

SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Peg Staeheli, Chair • Tom Early, Vice-Chair
Gordon Bradley • Leif Fixen • Jeff Reibman • Erik Rundell • Steve Zemke

The Urban Forestry Commission was established to advise the Mayor and City Council concerning the establishment of policy and regulations governing the protection, management, and conservation of trees and vegetation in the City of Seattle

DRAFT March 5, 2014

Meeting Notes

Seattle Municipal Tower Room 2750
700 5th Avenue, Seattle
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Attending

Commissioners

Peg Staeheli (PS) - chair
Tom Early (TE) – vice-chair
Gordon Bradley (GB)
Leif Fixen (LF)
Donna Kostka
Erik Rundell
Steve Zemke (SZ)

Staff

Sandra Pinto de Bader (SPdB) - OSE
Aly Penucci

Public

Denise Dahn
Mark Ahlness
Ruth Williams
Kathy Colombo
Miles Becker

Absent- Excused

Jeff Reibman (JR)

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive. For more details listen to the digital recording of the meeting at: <http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocs.htm>

Call to Order

Due to demands from Commissioner Matt Mega's new position, he will be unable to continue attending Commission meetings. He submitted his letter of resignation yesterday. Matt made a huge contribution to the work of the Commission and we are very grateful for his involvement and are very sorry to lose him.

Public comment

The following community members made comments in opposition of Parks' pilot program to include mountain biking in Cheasty Greenspace:

Denise Dahn
Mark Ahlness
Ruth Williams
Kathy Colombo

Miles Becker

Talked about his interest in installing MAPS monitoring stations in Parks property. This is a system to monitor habitat quality for birds. The benefits include: ability to monitor changes in wildlife population and determine how development influences wildlife; community engagement to involve volunteers. He

is requesting data by parcel. He will send the proposal to Sandra for her to distribute to the Commission and introduce him to Parks staff.

Approval of February 5 and February 12 meeting notes

ACTION: A motion was made to approve the February 5 meeting notes as written. The motion was seconded and carried.

ACTION: A motion was made to approve the February 12 meeting notes as written. The motion was seconded and carried.

2013 Annual Report Letter of transmittal

ACTION: A motion was made to approve the 2013 Annual Report letter of transmittal as written. The motion was seconded and carried.

Letter of recommendation for Mountain Biking in natural areas – initial conversation and possible vote

The Commission discussed the issue of this pilot program. Some questions posed included:

- How does the pilot fit within the Cheasty Greenspace vegetation management plan?
- What other areas did Park look at and why did they choose Cheasty for this pilot program?

The Commission will issue a letter of recommendation regarding best practices for the pilot program. UFC to be more effective by weighing in on the details of the pilot since the Parks board has already approved it.

Ideas mentioned included:

- Bike trails should be kept on perimeter only
- Install a fence on the interior side of the trail that would still allow for wildlife travel
- Keep interior habitat intact with no cross trails or meeting places
- Extend data collection for 5 years as a minimum and do it seasonally.
- Replace cut trees with native species
- Respect the greenways and green spaces of the City by not proceeding with this without a baseline (for both wildlife and vegetation) study and quarterly monitoring.
- Gain as much habitat restoration gain out of the deal.
- Include no net habitat loss and compensate for that.

The Commission would like to be involved in the MOA process. Sandra to reach out to Parks.

Steve Zemke will put together the first draft of the letter for discussion next week..

Pedestrian Zone Mapping Project – Aly Pennucci

The City uses Pedestrian Zone (PZ) designation to preserve or encourage an intensely retail and pedestrian-oriented shopping district. These areas are, or could become, neighborhood commercial

destinations, where residents access the services they need without driving, or at least with fewer automobile trips. DPD is working on reviewing 56 areas zoned neighborhood commercial (NC) to determine if a Pedestrian Zone designation is appropriate. They are looking at adding standards and rules, one of which would be requiring overhead weather protection. The rules would apply to frontages along main arterials. This is an opportunity for the UFC to provide input.

