information could be sent out to all the schools so parents will be aware of this option. Ken said this has been done in the past and will be again.

Winter Break Camps Prove Successful: The two week Winter Break Camps were well-attended. Garfield, Miller, Yesler, Ravenna-Eckstein, Meadowbrook, and Southwest Community Centers all participated.

Youth Basketball: Community Centers are reporting large numbers of youth signed up for basketball. Meadowbrook reports 525 youth, and Laurelhurst has a total of 52 teams this season. Laurelhurst's teams consist of 12 teams of six-seven year-olds; 15 teams of eight-nine year-olds; and 25 teams in the Citywide program for 10 years-up.

Learn to Swim Poster Winner is Chosen: Melissa Carter, nine-year-old student from Lafayette Elementary School in West Seattle, is the winner of the Pro Parks Learn to Swim promotional poster contest. Her colorful picture was selected from 44 submittals. She will receive a framed copy of her poster, a month-long family swim pass, and special recognition from Mayor Nickels. Melissa is an avid swimmer! A copy of the poster will be sent to the Board. (To learn more: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/Aquatics/learntoswim.htm>)

Project Updates: The contract for both Yesler Community Center and South Lake Union Wharf construction will be awarded soon. Buildings 47 (recreation building) and 406 (community center) have been completed and a celebration is being planned.

Terry asked if the events can now be scheduled at the new Sand Point Magnuson Park buildings. Ken answered that information on how to schedule is online. (Call 206-233-7892 or visit the web site: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkspaces/spmp/default.htm>)

City Council Committee Update: Councilmember David Della is the new Parks and Neighborhoods Committee Chair. The remaining members will be announced tomorrow. Parks staff will notify the Board with this information. A meeting between the Board and Councilmember Della has been requested. All Board members and Ken are available on February 1 and then again in March.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

Bruce explained that the general public comment portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had or are not scheduled for a public hearing. Testimony is limited to three minutes per speaker. No one signed up to testify.

Discussion/Recommendation: Homer Harris Park

At its December 11 meeting, Cathy Tuttle, Parks Department project manager, gave the Board a briefing on the new schematic design for Homer Harris Park. This was followed by a public hearing. (For a record of the minutes, see http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2003/12-11-03_Minutes.htm)

Tonight Cathy came back to the Board for a discussion and possible recommendation. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing. Both are included in these minutes.

Written Briefing

Action Requested

Park Board recommendation on the preferred schematic development plan for this new park.

Design

The preferred schematic design for Homer Harris Park was approved by Parks staff and was presented to the community on November 12 by Parks staff and Worthy and Associates, Landscape Architecture. The park design includes elements that serve neighborhood needs and pay homage to the life of Dr. Homer Harris such as art, a “reaching for greatness” stretching area, a play area that emphasizes mental and physical challenges, a human unity plaza, and a healing and restorative garden. The preferred schematic was reviewed by the Seattle Design Commission on November 13 and minor modifications to the design were made in response to the Design Commission’s directive to “simplify the design to make a small park work effectively.”

At the Park Board hearing and briefing on Homer Harris Park on December 11, Commissioners requested clarification about two issues for Park staff to report back on at the January 8 meeting: 1) the status of the big leaf maple tree on the northeast corner of the park site, and, 2) the intent of the play area with sculptural additions.

Tree health: The health of the big leaf maple was thoroughly evaluated by Park Urban Forester Mark Mead. It is his opinion that this 40-year old tree has cracks and diseases that will necessitate extensive pruning and cabling in order to retain the tree for another 15-20 years. Parks recommends removal of this tree and planting another “landmark” tree in nearly the same location.

Play area with sculptural additions: Parks proposes to use play components from one of our regular playground equipment vendors and add artistic elements in order to make the play equipment more engaging and reflective of the community. Parks landscape and operations staff have met with the project artist, Monad Elohim, to discuss play area construction with artistic input. Parks will hold a “Friends of” community meeting to move forward on the final design of the play structure.

Project Schedule

Construction documents will be completed May 2004. Park construction will begin in June and be completed by the end of the 2004.

