

BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 28, 2002

Present:

Bruce Bentley, Chair
James Fearn
Susan Golub
Yale Lewis
Sarah Neilson
Kathleen Warren

Excused: Kate Pflaumer

Staff:

Ken Bounds, Superintendent
Michele Daly, Park Board Coordinator

Chair Bruce Bentley called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. The agenda consent items were approved as submitted, including the March 28 agenda, minutes of the March 14 meeting and acknowledgment of correspondence.

Superintendent's Report:

- **Youth Appreciation Week** - April 5-13 – Pro Parks Teen Development Leaders have planned and coordinated activities, which they will conduct at their community centers.
A calendar of events was distributed to the Board members.
- **Earth Day** – April 20 – There are a number of projects planned throughout the city. The Downtown Rotary is doing a project at South Lake Union Park.
- **Japanese Garden** – A Shinto blessing ceremony on Friday, March 29, will celebrate the reopening of the garden after being closed six months for major repairs. The garden pond was restored and a water recirculating system was installed. A Seattle Times editorial was distributed to Park Board members.
- **Tall Ships at South Lake Union** – The Maritime Heritage Foundation is hosting a tall ships event at South Lake Union August 15-18. The major tall ships gathering on the central downtown waterfront was canceled. Fifteen or more Class B and C ships will sail from British Columbia and dock at South Lake Union Park.
- **O. O. Denny Park** – This city-owned park, located in Juanita, has been maintained by King County. The County closed the parking lot, restroom and will

not be maintaining the park. The city has been working with the county and the Denny Creek Alliance about things they can do to help maintain the park.

- **Aquarium Certification** – The Aquarium request for certification from the American Zoo and Aquarium Association has been tabled for one year. Reasons given include the lack of support from SEAS for the existing aquarium, not enough staff in the mammal and bird collection and the Touch Tank. The Aquarium will petition for reconsideration in the fall.
- **Professional of the Year** – Nick Bicknell, Recreation Specialist for Disabled Youth, was honored as “Professional of the Year” on March 23 by the Northwest Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance.
- **Aquatics** – National award received from the Waterways and Trails Association for the waterway trails project. Kudos to Kathy Whitman and the Aquatic staff.
- **Marine Reserves** – Critical habitat areas are being designated. The Department is working with the Law Department to determine boundaries for segments of all major Seattle beaches to be dedicated as reserves. Closed areas will allow visitors to look but not take any plants or animals.
- **Freedom Day Committee** – A request has been received to expand the festival planned at Volunteer Park from one day to two days and to have a beer garden. The Department is working with them on their request. A two-day event would essentially shut down the park for both weekend days.
- **Sand Point/Magnuson Park Open House** – The annual open house is scheduled for March 30. The public is invited to view the many projects underway at the park, meet with various advocates and project design teams.
- **Alki Bathhouse** – Meeting scheduled on April 2, 7 p.m., at the Alki Elementary School, to discuss change of use slated for the Bathhouse.
- **Advisory Council Meeting** – The Superintendent is meeting with the Advisory Councils on April 2 to talk about the current budget situation, what is anticipated in the next two years and gather ideas from the advisory councils on how the Department can save money.
- **Park Naming -**
6400 Corson Avenue – named “Oxbow Park” which was suggested by the Georgetown Community Council. Oxbow is a U-shaped frame forming a collar about an ox’s neck and supporting the yoke; something (as a bend in a river) resembling an oxbow. It also refers to the route the Duwamish River used to follow. The infamous “Hat and Boots” will be placed at this park.
- **3706 Ridgeway Place** – named “Trudy’s Triangle” to honor a former Park Board Commissioner (Trudy Sanders) who was instrumental in setting out the guidelines

and obtaining the approvals for Discovery Park. She was a former Mount Baker resident who helped with revitalization of the neighborhood.

Sarah Neilson suggested the Board send a congratulatory letter to Nick Bicknell to acknowledge his Professional of the Year award.

Oral Requests and Communications from the Audience

Chair Bruce Bentley reminded the audience of the Board's rules on civil discourse. They include no personal attacks, respect for the opposition and respect for others' time. He also reminded those signed up to speak that it is not necessary to repeat a message; decisions are not based on the number of individuals speaking for or against an issue. To the extent possible, the general public comment portion of the agenda will be reserved for topics that have not had or are not scheduled for a public hearing.

John Havard, Phinney Ridge Community Council, informed the Board that the Phinney Ridge Community Council has recently filed an appeal of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Woodland Park Zoo. He urged the Superintendent and Board to review the Long Range Plan and FEIS. The Phinney Ridge residents found the FEIS to be inadequate in many areas. The community has concerns about the parking garage and its impact on the neighborhood and the appropriateness of the large event center within the zoo grounds. His written comments were distributed to the Board.

Corey Satten, Phinney Ridge resident, requested further review of the Zoo's FEIS and "dittoed" what Mr. Havard stated.

David Spain, Capitol Hill resident, spoke on behalf of his neighbors who could not attend this meeting. He is opposed to the proposed expansion of the Pride march/festival at Volunteer Park. The neighborhood is particularly concerned about the proposed beer garden in the park. They have been told that there is information being circulated in the neighborhood in the form of leaflets to keep the neighbors informed but they are not being received. The neighbors are suspicious that because they are in opposition to the beer garden they are being left off the leafleting list.

Golf Management Alternatives – Briefing/Public Hearing

The Department's staff recommendations were presented the Board at its March 14 meeting regarding changes in the management arrangements for the city's major golf facilities. A long-term management arrangement for Interbay needs to be determined. The short-term management contract with Premier Golf for operation, maintenance and development expires December 31, 2002. The operation and development of the City's three regulation length golf courses is contracted with Seattle Golf (Municipal Golf of Seattle). That contract expires December 31, 2007. Staff recommended a management firm arrangement similar to the current arrangement for Interbay with a term of five years. For the three regulation complexes, staff recommended Seattle Golf be retained for operation and development with a revised contract but no extension of the contract term.