The Commission discussed the issue and expressed concern about this requirement generating tree removals or precluding tree planting. The Commission recommended DPD to make calculations to see how this requirement would affect existing canopy cover goals. Commercial/Mixed Use zones currently have 10% canopy cover and the UFSP sets a 15% goal.

Ally will coordinate with Sandra as they move forward with the process.

Race and Social Justice/community outreach – stakeholder engagement

Move to a future agenda.

2014 Work Plan - continues and adoption

ACTION: A motion was made to approve the 2014 Work Plan as written. The motion was seconded and carried.

New business and announcements

The Seattle Tree Map is live. Sandra will add the link to the Resources section of the website.

Adjourn

Community input

From: Mary Fleck [mailto:maryfleckws@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 10:57 PM

To: Carrasco, Jorge; Hamilton, Sefhir; Best, Lynn; Barber, Dave; Sawant, Kshama; Koritz, Joshua; Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra

Cc: Elaine Ike; Karen Lyons; Tod Rodman

Subject: Soil Evacuation Presents Risks -- Stop Disposal of Substation Property

Please see attached letter from Mary Fleck of West Seattle Green Space Coalition, letter from Sally Brown, PhD and c.v. of Sally Brown.



West Seattle Green Space Coalition

Jorge Carrasco
Sephir Hamilton
Lynn Best
Dave Barber
Seattle City Light
P.O. Box 34023
Seattle, WA 98124-4023

Kshama Sawant
Seattle City Council
P.O. Box 34025
Seattle, WA 98124-4025

February 25, 2014

Re: Seattle City Light Proposed Disposition of Surplus Substations in West Seattle

Dear Mr. Carrasco, Mr. Hamilton, Ms. Best, Mr. Barber and Ms. Sawant,

Sally Brown, PhD., has reviewed the soils reports for the surplus substation properties at White Center, Fauntleroy, Dumar, Andover and Dakota, which Seattle City Light had produced.

Dr. Brown is a highly regarded expert in the area of soils biochemistry and soils remediation. She has studied the reports and she has provided the expert opinion that excavation of the soils and vegetation is unnecessary. Further, she is of the opinion that it would be detrimental to conduct an excavation. I attach a copy of Dr. Brown's letter and a copy of her c.v.

Based on the above, I reiterate the demand that Seattle City Light not remove any more trees or vegetation from the surplus substation properties. Removal is unnecessary, costly, and premature as the City has not made any directive to Seattle City Light to sell the properties.

Sincerely,

West Seattle Green Space Coalition

s/

Mary K. Fleck
Co-Chair

Attachments

cc: **Sandra Pinto de Bader, Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator**
Office of Sustainability and Environment
City of Seattle
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2748
P.O. Box 94729
Seattle, WA 98124-4729

February 24, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

I was asked to look at reports prepared to characterize the level of soil contamination at a number of former utility substations in West Seattle by a citizen who is concerned that the vegetation on these sites is being destroyed prematurely. I reviewed the reports and for all except for one site; the site near White Center, exceedances of Model Toxicity Control Act (MTCA) were minimal and typically limited to one of the many composite samples collected from each site. For example, at the Andover site only one of the nine samples collected exceeded MTCA limits for lead. In this case, the standard acceptable concentration is 250 mg kg and the soil in this particular sample had a measured concentration of 290 mg kg. One of the samples exceeded the PCB limit of 1 ppm, with a measured concentration of 2.7 mg kg. Finally, two of the samples had DDT concentrations above the MTCA standard of 3 mg kg, one measured 4 mg kg and the other measured 6.2 mg kg. These results are typically of any urban soil and do not merit excavation.