Project Budget

Project funding for planning, design and construction, is \$498,976, including \$400,000 from Seattle Parks Foundation and \$98,976 from Pro Parks Levy

Additional Information

Cathy Tuttle, Seattle Parks Planner, 684-7033; or cathy.tuttle@seattle.gov

Verbal Briefing

Cathy reviewed the briefing information, the project design, and displayed a large conceptual drawing of the park. She introduced Steve Worthy of Worthy and Associates Landscape Architecture. At the December 11 Park Board meeting, the Board asked for further information on the large tree in the park and on the play area. Cathy noted that most of the correspondence received by the Park Board has supported a play structure.

Tree

Since the December 11 meeting, Parks Department Urban Forester Mark Mead gave the tree a thorough examination. His inspection included climbing the tree, inspecting it, taking photos, and completing an analysis. The tree sits on a four-foot rise near the sidewalk, has problems with fungus, and is currently branching over the sidewalk. The examination showed that, at some time point, the tree had been cut to the ground and the tree that stands there now developed from the sprouts that grew up around the stump. The interior is decayed and the tree needs extensive pruning and cabling, which will result in a much less attractive tree. Estimates are that the tree could possibly live another 15 years and would then need to be removed.

Cathy and the design team are recommending that the tree be removed during construction of the park and the four-foot rise, which causes a sharp drop-off towards the sidewalk, be leveled. Some of the community has strong feelings for the tree and Kate recommended that, when the tree is removed, signage be posted to explain the reasons. Cathy agreed.

Sarah asked if the removal could be delayed for a couple years, due to the neighborhood's regard for the tree. Cathy answered that the nearby community does not universally support the tree. Further, the tree should be removed during the park's construction, as it is easier and less expensive during this time.

Terry stated that he lived near the park site for years and is very familiar with both the site and the tree. At the December 11 meeting, he asked about the health of the tree because of the high mound of soil under the tree that results in the sharp drop-off to the sidewalk. He did not want to suggest that the tree be removed; however, he did want to ensure that the tree was healthy if it, and the sharp mound of soil it grows from, remains in the new park.

Play Equipment

Cathy said that the design team is recommending a play area, but not a full-size one. Royal Alley-Barnes, Manager of Parks Department Central East Operations, said that much of the community wants the new Homer Harris Park as a reflective-type park — with no swings, bouncy toys, or other high-energy play equipment elements.

Sarah asked about comments from the public that nearby Plum Tree Park is “creepy”. Is it on the list to be upgraded? Royal said that is the Parks staff recommendation to improve Plum Tree Park and that she will advocate for Department funds to improve the park by landscaping and major maintenance through the Park Upgrade Program.

Kate said if the park is intended to be inter-generational, why not put a swing and possibly other play equipment in the area where the large tree would be removed. Most of the verbal testimony and correspondence the Board received requested a play area.

Cathy stated that the Board is being asked to approve the schematic design, which includes a play area — but not a full-sized one. The plan will continue evolving with community input on the primary elements. Royal stated that the new recommendation of removing the large tree creates new opportunities in the design that needs to be shared with the community.

Kate moved approval of the schematic design with inclusion of a play area, and that the possibility of expanding the play area (based on the recommendation to take out the tree) be explored in future meetings with the community. Terry seconded.

Discussion: Terry asked how information on the tree removal and play equipment would be shared with the community. Royal stated that Parks staff will schedule a community meeting and will invite (by telephone or e-mail) the people who have shown interest. Cathy said that three public meetings have already been held — this will be a community meeting and that invitations to this meeting will be extended to the approximately 150 people who attended any of the three public meetings as well as to the other 100 people who asked to be kept informed during

the Homer Harris Park development process. Kate said she is comfortable with notifying interested parties of a community meeting.

The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

The opening of the park is planned for fall of 2004. Bruce thanked Cathy for the presentation.

Briefing: Seattle Parks Foundation

Karen Daubert, Executive Director of the Seattle Parks Foundation, came before the Board to give a by-yearly update on the Foundation's projects. Board members receive the Foundation's newsletter. Among the current projects are:

- Sherman Rock and the Volunteer Park Lily Ponds: both had dedications during summer 2003
- Homer Harris Park: currently working to raise an additional \$200,000
- Benefit Park: \$200,000 for renovation has been raised
- Bradford Street Park: ½ acre has been donated in this Southeast Seattle area. Once the blackberries are removed, there are wonderful views. The Foundation is now working with the community to determine if it wants a park on this site. The Foundation's goals are to add one new park each year.
- The Foundation is also taking the lead on the bench donation program, as of January 1, 2004, for the Parks Department.
- South Lake Union Park: moving forward with the capital campaign and are very pleased with the results so far. After testing offshore sediments at Waterway #3, the canal will be taken out of the project at this point. It could cost \$25-30 million to complete the canal.