The City would be responsible for issuing or backing debt. The revised contract should provide for increased collaboration between Seattle Golf and the Department; require joint preparation of a five year business plan plus a strategic capital investment plan; and, require at least a \$100,000 per year return to the city. Department employees would continue to maintain the courses under the modified staffing proposal, which achieves a cost reduction of roughly \$200,000 per year.

At the March 14 Park Board meeting, Seattle Golf requested time on the Board's agenda to make a presentation about their vision and the future of the courses and John Masterjohn, the Local 1239 labor representative for the City's golf course employees, also asked for time to brief the Board. It was determined that brief presentations would be allowed prior to the public hearing.

Seattle Golf

Andrew Kinstler, Vice President of the Board of Directors of Seattle Golf, acknowledged the volunteer Seattle Golf board members in the audience. Seattle Golf President, Booth Gardner, could not attend, but did submit a letter endorsing the Seattle Golf presentation. The Board is united in its commitment to do the right thing. The people who use the courses are juniors, seniors and working people who enjoy golf. Seattle Golf is passionate about the courses.

John Peoples, Secretary of the Seattle Golf Board, former Seattle Times golf reporter, spoke about golf history in Seattle. In the early 90's the courses were run down but golf was booming and the courses were packed. The courses were not profiting. The courses day to day operations were run by concessionaires. There was no money being reinvested into the courses by the people running them. Municipal Golf of Seattle began lobbying the city to turn the courses over to a not for profit organization. The City of Baltimore had turned their municipal courses over to a non-profit organization and was used as an example during the MGS lobbying efforts. Baltimore courses improved and revenue increased. As the MGS plan was executed it did not fully follow the Baltimore Plan. Mr. Peoples urged the Park Board to give Seattle Golf a chance to really succeed and fully implement the Baltimore Plan. It is a radical departure and calls for things that people in government don't like to do. It is a hard choice. When golf was booming the city missed the opportunity to have the facilities upgraded at no other expense to the city. We are at that point where we need to make a tough decision.

Sandy McCullough, Seattle Golf Board member, displayed a chart showing the recent achievements that Seattle Golf has accomplished, referencing the ERA Study. The golf courses are better. They are reaching the underserved. The Board staff of Seattle Golf has essentially recreated itself during the last two years. There is a level of service and commitment that is unbelievable. The Board is comprised of members of the legal profession, marketing, financial capital project management, golf industry and social services. Seattle Golf received a \$2 million loan, privately financed, in 2000 and was able to accomplish improvements to the courses. The green fees have been brought up to market rate. There has been an increase in the customer satisfaction level. Seattle Golf commissioned GMA, local research firm, to do a survey in 2000 and 2001. The surveys

were done in June at the three courses and average about 1,100 survey respondents each time. Included in the survey were questions about food/beverage, marshaling, course condition and pace of play. Customer satisfaction improved to over 90%. Improvements need to continue to be made. Seattle Golf is providing opportunities for youth to learn the game and growing future customers. They run camps, clinics, outreach programs and host 21 high school boys and girls golf teams. They also partner with a number of other organizations that focus on serving low income, minority and a couple of programs for young girls and women. Over 2500 youth were served in 2001. The number will increase by 750 this spring at Jefferson with the First Tee program. The First Tee program will expand to the other courses in the next two years. A Mayor's Cup is planned for May 17th.

Over the next five years \$10 million dollars in course improvements has been identified. The driving ranges are key as they are revenue-streamed and they are necessary as teaching facilities. The Par 3 improvements are important to the seniors. Every clubhouse needs some work.

There is a range of options before the Park Board. Seattle Golf believes the right decision about the management of the golf courses is the 501(c)3 model and has the Board and staff in place to make it work.

Andy Kinstler stated the bottom line issue that was raised with the Park Board a couple weeks ago is the \$500,000 a year cost for which Seattle Golf is not receiving market value in the charges it pays to the City of Seattle for what is called maintenance. \$2 million a year is spent on maintenance to the Parks Department and for that Seattle Golf gets \$1.5 in value. This has been identified in the ERA report. Seattle Golf does not want to sound like it is complaining about the maintenance. The people who do the work are good, hard working, efficient, productive people. The workers may come up and complain during the hearing as they are concerned about their jobs. Seattle Golf does not want anyone to lose a job. They want to be able to provide efficient service. \$200,000 of the "maintenance" charge to Seattle Golf is overhead. These are inefficiencies that are passed on to the golfers and in essence is a tax.

Rounds of golf are dropping per course as supply is increasing. Seattle Golf revenue has increased from 1996 – 2001 on an annual basis. This was accomplished by raising the green fees. Expenses have increased. The Seattle Golf operational expense per year has been about 20% of the total each year. The maintenance cost has run between 52%-46% of the budget. The city's charge to Seattle Golf for golf course maintenance has remained relatively static over five years. It has remained at \$2 million. There is a point that needs to be considered, Mr. Kinstler stated. Seattle Golf's portion of the maintenance expense has increased year by year. Seattle Golf pays almost a 6.5% mark up on everything that the city provides to Seattle Golf. If Seattle Golf takes the maintenance over they do not pay the mark up. Seattle Golf has taken almost 30% of the maintenance costs on to itself in order to avoid the mark up. The City's share of the cost has not gone down and has stayed relatively level. The ERA report states in real terms it has increased about 4% per year.