It is critical to understand the risk pathways for soil contamination and also that the MTCA standards, however well intentioned, are highly conservative and not risk based. For example, the US EPA recommends 400 mg kg as a level of concern for lead in soil in children's play areas with 1100 mg kg as a level of concern for soil in general. Risks associated with contaminants in soils are related to contact with the soil. A healthy vegetated cover on the soil is one of the most effective tools to reduce risk. Soil contamination, particularly at levels so close to background for urban areas, is not associated with acute toxicity to people, plants or animals. Repeated exposure over time would be the pathway of concern, but these sites do not pose that type of risk, both because of the low levels of contamination and the limited exposure pathways. Excavation is likely a more significant risk than leaving soils in place because of the potential for dust migration. In addition, premature excavation removes the benefits associated with the areas such as public access to green space and the environmental benefits of greenspace.

I have worked with US EPA on use of soil amendments to reduce the bioavailability of contaminants in soils in situ or in place. These approaches have been successfully used on sites on the EPA National Priorities List. I was also a member of the National Academy of Science panel on Bioavailability of Contaminants in Soils and Sediments. Based on my work with contaminated soils, I would highly recommend that you refrain from excavating

soils at these sites in the interest of public health. I am happy to provide you with scientific literature to support this position.

Sally Brown
Research Associate Professor
School of Environmental and Forest Sciences
University of Washington
slb@uw.edu



From: Cass Turnbull [mailto:cassturnbull@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2014 10:15 AM
To: Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra
Subject: FW: vacant lot ecosystem services research

Hello UFC and Sandra Pinto de Bader;

The following is an email sent to a councilmember aid. I thought you might want to know what is going on with this.

Cass Turnbull

206-783-9093

On Mon, Mar 3, 2014 at 7:47 AM, Cass Turnbull <cassturnbull@comcast.net> wrote:

With regards to the disposition of surplus City Light substations, I have included the following research conclusions from a scientific abstract titled:

[Mapping Ecosystem Services in New York City: Applying a Social-Ecological Approach to Vacant Land](#)

'Our goal has been to understand...overlooked places in the city where policy, planning, or community development could simultaneously meet combined biodiversity habitat, Ecosystem Services provisioning, and social justice goals.

Sampled vacant lots in NYC were often located in conjunction with social demographic and economic characteristics that indicate a social need for ES (ecosystem services), suggesting a novel opportunity for transforming vacant land in ways that enhance Ecosystem Services provisioning, especially in hotspot locations with high social need and low ecological value. A concerted effort by the city, grass-roots organizations and individuals to convert underutilized vacant land into green infra-structure with combined social-ecological-ecological amenities could provide increased resilience to predicted near-term effects of climate change (New York City Panel on Climate Change, 2009) including offsetting predicted increases in stormwater and urban heat.

Transforming vacant land has the potential to increase the overall sustainability of the city as well through provisioning increased green space for urban gardening, recreation, habitat for biodiversity, carbon and air pollution absorption and other regulating, provisioning, and cultural Ecosystem Services.'- T. McPhearson et al. / Ecosystem Services 5 (2013) e11

I apologize for the blizzard of information that I am sending to you. It is only because Seattle City Light continues to insist on remediating contaminated soils on some of the sites BEFORE council decides what to do with them. And that has resulted in cutting and clearing of vegetation, and potentially unnecessary endangerment to two other sites which they are [still](#) planning on 'cleaning-up' in the next two months.

Can [the Councilmember](#) tell SCL to HOLD OFF ON THE CLEAN-UPS, PLEASE? There is no legal mandate that they do these cleanups in a hurry, and no immediate threat to public health or the environment-- you'd have to eat the soil for a long time to get hurt.

Cass Turnbull
PlantAmnesty/TreePAC
[206-783-9093](tel:206-783-9093)

March 5, 2014

Dear Seattle Urban Forestry Commission,

As you consider making a recommendation about the bikes use policy in Seattle Parks, I hope you have a chance to review the information below.