Terry asked for more information on the bench donation program. Karen said that previously Parks Department staff have handled these requests and they can be time-consuming for staff. Now, the Foundation will be the initial contact for these requests, with Parks Department retaining control. Terry asked how much the benches cost and Karen said they range from \$2,600 to \$5,100 and include a small plaque.

Terry stated that these briefings from the Foundation are very valuable and lots of helpful information comes from them. He suggested that Karen continue briefing the Board every six months. Ken commented that the Foundation is doing great work.

The Board thanked Karen for the briefing.

BRIEFING: Golden Gardens Park Vegetation Management Plan

Eliza Davidson, Parks Department Urban Forester, came before the Board to give a briefing on the vegetation management plan (VMP) for Golden Gardens Park. No action is requested of the Board. The Board received the project description and executive summary. Both are included below in these minutes.

Written Briefing

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

SCOPE

1. To create a Vegetation Management Plan focusing on the forested areas above the railroad tracks and hazard tree mitigation park wide.
2. To cultivate community-based forest restoration and stewardship based on VMP recommendations.

PROJECT HISTORY

This project addresses the needs of Golden Gardens' wooded areas, which have received minimal attention over the years and represent a significant recreational and ecological resource to Northwest Seattle.

SCHEDULE

Plan development & PIP

August – December 2003

Community-based implementation

September 2003 — 2004

Elizabeth Walker of Sound Tree Solutions and Paul West, Consulting Arborist, have developed this VMP in conjunction with UF and District staff.

BUDGET \$47,000

II. SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

[Issues most directly addressed in vegetation management plan are highlighted]

- Tree hazard, failure history, and future management to minimize damage
- Unstable slopes and slide history — vegetation management and liability concerns
- Personal safety — crime and train-track hazard reduction
- Invasive plant control: vines, trees, noxious weeds, etc.
- Need for increased conifer regeneration to create sustainable forest
- Potential to protect near-shore salmon habitat through upland restoration
- De-vegetation by off-leash dogs, encampments, and social trails

III. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

PUBLIC MEETINGS:

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Project scope & preliminary findings (overview and input) | September 30, 2003 |
| 2. Draft VMP (presentation and comment) | November 17, 2003 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Golden Gardens Vegetation Management Plan addresses the forest resource of Golden Gardens Park. This includes both the forested hillside east of the Burlington Northern Railroad and also areas along the beach that contain trees and associated vegetation. The plan provides Seattle Parks and Recreation staff and allied citizens' long-term goals and intermediate (20 year) objectives for managing the park's vegetation. The plan is based on related planning documents, including the Seattle Parks COMPLAN, the Urban Wildlife and Habitat Management Plan, and the Seattle Parks and Recreation Tree Policy. It extracts long-term goals from these sources and develops related objectives based on the condition of the forest resource, historical context, ecological trends, and the potential of the community and management resources.

In Chapter 4, the plan reviews the known issues about park vegetation. It discusses the geology of the hillside, the history of slides in the park, and the limited role that vegetation plays in these events. It describes the general forest character and conditions. It reviews hazard tree conditions and characterizes the trees with greatest hazard potential. It evaluates the habitat potential and limitations found in the park. It describes the impacts of human use on the park's vegetation.

In Chapter 5, the plan analyzes the data that the consultants collected from 17 sample plots distributed throughout the hillside and the 100 trees identified for potential hazard. The data show that the hillside forest consists primarily of bigleaf maple, except in the slide-affected portions in the north end of the park where alder is more prevalent. Tree health is generally good, with certain exceptions as noted. English ivy is the most common

understory species, which represents a widespread problem with non-native, invasive plants. Tree regeneration and decaying wood features are below optimal levels.

In Chapter 6, the plan divides the park into several management area types that correspond to stands of trees with similar canopy composition and condition. The plan then superimposes this analysis with an overlay that refers to five understory issues. The result is a map of the park that illustrates the fundamental forest conditions found there. The plan identifies two quality habitat areas found in the South and Central portions of the hillside, which have minimal invasive species present and high wildlife habitat value. Priorities in project implementation for the forested hillside are centered on expanding these areas with reforestation efforts in proximity. Hazard tree management assigns the 100 identified trees into three action categories: removal/replacement, pruning/monitoring, and further inspection.