Mr. Kinstler informed the Board that Seattle Golf has a bid from Environmental Golf Corporation for \$1.5 million for golf maintenance. This would be a \$500,000 savings per year for the remaining five years of the contract that can be reinvested into the courses for the benefit of the golfer and that is what Seattle Golf was hired to do. Seattle Golf believes the Parks Department has an expanding role in other areas. Seattle Golf believes the maintenance workers on the city's courses can be moved over to other positions within the Department. If there is a transition that needs to be done, Seattle Golf will do that. If the workers want to remain as workers on the courses that is fine. Seattle Golf has the greatest respect for the workers. This is not just a cost issue; it is an accountability and business issue. The Park Board heard complaints two weeks ago about West Seattle Golf Course water running into neighbors' property. Seattle Golf is not to blame – that is a maintenance issue. It does not make sense for the day to day operations of the golf course to be split between two entities – Parks and Seattle Golf. Day to day operations should be run by the day to day operator. Seattle Golf asks the Park Board to implement the plan that they recommended six years ago – a private non-profit operator for the day to day operations of the course. Seattle Golf invited one of the Park Board members to meet with Seattle Golf and the Department and have this arrangement “hammered out” in 30 days and go forward in a way that is a win-win in the long run for everyone.

John Masterjohn, Local 1239, has been working with the Park Department and Seattle Golf from the beginning. It is confusing to John as to why Seattle Golf thinks the inefficiencies belong to the maintenance. They relate how great the crews are and that they do a great job. The courses are now at a 93% rating and John believes that is a result of the maintenance. If Seattle Golf does eliminate 30 maintenance workers, trying to place them within the city system now would be impossible and budget cuts will be getting worse. There may be some positions in Pro Parks, but not 30 jobs. There would be some people losing their jobs.

Last year, Local 1239, city management and Seattle Golf negotiated working conditions for a number of employees and pay scales for maintenance positions. This was done in good faith to aid in the reduction of costs Seattle Golf was seeking from the city. During these negotiations, labor asked Seattle Golf if they could do anything on their side of the operation to reduce costs and aid in realizing their goals. Seattle Golf did not want to address this question. Labor has agreed to eliminate 12 permanent positions and 9 FTE and reclassify job duties as seasonal positions with reductions in pay, scales to reflect the new classifications. This reduced the Seattle Golf maintenance costs about \$250,000.

John Masterjohn referred to the ERA study and the Clark Nuber report. The city maintenance costs have remained steady over the past six years and, in fact, have gone down from 52% to a total golf budget of 31%. During the same period Seattle Golf's budget has gone up \$2.5 million. In looking at the financial reports questionable management on strategies on Seattle Golf's side of the operation have been found. Why have salaries increased \$495,703 from 1999-2000 for Seattle Golf? That is a 32% increase. There was approximately a 4% increase for the city maintenance people. Why did Seattle Golf take over the restaurant operation when for five years they made \$105,849 in royalties at no cost to them? Now in one year they have lost \$45,991 or 43%

of what they made the previous five years with the cost of the operation being \$867,000. Why is the Pro Shop profit margins through costs of goods sold going down instead of up? Why has the yearly expense of golf cart fees gone up at a higher rate than the revenues? Why aren't the driving ranges bringing the revenue that should be expected? Seattle Golf could control some of their costs and the city might receive some of the money due them as far as the contract. John would like the Park Board to also ask Seattle Golf about capital improvement management practices. Why did they overrun the driving range cost of improvements at Jefferson from \$219,000 budgeted to \$443,000? Why are they now, only a couple of years later, proposing to scrap most of the improvements and spend another \$1.7 million on the same site? Why have they selected their project manager to also be their contractor performing most of their course improvements? Where is the quality control in this practice? Was there a bidding process performed to select the contractors? Many of the projects have not been completed as per their approved plans. ERA indicates that Seattle Golf had a cash flow problem in 2000 that resulted in default payments to the city. How far in default were they and how long? Is there a similar situation in the 2001 payment? John believes Seattle Golf is \$700,000 behind in their maintenance fees. Is there a similar situation in 2002? John does not think they have made a payment in 2002. If they turned the maintenance over to a private contractor and they did not make their payments how long would the private contractor stay on the site? He would like Seattle Golf to pay their bills but John thinks Seattle Golf can stay on as manager of the three courses. Seattle Golf is working to make the courses successful and they have an excellent board now. He thinks the Seattle Golf Board needs to get out and raise funds. John closed by saying we need to have the people working on the courses who are doing their job and making the courses the 93% improvement rate continue doing that work.

John Mallon. Department of Parks and Recreation Golf Manager, spoke about costs and the benefits of having the city crews work on the golf courses. The city maintenance average cost was \$2,017,000 and the last three years it has been \$1,998,000. Each year Seattle Golf's budget goes up while the maintenance costs remain steady. From a standpoint of affecting Seattle Golf's net operating income and their ability to invest in the golf courses, the problem is not in the golf maintenance costs. Seattle Golf in 1995-1997 was producing net income. Just recently their net income has dropped considerably and the city maintenance has gone down. The golf maintenance performance is good. The first survey taken in 1997 indicated golf performance review for tees, greens, course conditions was 87% (good to excellent) rated by the public. In the last two years the customer surveys have shown that the performance has gone up to 93%. The costs are being reduced as performance has increased.

An outside service provider has indicated they could provide maintenance service for \$1,726,000. There is no indication whether they have considered sales tax in that figure. It is clear that there is no technical supervision or administration for the contract between the contractor and Seattle Golf. In checking with other municipalities who use this service, there is a technical supervisor who does both the inspection and administration of the contract. Many things that the city provides in the \$200,000 overhead amount is technical supervision, legal, accounting, acts of God such as lightning strikes, tree and

shrub replacement, capital improvements, vandalism (partially covered), vehicle expense, trees over 15 feet and extras without haggling. Extras can add up to \$100,000 per course. John Mallon thinks, based on his investigation, the outside service provider number is low-ball and it would be increased over the years.