Pilot Project

The Seattle Board of Parks Commissioners voted on 1/9/14 to adopt a three year pilot project. This was clear attempt to circumvent normal rules and procedures to appease a powerful special interest group. The establishment of mountain bike trails in Cheasty Greenspace will change Cheasty from a greenspace to a bicycle recreation area. If the pilot does not work out, for any number of reasons, it would take many, many years for Cheasty to “revert” (Parks Department staff terminology, 1/9/14 meeting) to its current state. Will we soon be treated to a “Pilot Old Growth Zipline in Schmitz Park”? What special interest group will line up next? Regulations are there for a reason. This pilot is in violation of the current Parks Department policy on bike use.

Critical Missing Measure – Baseline

The hope is that, after three years, this pilot project will help Parks and Recreation make a decision on changing the current bikes in parks policy. However, besides this pilot only addressing a small part of the possible kinds of bike usage in parks, the pilot is based on bad science, namely, not having anything resembling a baseline or an environmental impact statement. The pilot will change the face of Cheasty Greenspace. It will no longer be a greenspace.

The Cheasty Vegetation Management Plan (VMP)

This important document, written in 2003, provides a comprehensive look at the vegetation in Cheasty, a history of the place (including Cheasty Boulevard being part of the original Olmstead corridor), cautions about slides, detailed recommendations for restoration and maintenance, a review of Parks policies on natural areas and greenspaces, and much more:

<http://www.seattle.gov/parks/horticulture/vmp/Cheasty/VMP.pdf> The document clearly lays out the lifespan of its recommendations - 20 years, which brings us up to 2023, when a new VMP should be done. Installation of a mountain bike trail would not only violate the spirit of the document, but it would eliminate as possibilities numerous recommendations for the responsible stewardship of Cheasty.

The Push

The group pushing forward with the bike park proposal has been in planning and implementation for nearly three years. It came forward with a proposal in the fall of 2013. The Board of Parks Commissioners met on the issue twice (October and November, 2013). Viewing the proposal as a violation of Parks bicycle use policy, the Commissioners put off making a decision on changing the policy, because it was clearly a very big issue. Undeterred, the Parks Department came forward with the pilot proposal in January, 2014.

Policy Change Based on a Flawed, Harmful Pilot

Some have suggested that Cheasty Greenspace is simply not a special or unique enough place to protect, maintain, and restore as a natural area. This assessment is arbitrary and subjective. While parts of the forest are in decline, it certainly has the potential to return to a healthy urban forest. I urge SUFC members to visit the site. Some recent pictures:

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/ahlness/sets/72157641036323085/>

Community involvement

The Cheasty Greenspace proposed for the mountain bike trails is separated from Cheasty at Mountain View area by Columbian Way. In addition to having no easy foot or even car access between the two sections of Cheasty, the neighborhoods around the two areas are very different. The bike proposal is coming from a couple who started up the Cheasty at Mountain View group and the Beacon Bike Park group. The bike proposal is for the area north of Columbian Way, impacting very different neighborhoods, one of which includes the original Friends of Cheasty Greenspace, which has been in existence for 25 years. That group is not in favor of the bike park proposal. There is a petition at Change.org: "Maintain foot traffic only policy within Cheasty Greenspace":

<http://www.change.org/petitions/city-of-seattle-seattle-parks-and-recreation-maintain-foot-traffic-only-policy-within-cheasty-greenspace>. Parks Department statements that there are no neighbors in

opposition to the mountain bike proposal are not correct. The Parks Department has scheduled a community meeting to discuss the mountain bike trail for March 25th. Meanwhile, the Cheasty at Mountain View group is currently training volunteers, who they say will begin working on the bike trail in March.

Funding and Volunteers

The Parks Department has said it does not have the financial resources to do the trail construction and maintenance. Parks will rely on volunteers to do the work, and Parks will provide oversight and evaluation. Parks also said it does not currently have the financial resources to do even that. No plan for financing to even cover oversight and evaluation of volunteer work? Cheasty Greenspace and the City of Seattle deserve better.