In Chapter 7, the plan details recommended management practices for implementing the projects outlined in Chapter 6. These include not only horticultural prescriptions, but also planning and evaluation protocols to improve project implementation with each successive generation of projects. Chapter 8 proposes that priority for project work should focus on the South and Central Sections of the hillside, as well as the north end of the Beach Section. All projects are planned around maximizing volunteer partnerships between Seattle Parks and Recreation and community volunteers. A 20-year implementation budget for the critical forest management priorities is estimated using this approach. The consultants estimate that work in the priority areas outlined in Chapter 6 would require 33,000 hours of volunteer labor, combined with 5,700 hours of staff time, \$112,000 in contractor costs and \$242,000 in materials (in 2003 dollars). The total value of this work is estimated at \$947,000 (in 2003 dollars).

Verbal Briefing

Eliza displayed a large map of Golden Gardens Park and pointed out to the Board sites of the proposed work. She gave a detailed description of the proposed work. The VMP focused on the forest, a grove of locust trees north of the bathhouse, and the trees located around picnic tables. Every single tree couldn't be examined and some of the most high-risk trees don't belong to the Parks Department. Staff will continue working with nearby neighbors on solutions. The VMP calls for the locusts north of the bathhouse to be removed and replaced with shore pines. Eliza described additional portions of the proposed work. Most of the work is to be performed by volunteers.

Board Discussion

Terry asked what, if any, impact the off-leash area has had. Eliza said that this is a controversial issue and there has been impact to the understory. Mark Mead, Parks Department Urban Forester, said the most substantial damage has been noted and plotted. Eliza said that much of the soil in this park is sandy and fragile; consequently, foot traffic off the designated pathways does more damage than in some of the other parks. Terry stated that it is important to document any damage from the off-leash areas when considering future off-leash area sites.

Kate asked if the current ivy doesn't act much like "glue" to stabilize the soil and what will happen if it is removed. Eliza said it is important to quickly replace the ivy with mulch and vegetation.

Terry asked about the Parks and Recreation Tree Pruning and Removal Policy. Mark will forward a one-page summary.

The Board thanked Eliza for the briefing.

Update Briefings: Fauntleroy Park Vegetation Management Plan and Carkeek Park Forest Management Plan

Parks Department Urban Forester Mark Mead came before the Board to give briefings on both the Fauntleroy Park Vegetation Management Plan and Carkeek Park Forest Management Plan. The Board received written briefings, included below. Mark also gave a Powerpoint presentation on both plans. The Board asked several questions during the presentation and suggested that informational brochures be supplied to volunteers to distribute to neighbors of the parks.

Written Briefing – Fauntleroy Park Forest Management Plan

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

SCOPE

1. To create a Vegetation Management Plan focusing on the forested areas of the Park outside of the stream corridor as supplement to ongoing stream work of Seattle Public Utility.
2. To develop vegetation management objectives that will prioritize and efficiently utilize significant volunteer and community support for Fauntleroy Park and Creek.

PROJECT HISTORY

This project was originally slated for completion in 2002 and was rescheduled to utilize research and restoration work performed by Seattle Public Utility in 2003. Significant resources have been devoted to stream repair and siltation control in the Fauntleroy watershed. An investigation into forest and vegetation management was viewed as a way to tie ongoing forest restoration efforts of volunteers with stream work.

SCHEDULE

Initial project PIP	May, 2003
Plan development	May-November, 2003
Draft VMP Comment and Input	November–December 2003

BUDGET \$40,000

II. SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

- Retain and expand a diverse conifer forest habitat
- Create a self-sustaining forest community
- Retain native diversity and expand forest habitat
- Increase wildlife habitat while protecting existing wildlife habitat
- Regain and maintain health of riparian system
- Increase quality of wetland
- Discourage stream sedimentation
- Increase and maintain safety of people who use trail

III. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

PUBLIC MEETINGS:

1. Initial Public Meetings May 15, 2003
2. Draft VMP (presentation and comment) November 17, 2003

PUBLIC INPUT

Public Comment on Vegetation Management Plan

The Parks Department coordinated a public meeting on May 15, 2003, to solicit public input into the goals and objectives for Fauntleroy Park. Comments were taken at the meeting. Presented below is a summary of the main topic areas and perspectives presented by the public as well as written comments from Judy Pickens, Chair of the Fauntleroy Watershed Council.