The City gave Seattle Golf \$3.3 million for improvements in 1995. There is approximately \$900,000 available in that fund. Other things the city includes is the golf supervisors work with contractors and developers to find material resources at little or no cost. A supervisor built a couple forward tees for \$5,000, which are worth about \$25,000. SPU put in \$465,000 at Jackson Park. The Beacon Avenue landscaping project, resulting in parking for the Jefferson Golf Course, resulted in a value of approximately \$400,000. Seattle Golf has received in cash or cash equivalent at approximately \$4.3 million. Baltimore sent the non-profit away with a \$150,000 line of credit. John Mallon thinks the partnership here has been overwhelming in favor of Seattle Golf. There is a \$10 million project currently at Jackson that will probably put in a value of \$1.7 million in course improvements. The charge to Seattle Golf has been \$13,136,000 over the 6-1/2 years of operation. Cash and cash equivalents of approximately \$4.3 million make the actual cost to Seattle Golf approximately \$8.8 million. If that is divided by the maintenance service, Seattle Golf is getting golf unit maintenance at a cost of \$1.3 million. In closing John again praised the Department's maintenance staff.

Public Hearing

Gary McNeil, Jefferson Golf Course neighbor and player, highlighted some of the improvements he has seen both by Seattle Golf and the Department maintenance workers. Some of the course improvements include the new tee boxes, the sodding of old cart paths and the food service. Mr. McNeil has seen more young people playing golf and enjoying the game. The professional staff is accommodating. He noted the restaurant is a good neighborhood place to eat even for the non-golfing public.

Adam Dalenius, has played golf since he was 13. He has worked at TPC at Snoqualmie Ridge and at Newcastle and thinks Seattle Golf is very comparable to the way that they are operated. He is excited about what may come in the future.

Larry Glaser, has worked in the golf industry for 20 years, served the Pierce County Golf Advisory Board and has been an employee of West Seattle Golf for the past five years. He spoke as a skilled worker, on behalf of the golf courses, golfers and employees. Is MGS and a private plan in the best interests of the golf courses? Based on things he has seen in 20 years he would have to question the plan. He has had the opportunities to work for a golf maintenance contractor, municipalities and privately owned golf courses, and noted the courses with the least amount of upper management seem to be running the best. The courses have paid their employees a livable wage. When you have too many people involved in the decision making process there are delays in projects, missed opportunities for low cost improvements, increases in the cost of projects and increased overhead. He thinks there is a duplication of Seattle Golf and city management positions, which have ballooned expenses. Because of this high overhead Seattle Golf has asked for

staff reductions. Staff reductions will greatly affect the quality of the golf courses. When wages are decreased there are higher turnover rates and unqualified workers on the courses. Our current city crews have made great strides in bringing up the quality of the courses. Are the standards going to be maintained when staff and wages are reduced? If the courses are turned over to contractors you can expect consequences. The contractor employees just want to mow the grass. You get a better value with city employees as the city workers do many projects besides mowing the grass. They also have a high regard for pesticide reduction. He would like to see the staff remain the same.

Lorette Schneider, Captain of Jackson Park Women's Golf Club, member of the Links Council and liaison between Jackson and the Links Council, stated the city has imposed fees and other charges totaling \$2 million annually. Lorette referenced the article in the March 28 Seattle Times which states the city can reduce this expense by \$200,000 annually. She wonders why the city did not do this 5 years ago. The article stated MGS could reduce it by \$450,000. She has spoken to greens crews. They deserve good wages and benefits as they do a really good job on the course. MGS stated they could remain unionized. The City does not seem to appreciate the extremely valuable asset that the MGS Board offers. They are professional, high caliber, business savvy people. They serve without pay and volunteer their time and expertise because they care deeply about the success of the public courses. We must not risk losing that valuable asset. "Heaven forbid" the city get back into the management of the courses.

Bobbi Bradstreet, golf technician at Jefferson Park, "dittoed" the comments of her fellow employee, Larry Glaser.

Paul Livingston deferred as his comments have been addressed by previous speakers.

Dottie Wood, Treasurer of Jackson Park Women's Golf Club, has seen a lot of improvements since MGS has been managing the course. MGS should be given a change to set forth their planned improvements such as the driving range and the changes to the Hole 1.

Cathy Wagner, Executive Director of First Tee of Seattle, spoke about the relationship First Tee has with Seattle Golf. Seattle Golf has helped open the door for the young people in Seattle not only with First Tee but also other viable junior groups they have helped. The mission of the First Tee is to impact the lives of young people in the city by utilizing existing facilities to create affordable and accessible golf primarily to serve young people in the community who are disadvantaged. First Tee's goal is to make improvements to the facilities by building learning centers at each facility. The learning centers would have computers with life skill curriculum taught along with learning how to play golf. First Tee is also looking at making improvements such as a driving range at West Seattle at some point and improving the 9-hole courses at Jefferson and Jackson. The First Tee Board wants to lend its support to the Seattle Golf Board.

John Ellis, golfer, is concerned about the possibility that the Interbay contract may be combined with the operation of the other three courses. Mr. Ellis thinks the things that

Seattle Golf is proposing are worthy. The Seattle golf courses have been for many years very important for a broad range of people in the community. The golf market is tough and there are a lot of problems for the Seattle courses based on their age and other factors. There is a level of vitality about the operation at Interbay that you do not see at the other courses. There is a lot of promotional activity – ladies nights, junior and regular tournaments, jazz concerts with barbecues at Interbay. The high rating of 93% is the improvements to the courses not the clubhouse or the promotional efforts. Based on what you see right now he hopes Seattle Golf is left where it is and Interbay is not tied into it.