Access

The planned parking areas for mountain bike user access are problematic. They are located in a congested area on the east side of Cheasty (Rainier Vista) with limited on street parking. Access, via Martin Luther King Jr. Way, is only from the north. Anyone accessing from the south will have to take a u-turn across the Light Rail line to get there. There is no parking along the west side of Cheasty Greenspace. This is not an area to which neighborhood kids will ride after school. They will be driven in cars by their parents.

Portland

Portland's official position, denying a proposed mountain bike trail in Forest Park (February, 2014): <http://www.portlandonline.com/fritz/index.cfm?a=480091&c=49233> The proposal was turned down for three reasons: a lack of consistent funding, the need to look at the bike master plan "prior to embarking on individual projects", and a doubt that it would pass an environmental review (to include a baseline study). Seattle Parks and Recreation has decided that those three issues, also faced in Seattle, are not a problem.

Recommendation

I urge the Urban Forestry Commission to refrain from supporting the development of the pilot mountain bike trail in Cheasty Greenspace.

Sincerely,

Mark Ahlness, retired Seattle Public Schools teacher

mahlness@comcast.net

206-225-4780

(document available online at <http://tinyurl.com/l3w2xjf>)

To: Urban Forestry Commission

Letter of Concern Regarding Change in Policy for Greenspaces and Natural Areas

About Me

My name is Denise Dahn and I am an artist, writer and graphic designer from West Seattle. I have a degree in Environmental Studies from the University of Washington, and for the last 25+ years, I have devoted my career and my life to helping people understand, appreciate and connect with nature. In recent years, I have become extensively involved in the Children in Nature Movement, the New Nature Movement, and in preserving the urban wild. I have co-founded the Seattle Nature Alliance, but these views are my own and not necessarily those of the entire group.

Concerns

I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes to the long-standing Park policy of preserving greenspaces and natural areas for wildlife habitat, natural qualities, and passive recreation. These places, while they may no longer be pristine, have irreplaceable value that will only become more important as the population grows, as the built environment increasingly dominates the earth, and as the Puget Sound region begins to feel the inevitable, unpredictable effects of global climate change.

Offering these places to specialized user-groups at the sacrifice of the general population and the natural ecosystem is unfair, unsustainable, and unwise.

I am particularly concerned about setting a precedent of offering greenspaces to user-groups in exchange for eco-restoration services. The risk is that the City will allot greenspaces to specialized groups that have the energy and resources to develop them. If greenspaces are essentially put up for grabs, who will advocate for the general population?

Just eleven years ago, a detailed Parks Department Study (1) described Cheasty Greenspace as having "notable wildlife value," largely for the fact that it is a rare fragment of maturing interior forest habitat. It is in the middle of a corridor of greenspace, an important feature for wildlife of all kinds. The study lists many native plants and birds known to inhabit the space, and suggests there are many habitat features that surely harbor countless others.

But, just a few weeks ago, the Parks Department approved a bike park project to be built in the greenspace. When questioned about the impact to wildlife, the response was that there are "no significant species" present to consider.

So, what has changed in eleven years? Does a species have to be on the brink of extinction to be considered "significant?" Or, has all wildlife simply disappeared in the last decade?

Portions of the site are quite infested by ivy and other invasives, but the site is far from being a lifeless wasteland. But, if a greenspace *is* heavily invaded—as many of them are destined to be—does that mean it no longer has value for nature at all? Is it to be written off as “unused space”, no longer worth preserving?

We cannot afford to forfeit natural areas, no matter how invaded they might become. Seattle has already developed or landscaped 86% of its parkland, only 14% remains natural. (2) What is left are often small, fragmented spaces with extremely limited carrying capacity for intensive use. And, if one specialized user-group gets access, others will want the same deal in other greenspaces. Eventually, wildlife and the general population will get squeezed out. This does not mean that any particular user-group is more or less “legitimate” than another, it’s just that there is not enough greenspace left to accommodate specialized user-groups *in addition* to the general population. It’s one or the other, but not both.