Habitat for Wildlife

- The park is used for birdwatching
- Small mammals such as red fox and raccoons were noted in the past, but now seem infrequent
- Dog leash use needs to be encouraged

We suggest an educational opportunity by posting signs and distributing information regarding the consequences of free roaming dogs. See section 7.1.1

- Despite the invasives, native species appear to be abundant in the park, offering food and protection to complement the creek as a water source. Until recently, however, the park was eerily quiet. Birds are more evident now but ground dwelling wildlife is not. We are unaware of a feral cat problem. Is this typical of natural parks in Seattle? Or could the vegetation be yet more supportive of wildlife? Residents of the neighborhood are interested in knowing what's here and would respond to improve the habitat for "safe" species.

Additional native vegetation will support more wildlife. See Appendix D for the list of species currently in Fauntleroy Park and Table 5 – Table 8 for suggested species and planting priorities.

Park Safety

- Historical problem with encampments, parties, and neighborhood robberies
- Hazard trees provide food for other species (e.g. carpenter ants)

Any felled trees will remain in the park as snags, brush piles, or used in wetland restoration. See Section 5.14 Hazard Tree Treatment.

Restoration

- Possible decline in the Trillium population
- Some nearby neighbors have plants that originated from the park and are available for reintroduction.
- Natural succession is very possible in this park and should be encouraged, even if groups wanting to plant trees must be directed to another more needy park.
- Despite selfless efforts, volunteers and teen crews cannot make headway fast enough against invasives in the park. They are necessarily limited to easily accessed areas and, in the case of teen projects, to large stands of invasives where the chance of error is reduced. If we are to maximize volunteer contributions, the City must establish a continuing partnership with the community. It must include City support for addressing heavily infested areas and those not safe for volunteers. And it must include City support for all aspects of the task, including recruitment and retention of additional volunteers.
- The plan should recognize the extensive erosion control work to be done this year by SPU in the park, as well as the expected separate contract to address Cambridge Street. Doing so would make the plan current and keep its focus on work not yet addressed.
- Many facets of education are critical. Education that gets responsible users into the park will cultivate more responsible use. Education aimed at adjacent property owners will reduce intrusions of ornamental vegetation and harmful behaviors. The community can be an active partner in these activities. What we cannot effectively do is confront property owners when we see evidence of illegal dumping, for instance, or "landscaping" of park property. We need assurance that Parks will provide enforcement in a timely manner.

Education is addressed as a high priority for implementation in Section 7.1.1.

- Many plants are not represented in the park that could be introduced
- The lack of diversity in the wetlands is clearly a problem. Restoration in other habitats should focus on augmenting the existing species for the best possibility for success. Table 5 – Table 8 and Appendix C.*

- Past experience with salvaged plant installation yields slow growth or failure

Properly planned introduction projects should be coordinated by Parks staff to determine species selection, timing of introductions, and appropriate locations. Table 5 – Table 8 and Appendix C.

- Where is restoration of native communities planned?

Initial restoration should take place at trail and wetland junctions for the maximum benefit. The next restoration should occur at the slide area. Table 9

- What species will be used?

See Table 5 – Table 8 and Appendix D for a list of appropriate species. Obligate wetland species should be increased, buffers added to the wetlands, and upland restoration should focus on commonly occurring species.

- One goal is to eliminate invasive species. How does Parks see that occurring?

It will depend on community volunteer effort, available grant funding, and maximizing other work being done in the park by EarthCorps, SPU, the Starflower Foundation, and others. The three-person City Natural Areas Crew may be available for Fauntleroy Park in 2004. This VMP is the planning document that will provide direction and prioritization for park management, and details for granting agencies.

- Can this plan address adjacent property owner issues regarding invasive species on their property?

Yes. We suggest an educational campaign by distributing information to park neighbors to alert them to the effects their behavior and landscape choices have on the park.

- Fauntleroy Church is the single largest property owner adjacent to the park and, with some attention, it could be a larger ally of the park. The Church is about to adopt an updated mission and set of goals that includes environmental stewardship. The church is in conversation with Parks about a maintenance easement for the property south of Fenton Glen, encompassing the bridge over the Forest Court tributary. It will relieve the church of a problem-maintenance area and bring it up to Parks' standards. The church, too, has problems with illegal disposal of yard debris by adjacent neighbors. The church also dumps leaves and clippings near the upper parking lot and probably exacerbates the problem; neighbors thinking dumping in the park is okay. What could advance a solution is a meeting with Parks and church representatives to devise workable alternatives.