Chip Wilson, former co-owner of the Paramount Theatre, stated union and non-union staff issues can be worked out successfully as was done at the Paramount. He wrote a letter to Pete Guzzo at Jefferson approximately a year ago which he read to the audience. He “commended the staff on the monumental improvements that have been made at the course. The course is well on its way to earning its reputation as a challenging place to play...it is a result of the employees responsible for working the plan. Many of the grounds staff are enthusiasts of the game and anxious to play even after a long day of groundskeeping. Improvements include the courteous tee announcements, attentive grounds staff who stop mowing the greenside, whenever possible, while guests are over the ball, new level tee boxes and more reliable food and beverage service on the course. The greens are kept with creative pin placements and the rough that is becoming a signature component of the course...to the entire staff at Jefferson, congratulations on your great work and continued excellence.”

Larry Kingen, resident of West Seattle, stated the crew goes over and above the call of duty. They are dedicated. Mr. Kingen has no faith in an outside contractor. He is confused why the city would pay two administrators for one job. The Department has the expertise in-house with the technicians. Attendance is down. We pay for what we get. Something has to happen to make the numbers that were shown tonight right. Numbers don't lie too much; it is how they are presented.

Bill Schickler, President of Premier Golf, responded to the Park Board's inquiry of two weeks ago about the net income at the Interbay Golf Center. A brief summary of the operations since the City purchased the site on March 1, 2001 was previously distributed to the Board members. Through the Department's and Premier Golf's efforts, a seamless transition was accomplished. All operations were continued without interruption. For the full year 2001, Interbay Golf Center generated revenue of \$2,807,000 with a net income of \$1,044,000. Highlights for the year included: 43,000 rounds played, 136,000 baskets of balls purchased, 13,000 lessons purchased, food and beverage totaled \$203,000, pro shop \$486,000 in revenue, and the Garden Golf Course (mini golf course) generated \$163,000 in revenue. The fine staff at Interbay has done an excellent job. Premier Golf looks forward to continuing the success in 2002.

Scott McCallum, resident of West Seattle, golfer, Vice President of West Seattle Men's Club, informed the Board of the golfer customer dedication. The Men's Club puts time and money into the course. The Men's Club has a memorial to raise funds for a student scholarship. The Men's Club purchased a bigger TV set for the clubhouse. Sometimes the

club feels it is being taken advantage of and not getting the product it deserves. MGS has their heart in the right place, they have a lot of good people, but their overhead is a little much. A lot of numbers were shown in favor of each entity but as a golfer and customer he thinks all sides can cut costs. They should look at themselves rather than pointing fingers. The improvements to the courses have lagged behind of where they should be. We have some marvelous facilities. Upgrades need to be made to the clubhouses. He hopes the management gets worked out.

Dave Clark, former MGS President and Board member, is a bit frustrated as he has heard these same tunes for a number of years. There seem to be two sets of numbers and it makes it difficult to decide where you go from here. He is of the opinion that some of the policies, procedures and institutional things that are part of running a government have hamstrung MGS. City policies and procedures are typically hard to deal with, they do not change quickly and they tend to be expensive. He hopes the value added by Seattle Golf is appreciated. They are experts and give very good advice. The organization needs to be kept in place and he thinks MGS and the City need to look for efficiencies. He suggests being as imaginative as possible – “think outside the box.” MGS is looking at business opportunities. The city is not really in business to look at business opportunities – they are looking to provide service. Keep MGS in place – there are lots of good things ahead.

The Park Board is scheduled to have a discussion of the golf maintenance alternatives and make a recommendation to the Superintendent at its April 11th meeting.

Land Exchange at 1700 Magnolia Way West

Terry Dunning, Manager, Major Transactions and GIS, asked the Board to recommend an exchange of a portion of Magnolia Boulevard property (known as Magnolia Way West) for better property in the vicinity in accordance with Ordinance 118477, also known as Initiative 42. Anna Bowlds, property owner, proposed the property trade in order to resolve encroachment of a portion of her garage onto Park property. Ms. Bowlds needs to resolve the garage encroachment onto Magnolia Boulevard and onto West Hayes Street right of way so that she may pass clear title of her house to successors. She is prepared to trade property of greater value in the vicinity for the Magnolia Way Boulevard property. The encroachment area and exchange parcel were shown on a map. Mrs. Bowlds has petitioned for vacation of a portion of West Hayes Street, and the property is a condition of that vacation. The City Council Transportation Committee will consider the vacation at its April 16 meeting. The City Council has already reconveyed portions of Magnolia Way West to neighboring properties. Therefore the added benefit of the proposed trade is that the boundary line of Magnolia Way West would then be consistent with the reconveyances. The city will receive 2,000 square feet and give up 540 square feet totaling 842 square feet (including street right of way).

James Fearn moved the Board recommend approval of the proposed land exchange. Susan Golub seconded the motion. Kathleen Warren inquired if there was any downside to the exchange. Terry Dunning has not heard any disagreement. A letter was sent to the Magnolia Community Council and the street vacation announcement is being

widely circulated. A sign will be posted at the site announcing the City Council hearing. The city will benefit from the use of the property. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Ballfield Lighting Design Guidelines/Use and Field Scheduling Policy/Sports Participation Policy - Board Briefing

Yale Lewis inquired what time the playing fields are turned over to scheduling. Fritz Hedges, Director of Citywide Division, stated the School District physical education classes use the fields during normal school hours and they are included in field scheduling. All Seattle School District programs other than physical education programs need to be off the fields by 5 p.m., except baseball games, which are up at 6 p.m. Schools have priority but if they are not using the field then the field is available for scheduling. Yale wondered how many hours are available for community sports and if they are any empty fields between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. that could be used for soccer and baseball? Alix Ogden, Strategic Advisor, stated there are not many fields that are not being used and if not in use they are undesirable for play.

Alix Ogden stated the Seattle Parks and Recreation is updating the Joint Athletic Facilities Development Program, a physical development program to increase capacity throughout the athletic field system, and is coming back to the Park Board to review related issues raised during the public involvement process. The Board held a public hearing on the JAFDP on January 24 followed by a discussion and recommendations at the February 14 meeting. In response to public comment the Department is revising the Use and Scheduling Policy and Sports Participation Policy and developing Lighting Design Guidelines. A Park Board public hearing on the policies and guidelines is scheduled for April 11.