For comparison, Forest Park in Portland is roughly 100 times bigger than the Cheasty Greenspace, and city officials still declined a single-track mountain bike proposal in part because of the added environmental impact of building additional, bike-only trails. (3)

And, it’s not fair to parcel out rare plots of greenspace to select groups, at the expense of everyone else. What about the elderly, or the very young, the less-abled, or people that cannot afford bikes?

Connecting with Nature

Finally, I am particularly concerned about the oversimplification of the concept of “connecting with nature”. The very real, very important human need for daily contact with nature is being interpreted by some as license to treat urban greenspaces as nature playgrounds. Nostalgically, there was a time we could get away with this, unfortunately the built environment has expanded to the extent this is no longer the case. This presents some challenges, but also some exciting opportunities that are perhaps being overlooked.

Urban nature playgrounds—both for children and adults—are important, and should be incorporated into the built environment. Many cities around the world are replacing their traditional playground equipment with natural features like logs, boulders, and mini-ponds with natural-style, unmowed landscapes. These are places for kids to go wild with unstructured, active play.

For adults, nature playgrounds can be mountain bike challenge courses, ropes courses, or climbing walls—again constructed within existing developed/built areas rather than developed in the few remaining urban natural areas.

But, greenspaces and natural areas are places we should approach with a different attitude—for our own sake as much as for the sake of wildlife. Nature is not merely a setting in which to recreate. Natural areas are living systems. We should approach the

entire space—plants, animals, insects, everything—as we would a living being that we wish to get to know. Young children can, and should, be taught to treat nature mindfully, much as we teach them to not maul puppies and kittens or trample in the flower garden. People of all ages should be encouraged to explore, be curious, and find wonder in nature. It is unstructured, adventurous, and just as much fun, but in a gentle mode rather than an overbearing one.

This is where the opportunity lies—by directing our awareness toward nature and recognizing fellow living creatures, we find our own place in nature. There is plenty of evidence that this is just as important to human health and well-being as active nature-sport. It requires mindfulness, but gives back so much more.

Signed,

Denise Dahn

www.dahndesign.com

Sources

(1) Cheasty Greenspace Vegetation Management Plan

<https://www.seattle.gov/Parks/Horticulture/vmp/Cheasty.htm>

2) Seattle Times

http://seattletimes.com/html/pacificnw/2014312829_pacificparks06.html

(3) <http://www.portlandonline.com/fritz/index.cfm?id=480091&c=49233>

Recommended Reading

[The Urban Bestiary](#), by Lyanda Lynn Haupt (West Seattle!)

March 5, 2014

Dear Seattle Urban Forestry Commission:

I am here today as a resident who lives within Cheasty Greenspace and as a member of the Friends of Cheasty which has been a longstanding partner with the Parks and with the Friends of Olmsted.

I understand your purpose is to advise the Mayor and City Council concerning the establishment of policy and regulations governing the protection, management, and conservation of trees and vegetation in the city of Seattle with the additional *goal of achieving 30% tree canopy cover by 2037 to increase the environmental, social, and economic benefits trees bring to Seattle residents. The Seattle Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP), adopted in 2007, is a comprehensive strategy for increasing Seattle's tree canopy cover to meet the 30% target. The UFMP lays out goals and a broad range of actions to be implemented over time to preserve, maintain, and plant trees as well as restore the public forested areas remaining in the city.*

I want to thank you for the volunteer service you provide and to have you think about the process you use to assess and determine recommendations on behalf of the flora/fauna and residents. I am wondering if you are asking the necessary critical questions to gain the entire perspective in order to make fully knowledgeable decisions.