Comments and questions beyond the scope of this Vegetation Management Plan included:

- Would money spent on this VMP be better used to hire staff and remove weeds?
- Who in Parks helps with grants?
- Why is Parks going outside for grants?
- Is Parks too weak in labor services and too heavy in planning?

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Fauntleroy Park is a Puget Sound Lowland Remnant Forest of approximately 32.9 acres located in West Seattle. Over 30% of the park is considered steep-slope area, rendering it unbuildable, which ultimately preserved this property. The topography of the park prevents all but passive uses such as walking and observing nature. While some steep areas have been degraded due to human activities, and weeds are abundant in places, the habitat quality of the park remains high. Much of the park retains its native character and appears to be undergoing natural succession.

Goals were defined using existing applicable City-wide plans, specific Fauntleroy Park documents, interviews, a range of public comment from user groups and stewardship groups. The following eight goals have been identified to serve as the framework for this VMP.

1. Retain and expand a diverse conifer forest habitat
2. Create a self-sustaining forest community
3. Retain native diversity and expand forest habitat
4. Increase wildlife habitat while protecting existing wildlife habitat
5. Regain and maintain health of riparian system
6. Increase quality of wetland

7. Discourage stream sedimentation
8. Increase and maintain safety of people who use trails

Fauntleroy Park can be separated into four forest types and wetlands. The majority of the park is classified as hardwood and riparian forest types of approximately 18 acres. Adjacent wetlands consist of approximately 5 acres and conifer and mixed forest types make up approximately 10 acres. The forest is generally healthy and regeneration is occurring at acceptable levels. Some trees along the trail are at or near the end of their lifespan with evidence of damage or disease. These trees should undergo a hazard evaluation by a certified arborist. Trees determined to be a hazard to people or property should be removed.

The greatest diversity of weeds is found in the hardwood and riparian forest type with ivy and blackberry reaching severe levels in places. The conifer and mixed forest types have trace to moderate amounts of ivy and holly, both shade-tolerant species.

Volunteer efforts to remove weeds have been underway since 1996, however, some immediate, focused efforts should be implemented to control the spread of some weeds and eliminate weeds from high quality habitats. Habitat areas that are candidates for restoration are found mostly at trail/wetland junctions. Wetland areas are in need of buffer vegetation to aid in natural recovery and prevent access by off-trail users.

Education is a necessary step toward preservation of the character of Fauntleroy Park. The opportunities for education include alerting adjacent property owners of surface water drainage, proper disposal of yard debris, and invasive weed management. All park users should be made aware of the damage created when people and pets wander off trails causing vegetation damage, stream siltation, transport of invasive species, destruction of wildlife habitat, and slope destabilization.

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Projects have been divided by high and low priority based on threats to people and habitat, and cost and benefit. Specific projects listed in Focus Areas that should be given high priority. Low priority projects are listed separately.

High Priority Projects

One project, hazard tree removal, has safety implications and therefore should receive the highest priority for implementation.

High Priority Projects.

Management Area	Focus Area	Projects	Est. Area	Performed By	Est. Cost
All Park Entrances		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post educational signs to explain the consequences to the habitat when dogs are allowed to roam free inside the park 	<50 ft ²	SDPR	\$5,000 - \$8,000
All	Neighbors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and disseminate educational information for bordering property owners regarding drainage, dumping, pets, and invasive species management 	N/A	SDPR develop, Volunteer group (school children, etc.) to disseminate	\$6,000
Conifer	Eastern Strip	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain the spread of ivy and blackberry 	1 Acre	Volunteers	\$3,500 (tools, herbicides)
Hardwood /Mixed	Slide Area along northern boundary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue restoration with appropriate species to prevent siltation and prohibit weeds 	5000 ft ²	SDPR, Contractors	\$12,000
	Invasives in SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain ivy Remove blackberry 	2 Acres	Volunteers	\$4,000 (tools, herbicides)
Riparian	Fletcher St Right-of-Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain weeds 	1 Acre	SDPR, SDOT, Contractors, Volunteers	\$20,000
	Cambridge Street Entrance Dumping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove yard debris and garbage 	4,000ft ²	Volunteers	\$8,000 disposal fees
Wetland	Wetland/Stream /Trail Junctions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant barrier vegetation to prevent park visitors from going off-trail 	2000 ft ²	SPU, Contractors,S DPR and Volunteers	\$6,000
	Cambridge Street Erosion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Revegetate after stormwater repair and trail completion to limit travel off trail and soil erosion 	2000 ft ²	SPU	\$4,000
Trail	Hazard Trees Adjacent to Trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees assessed by ISA Certified Arborist 	8 trees	SDPR	\$5,000