Lighting Design Guidelines

Michele Finnegan, Administrative Staff Assistant, presented a summary of the Lighting Design Guidelines. A lot of issues related to the actual development of new lighting projects and replacement of existing systems were raised during the public comment period. The Department developed design guidelines on how it would approach projects in the future. The guiding principle for that process was to provide safe, quality play that minimizes impacts on neighbors. The guidelines are based on the 2001 Ballfield Lighting Study which primarily focused on the conditions assessment of our current system and recommendations on how to go about replacing those systems as well as what to think about when new systems are developed.

In general, Parks and Recreation Department facilities will be built to Level IV illumination standards. Certain baseball/softball playfields that can accommodate tournament play with spectator attendance will be built to Level III illumination standards, such as Lower Woodland. Level IV is the minimum required for safe play.

Improvements in technology will be considered when choosing materials. Lighting projects will consider galvanized steel and concrete poles, as wooden poles are not

acceptable due to the susceptibility to twisting and rotting. In terms of minimizing impacts to the surrounding community, this sets guidelines for addressing obtrusive light (spill light, glare analysis and sky glow assessment) in the design process. It also sets standards after a project is built for spill. All of Seattle falls into an E3 environmental zone (defined by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America). E3 is described as areas of medium ambient brightness such as urban residential areas. The light trespass standard for E3 is to have 1.1-foot candle at the initial time a project is completed and a maintained level of 0.8 foot-candle. Lamps are brighter for the first 100 hours. The guidelines also set requirements for the consultant on the project. Managers are to consider other issues in their design including topography, vegetative screens, traffic patterns, energy costs/efficiency and maintenance after a project is built

The Department believes these guidelines will result in more energy efficient systems in terms of the improved technology for aiming lights on the field. The Department gets a lot of spill and non-uniformed experience on a lot of its sites now, which requires more light to be generated. All playfield lighting projects will include a control switch that can allow lights to be operated at the site. Projects will also be designed to allow individual fields to be lighted separately so that all facility lights are not required to be on when a limited number of fields are in use.

Kathleen Warren asked if there have ever been any guidelines for lights in the past for the fields. The only lit field that has been built in the past decades is Interbay. Kathleen Warren asked if the guidelines are based on real life experiences. Michele Finnegan called a number of other cities to inquire about their lighting guidelines and found they did not have any but many build to Level IV. Ken Bounds noted the direction the Department is pursuing is to have safe, enjoyable play at a competitive recreational level. There are some facilities the Department may build and some that the School District may build which the Department may schedule that may be tournament competitive with grandstand spectator viewing which would be lit at a different level. The Department wants to minimize impacts on adjacent communities and be environmentally sensitive in terms of usage of electricity. There are advocate groups that want higher levels of lighting and groups that want less.

James Fearn asked if brighter lights mean more spillage. The brighter the light the greater the impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Kathleen Warren stated in terms of spill light, glare and sky glow, we are setting standards without really having something to look at as to how it will really work. Michele Finnegan stated the Department has some experience in the current designs for Lower Woodland and Genesee. Kathleen Warren asked if the fields that people have toured to view the new generation of lighting would match these guidelines in terms of spill light, glare and sky glow. Alix Ogden noted it would depend as spill light is measured from property lines and it would depend upon how far that residential property line is from the field. The Bothell facility may have a higher lighting level as it has grandstand viewing. Kathleen Warren inquired what was the Magnuson Park lighting demonstration level. It was at Level IV. James Fearn asked if there were scientific journals or manuals that actually say how much spillage from certain

lights at certain heights and what sky glow you get from what distance. Michele Finnegan related there is computer modeling that is done in the design phase. The spillage, glare and sky glow can be stated in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Susan Golub inquired if safety issues are going to be raised by sports proponents regarding Level IV. Alix Ogden stated it might get raised for issues like tournament play or different sports. The Department feels the Level IV recommendation will allow safe play. The National Little League Association states a need for Level III lighting for sanctioned tournaments. Fritz Hedges noted the higher lighting level is for the spectators. James Fearn asked if we are adopting a uniform standard for all fields? Fritz Hedges replied that the Department is moving towards most of the fields being Level IV with Level III exceptions. James Fearn asked if there were unacceptable impacts on the neighborhood from Level IV would the Department not light the field? Alix Ogden stated the lighting design guidelines reflect the commitment to both providing safe, quality facilities and the recognition that these facilities impact the communities in which they are located. The Department does have an issue for replacing lights but it is the intent to meet the playfield lighting guidelines. Kathleen Warren inquired if there are any neighborhoods that would be adversely impacted even at Level IV. Yale Lewis noted that any neighbor is going to say they are adversely impacted. Alix Ogden noted the Department's lighting systems right now are poorly aimed. It is hoped that redesigning or replacing the current lighting system will decrease the impacts that people currently experience. Kathleen Warren asked if there were fields where the residents were so close there wasn't any lighting that would not violate the spill light and glare standards that are going to be set. Alix Ogden stated they did not have the technology to look at each site. The study measured what the current spill was but did not model each site. If the Department decides to light a field there would be an analysis of the light impacts on the property at that location. Bruce Bentley asked if the lights at High Point were replaced would the sky glow be reduced. Michele Finnegan stated they are different systems that have different benefits. During the design public involvement process for each project different things are weighed. If you do a full cut-off system you are greatly improving the effects of sky glow but the angle of the light results in more spill light behind the pole. During the modeling process you can see what the impacts would be for different projects. Yale Lewis asked if Miller, Washington Park or Bobby Morris have been measured in terms of Level IV. Alix Ogden related the Department does not have many fields that perfectly meet Level IV standard as the uniformity is poor. There are bright areas and dark areas on the fields with the current lighting. New lighting in some cases will reduce the foot candles from what the Department currently has and should increase the uniformity which will increase the quality of play and will have less spill and sky glow.