I am concerned and interested in the public process that was used to determine that this is the only viable option for Cheasty Greenspace. We have been attending meetings since last spring presenting opposition to the mountain bike trail due to the wildlife-deer, pileated woodpeckers, redshafted wood peckers, coopers' hawks, barn owls... a wide variety of song birds as well as reptiles, amphibians and mammals and plant life that sustains the animals. We have for several years been working to gain insight from neighbors as to how to maintain and improve the area, and at the same time being reminded of the need for increased density to prevent urban sprawl. Cheasty Greenspace and trail remained a respite for people in the area to enjoy a quiet walk, whether it is a neighbor, someone walking to the Mt Baker Station or employees from the Veterans Hospital or the Asian Counseling and Referral Services. And this fits with the Parks' definition for Natural Areas-*"designated for preservation because of their natural or ecological qualities and their potential to contribute to an interconnected open space system"*.

We(FOC) have worked to remove invasives, pick up trash, and work to improve the neighborhood for city residents and were excited to see more public involvement to remove invasives and to restore Cheasty to its natural state. You can imagine our concern when we first heard about a mountain bike proposal last year, as being supported by the Parks Department.

We have worked closely with the parks Department for over 30 years. We thought we were keeping in alignment with what the Parks Department had planned for Cheasty and to hear that a Mountain Bike Park is something they want for the Greenspace was quite a shock and a concern, on many levels. We have several serious concerns about the wetland and ravine being transformed into a mountain bike path, the long term effects and the population the trail will serve.

The area is a wetland and a geologically sensitive area -several slides have occurred and we want to know what precautions will be considered knowing that skunk cabbage is an indicator species for wetlands-underground springs. We (my family) needed to have a geotech to review our lot (area) before we could do any yard work to maintain soil stability... when we (FOC) were a part of the walking trail design, we had historical knowledge of slide zones.

We are concerned with the ever increasing traffic and parking around the Greenspace. Mountain biking is a destination activity and we realize many people will be driving their cars to access the site. Where

will they park? And how will traffic patterns be taken into account. Has there been a traffic pattern study? Has anyone looked at the traffic patterns now and then later to be able to compare? Having lived within the south end and raised 4 children all attending Seattle Public Schools, we know that only upper middle class families and children can afford a mountain bike. We are a dual working family and we could never afford a mountain bike for our children. They had and we use street bikes...having a son who built street bikes for low income children at Bike Works took a concerted amount of time to build a bike for someone else. Will anyone be providing mountain bikes for the low income children who cannot access the trail otherwise? Another concern is –aren't you limiting the groups of people who will be using this site? Wouldn't it benefit a greater variety of people to put energy into creating an environmental walking trail in which Aki Kurose MS, Asa Mercer MS, Kimball, and Franklin HS could create collaboratively and use to supplement their STEM curricula?

We are concerned about the lack of transparency with this project- isn't that what a community dialogue is all about, to present ideas and to come up with one(s) that would provide the greatest benefit for the Open Space and for the largest amount of community members? I know teachers at the local schools who would love to have their students partner with the parks to collaboratively create something that would benefit schools, students, and the community. Look at Jefferson Park-it took a long time of community processing but it was worth it, because it represents all members of the community and provides for the uniqueness that makes the south end of Seattle a wonderful place to live. It is wonderful to walk on the Jefferson overlook path in the spring and watch our Samoan neighbors playing cricket and playing their drums!

Another concern that has not been addressed is the Landmark status designated to Cheasty... how will this plan affect the Landmark status? Does this pilot project eliminate the work we have done to preserve the space?

What does a pilot project mean? Who is collecting data-from a restored natural area to a mountain bike path? Who will be analyzing the data and when will data be pulled, shared and analyzed?

As the overseers or one of the agencies that provides the checks and balances for the Parks Department we would like the Parks Department to address:

1. What is the overall plan for Natural areas? How does this project fit into the plan?
2. How does the Olmsted Plan affect the Natural area plan?
3. How will the mountain bike plan benefit the Greenspace and how can they guarantee that a large amount of the community will benefit from the proposal or is there another idea that is out there that has not been considered?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kathy Colombo
3820 Cheasty Blvd S
kcolombo@lwsd.org