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove hazard trees 			
	Excessively Steep Trails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with SDPR trail maintenance crew to eliminate steep and discourage social trails 	500 linear feet	EarthCorps, SDPR	\$3,000

Low Priority Projects

Lower priority projects include mostly plant installation for increase in diversity. These projects are considered low priority due to the cost of materials and labor. The donations of both plants and labor would turn these into high priority projects.

Low Priority Projects

Management Area	Focus Area	Projects	Est. Area	Performed by	Est. Cost
Conifer	NW Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove ivy and blackberry 	1 Acre	Volunteers, SDPR	\$3,500
Wetland	Boardwalk Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Increase wetland plant diversity 	4,000 ft ²	SDPR	\$5,000
Hardwood/Mixed Hardwood Conifer	Lack of Diversity on North Edge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant hemlock, cedar, and Sitka spruce 	½ Acre	SDPR with Volunteer assistance	\$4,000
	Denuded Slope at Rope Swing Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve soil conditions and revegetate the slope 	2,000 ft ²	SDPR with Volunteer assistance	\$4,000
	Wind-throw Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor for weed invasion 	10,000ft ²	Volunteers	41,200
Riparian	Lack of Diversity Near Barton Street Entrance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant Sitka spruce, hemlock, and cedar Add shrub layer in stream corridor 	10,000 ft ²	SDPR with Volunteer assistance	\$8,000

* Project should occur with trail repair and/or SPU work to maximize resources and lower costs.

Written Briefing – Carkeek Park Forest Management Plan

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

SCOPE

- 1 To create Forest Management Plan focusing on the forested areas of the Park outside of the stream corridor
- 2 To develop forest management objectives that will prioritize and efficiently utilize available PROParks Levy funding of \$125,000.

PROJECT HISTORY

This is a community driven and Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF) completion of Forest Management Planning project discontinued by the Urban Forestry Program in the summer of 2000. The community developed addition

funding to complete the plan and submitted it for Parks approval in December of 2002. PRO Parks funding is currently available through 2004 for implementation of the Plan.

SCHEDULE

Initial project PIP	August, September 1999
NMF funded Plan development	August – December 2002
Community-based implementation	September 2003 - 2004

BUDGET \$0

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

- Invasive plant control on trees and along the perimeter of the Park.
- Need for increased conifer regeneration to create sustainable forest.
- Outreach to adjacent property owners to control encroachments and invasive plantings

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

PUBLIC MEETINGS:

- | | |
|--|------------------------|
| 1. CRF Funded Initial Public Meetings | August, September 1999 |
| 2. NMF funded Draft VMP (presentation and comment) | November 17, 2002 |

PUBLIC INPUT – Carkeek Park Forest Management Plan

Public input was limited during the initial CRF funding portion of the project. No significant comment was generated during the NMF funded portion of the project.

Executive Summary

The Carkeek Forest Management Plan (FMP) outlines a framework within which forest restoration activities for the coming ten years should be based. The plan conforms to all applicable Parks policies as stated in Park’s Comprehensive Plan 2000, Best Management Practices, and Tree Policy Guidelines.

The FMP is an initiative of the Carkeek Park Advisory Council (CPAC), in close cooperation with the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation. It has been made possible with funding through the Department of Neighborhoods “Small and Simple Projects Fund” and Parks Urban Forestry Unit. After a short sketch of the Park history, the basic physical nature of the park is discussed. Subjects covered include: soil types, topography, ensuing problems with landslides, erosion, and sedimentation. There is an extensive forest description.

The plan outlines general protocols that should be used when working in specific areas based on ecological sensitivity and slope position. The best ways of removing all major noxious and obnoxious weeds are included as part of the supporting documentation.