Fritz Hedges stated he is substituting for Patti Petesch and is joined by Dennis Cook. They manage the Citywide Athletics Office and are responsible for administering the policies that the Park Board is reviewing.

Sports Participation Policy

In 1994 a girl wanted to play on a boys soccer league and initially the boys soccer league was not in favor of that. There were many discussions and the Department established the Sports Participation Policy, effective May 26, 1995. The policy provided some help to sports organizations concerning who can and cannot play and established standards for conduct. The revised policy includes appropriate player conduct during games and events and establishes standard expectation of behavior with regards to noise, clean up, litter, parking and respect for neighbors who live in close proximity to the sportsfields. The sports organizations will agree to abide by the Sports Code of Conduct or the Sports Participation Request Standard. A certification form shall be signed by the organization and filed annually. If it is determined the sports organization has not acted in good faith the Department will deny them the use of Department facilities. Expectations for field use include no fighting, public urination, drinking alcohol, littering or any violation of the law. The Department will work with field user groups and communities to provide information regarding preferred parking areas. The use of air horns and other such devices are prohibited. Noise levels generated by players and spectators should be kept at a reasonable level that respects the surrounding neighborhood.

Kathleen Warren asked if any certain sport is more problematic than other sports? Dennis Cook replied that it is pretty balanced but some organizations are not as together as others. There are some problems with organizations themselves but on the whole the problems are pretty minimal. Kathleen Warren thinks there is a notion that there is a problem with younger men's teams . Dennis Cook stated that has not been an issue the last few years. Years ago teams would be drinking but the Department has tightened a lot of things up in terms of behavior. The complaints that are received relate to litter. Sunflower seeds on softball and baseball fields draw complaints which may seem minor but are major for people who next use the field. Late night noise after the game draws complaints. Sometimes the players tend to turn their car music up a little loud in the neighborhood while people are sleeping.

Use and Scheduling of Outdoor Athletic Facilities Policy

Fritz Hedges noted the Use and Scheduling policy was last revised in 1996. The purpose of the policy is to establish guidelines for the use and scheduling of outdoor athletic fields which are scheduled by the Department, excluding West Seattle Stadium which is covered under separate policies. During the Joint Athletic Facilities Development Program it was discovered there was a hole in the policy as it did not address the Department's scheduling of lighted fields. The March 14, 2002 draft revision does not change the scheduling priorities and practices much but the Department has proposed a policy for the lighted fields. Lighted fields will be scheduled until 10 p.m. and that represents a change from the past practice of scheduling lighted fields until 11 p.m. Baseball and softball sites will be scheduled for games until 10:45 p.m. On fields with newer lighting technology or with existing security lighting the field lights will be turned off at the end of scheduled play. On fields where there is no security, or ambient pedestrian lighting, lights will be turned off 15 minutes following completion of scheduled play to get people safely to their cars and out of the area.

The City Auditor audited the application of the Department's policies. The results of that audit showed the Department was following the policies pretty well. The Auditor did recommend some minor changes in the policies and those changes have been incorporated.

Alix Ogden distributed an "Evening Hour Analysis – Implications of Staff Recommendations" to the Board. The sport, season and game length were outlined and essentially were taken from the scheduling policy. The year 2000 scheduled hours for youth and adults were listed by sport. The Seattle School District 35,000 physical education hours were not included in the figures. The chart gives a sense of how much different sports use different fields. Alix noted the year 2000 hours was being used as a baseline because the Department limited some of the field time in 2001 because of the energy crisis.

The Department looked at year 2000 games beginning at 8:45 p.m. With a 10 p.m. turn off time games are affected that start as early as 8:45 p.m. If the 10 p.m. turn off time policy had been in effect in the year 2000, it would have had an effect on 740 soccer games or 1110 hours of game time.

The Department used Genesee as an example as it has funding, is in the "pipeline" and the Department is in the process of obtaining permits which is estimated to add capacity for soccer. Assumptions were built in: 7 months of the year adults would have field access from 8 p.m. to 10 p.m. (1 game per evening from March-September). 5 months of the year (October – March) adults would have access beginning from 6:30 p.m. to 10 p.m. (2 games per evening). Play would be Monday through Friday. The total estimated additional capacity of the Genesee project based on the above assumptions: 427 games per field for a total of 855 games per year or 742 hours per field for a total of 1448 hours. This figure does not include the additional capacity for adults gained on weekend days in the fall and winter from replacing a seasonal grass field with a year round synthetic surface. Alix noted it is not a one for one trade in terms of games lost but the Department feels it can make up for the capacity pretty quickly.

Yale Lewis inquired if one assumes an hour and a half units for practice or games, would reducing the time from 10 to 9:30 p.m. eliminate a unit; would it increase a unit from 10 to 10:30 p.m. Yale noted 10:00 p.m. may or may not be the right time to close a field. Alix stated the Department did try reviewing the times. The reason baseball and softball were given until 10:45 p.m. is it takes longer to play the game and if you cut the time 10 p.m. adults would not be able to play a full game. There are complications with multi-use fields as you cannot have two baseball and soccer games going on at the same time; you cannot just figure the number of fields and the number of hours.

Susan Golub noted in all the e-mail and letters she has received she has not seen any complaints from people that now live next to a lighted field but from people that live next to a field that may be lit. She is wondering why the Department is rolling back on the lights. Alix related the Department did hear complaints from neighbors of certain fields.

One of the questions that the Department is evaluating - are there fields where light does not matter and where you could schedule until midnight, such as Washington Park.