Site Description

Carkeek is predominantly a mixed deciduous forest at present. This is due mostly to the local history. Carkeek at one time was under near complete agricultural use. The forests, resulting from allowing the land to lay fallow, have matured following the traditional successional model of forest development. There are, however, several mixed deciduous/evergreen stands and a few pure conifer stands in existence.

Findings

Forest analysis has shown that most of the deciduous trees have exceeded their life expectancies. This has resulted in several blow-down caused canopy gaps. It is estimated that about 20% of forest canopy cover is open within the forest alone. This is an estimate not based on recreational areas or trail cuts but purely from within the stands. It has been observed that trees within Carkeek are not regenerating fast enough to keep pace with the rate of tree decline and non-native tree invasion. Without intervention, it can be expected that Carkeek shall completely succumb, as many other Seattle parks are on the verge of doing, to complete and total inundation by non-native plants such as Himalayan Blackberry, English Ivy, Scot's Broom, English Laurel, Holly, and Horsechestnut.

Now more than ever, Carkeek's forests are in immanent danger from outside forces. Pressure from urbanization and non-native plants surround the park on three sides. This pressure is stronger at Carkeek than other Seattle area parks due to the shape of the park's boundary. Carkeek fits into a series of ravines which disrupt the otherwise normal grid of single family residences. In the recent past, bordering residents have encroached into the park in order to enlarge their backyards. And while most park neighbors do not intentionally plant potentially harmful plants, extremely noxious non-native weeds do exist in large quantities just outside Carkeek's borders. For these reasons and many more, it is crucial that action is taken to ensure the natural areas in Carkeek are stable enough to withstand the ever more urbanized city.

Management Objectives, Protocols & Projects

In an effort of preemption, the FMP identifies 4 major goals of forest restoration. These are: control and limit non-native plants, increase native plant diversity, increase canopy layering, and address problematic areas in the forest.

This plan outlines general protocols that should be used when working in specific areas based on ecological sensitivity and slope position. The Best Management Practices (BMPs) for removing the major noxious and obnoxious weeds are included as part of the supporting documentation.

The plan has divided the forest into five major management units, each with a number of sub-units based on easily identifiable boundaries and then on management practices and existing forest composition. Each unit is discussed at length; boundaries, existing conditions, major issues, local ecology, human use patterns, and best management practices are identified.

Management projects have been divided into two types. Restoration type projects tend to be more intensive. The areas where these projects have been located are moderately-to-intensively covered with invasive plants. The major focus of restoration projects is to reduce the non-native outside threat to the forest. The other types, enrichment projects, focus on ensuring that the invasive free areas of the park remain so. This is accomplished through the invigoration of existing populations with higher amounts of native plant diversity and increased plant density. This will not only create more varied plant communities but will promote plant coverage's to overlap (canopy layering) and develop multilayered forest canopies.

Several of the projects have been labeled "opportunistic". These projects have been developed for areas that are experiencing high levels of tree decline. Such areas tend to be less stable plant community-wise. Non-natives that would otherwise be locked out of a forest system can find a toe-hold in canopy gaps. It is the intention that opportunistic projects serve as a general framework in the hopes that this will decrease response time for reestablishing dense canopy cover in newly formed light gaps.

Timelines have been developed for all projects. Regular, consistent documentation, monitoring and aftercare have been identified as paramount to the success of restoration programs. General record keeping forms have been designed to be used with this plan. It is intended that these forms will evolve through testing and modification to best fit the need while remaining fairly easy to fill out.

To truly ensure a sustainable restoration of Carkeek Park, an edge plan type agreement should be developed for the surrounding communities. As noted by several professionals, the boundary of the park is much like a many fingered hand. Backyard exotic plantings are placing undue pressures on the park's natural communities. This can be abated by measures designed to entice local residents into developing their backyards are forest edge communities.

Old/New Business

- *Change in Call to Order Time:* In September 2003, the Board elected to change its meeting time from 7:00-9:00 pm to the new time of 6:00-8:00 pm. To advertise this change, Parks staff included the change in several press releases to local newspapers, listed it on the Park Board web page, and in October began adding it to the Board's agendas. These agendas are mailed to approximately 250 individuals and groups. At the suggestion of a Board member, the information was also posted to the main Park Department web page.
- *Vegetation Management Plans:* The Board briefly discussed the option of hearing briefings only on the vegetation management plans that are controversial.

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

APPROVED: _____ DATE _____
Bruce Bentley, Chair