Bruce Bentley inquired about turning out lights at fields when users do not show up. Procedures are in place and the Department is doing a better job. The Department receives complaints from West Magnolia residents specifically about lights being on with no one on the field. They are calling between 10-11 p.m. because the lights are on. Part of that can be solved eventually with technology. An option could be to have variable times for different sites. The proposed 10 p.m. cut off time would be effective in 2003. If it were approved, the Scheduling Office would need to know by June 2002. James Fearn asked if the 10 p.m. time is a guideline and if something were to go beyond 10 would it be scheduled or if it would go to 10:15 p.m. it would be okay. The lights are programmed and would shut off 10 minutes after the scheduled time. Kathleen Warren asked what the main reason is going from 11 p.m. to 10 p.m. Alix noted the Department is working to be responsive to the public comment received during the JAFDP process and try to do it in a way that the Department felt it was not losing capacity that it would never make up again.

Kathleen Warren asked if the Department has looked at the economic impact when the 740 games are cut. The Department will review the impacts and distribute the information to the Board members. Kathleen asked what it costs the City to organize softball and baseball as staff is hired and if someone wants to play staff "hooks" a person up with a team, organizes it and sends out a schedule. If she wanted to play soccer she would be referred to Co-Rec, GSSL or Washington State Women" Soccer and volunteers organize the soccer. Fritz Hedges stated the Department tries to recapture the Department's costs through the fees that are charged. In some cases Advisory Council staff are doing the work. Kathleen wondered if the amount of money paid in league fees was equal for Department and non-Departmental sports. Fritz Hedges said everyone pays a scheduling fee and the Department organized sports pay an additional fee. Kathleen stated it seems like the Department-scheduled sports have priority and it is not possible for soccer, rugby, lacrosse and ultimate Frisbee to get field time. Kathleen said there is a division between Department-sponsored sports and non-Department sports in terms of how they are organized. There is an accusation of privatizing fields and soccer does not have a choice. The Superintendent referred to the analysis page and the scheduled hours for soccer. Soccer is year round. The softball/baseball season was shifted forward in order to accommodate more soccer in the fall. Dennis Cook stated the Department does not sponsor baseball; softball is sponsored.

Kathleen Warren is concerned about the fairness of Department-sponsored and non-sponsored sports as non-Departmental sponsored sports do not have the same status. The Superintendent stated adults are a lower priority in the scheduling policy. Priority access is given to the youth. Historical use is considered in establishing priorities. It is the Department's policy to provide a reasonable amount of equity for gender and some allowance for new field sports and/or field sports organizations. Some of the softball numbers noted in the analysis chart are not organized by the Department. The time of conflict is between March 2 and early August. There is a choice made of who gets scheduled but it is a relatively small percentage of the total hours of use of all the fields.

Kathleen does not want to get into a battle with any other sports user but if the issue is that field neighbors do not like the lights, are they going to like them any more because it is softball. Alix said “no” but the idea is to be able to accommodate adult play on softball and baseball fields. It does not make economic sense to light baseball fields if full games cannot be played. Kathleen asked if there was a sense of how much demand there is that is not being met. Alix stated the Department did a survey and there is more demand. Part of the reason for proposing the JAFDP is the Department feels there is a reasonable accommodation for field use that is not being met. For adult soccer how many practice permits seem reasonable and what percentage of games should the Department try to meet within the Seattle City limits. For youth baseball, how many practices are reasonable for a kid to play and how many games per week? The demand is a lot greater than the supply. Kathleen stated some players do not play any more because they spend more time driving to fields outside the city or they cannot get to a 6:30 p.m. game because they work until 6 p.m.

Yale Lewis has some concerns about dropping from 11 to 10 p.m. without some analysis. If for example 4:30 p.m. were the earliest that teams can practice during the week and if you go 1.5-hour increments from 4:30 the last increment would be from 9 to 10:30. There is a large unmet need for middle school age youth to get soccer practice time. They get an hour where two teams share a field. Yale thinks it is appropriate for adults to have at least one practice every day and they can start at 9 p.m. It seems reasonable to give them 1.5 hours and go until 10:30 p.m. Alix noted the Department usually schedules 15 minutes in between to allow teams to get off the field and teams to get back on. Yale noted 10:00 p.m. is arbitrary.

James Fearn likes the 10:00 p.m. cut off time. The impacts need to be looked at first and then the “demand” into what is left. Demand is irrelevant as it is that way now and is going to get increasingly worse. We want to use the facilities as much as we can but 10:00 p.m. is a reasonable time for the neighbors who want to go to bed and not be bothered with lights and noise. That is an impact on the public that should not be imposed by players.

Kathleen Warren asked if there was a way to measure health impact if you do not meet the demands for people who want to be healthy. Every study indicates there is an epidemic of obesity with children. There are impacts on people who cannot be active. There are impacts on disturbing people’s sleep. The Department cannot do the research to answer Kathleen’s question about health impacts.

Woodland Park Zoo Long Range Plan and EIS

Mike Waller, Zoo Director, noted an appeal on the EIS has been filed. The appeal is being discussed with the City Law Department. The Zoo Society may file a motion to intervene. It has not been determined if the Zoo will proceed with an addendum to address some of the issues in the appeal prior to the hearing. If that does happen it would probably delay it two or three months. The Hearing Examiner has scheduled the hearing

for the 29th. If the City prevails it would proceed with a recommendation to the City Council. A briefing of the Park Board will be scheduled for April 25.

New Business/Old Business: None

Future Agenda – The April 11 agenda includes the Golf Management Alternatives discussion/recommendation and the public hearing on the Lighting Design Guidelines, Use and Scheduling Policy and Sports Participation Policy. It was decided to hold the April 11 Park Board meeting at the South Lake Union Park armory to accommodate the expected larger attendance.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

APPROVED: _____ DATE _____
Bruce Bentley, Chair