

**BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
MEETING MINUTES
October 23, 2003**

Present:

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

Staff:

Ken Bounds, Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

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

Chair Bruce Bentley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. **Terry moved and Kate seconded that the October 23 agenda, September 25 minutes, October 9 minutes, and acknowledgment of correspondence be approved. Motion passed unanimously.**

Superintendent's Report

Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds reported on the following:

Flooding: The recent heavy rainfall caused flooding at South Park. The Department worked with the American Red Cross and opened the South Park Community Center as shelter. Approximately 30 people whose homes were flooded came to the Center.

Freeway Park Safety Improvements: Park Department staff are completing a major landscape project to open up sightlines, eliminate hiding places, and improve the aesthetics of the trees and shrub beds. Next week a contractor will remove part of the concrete wall along Hubble Place to allow pedestrians to see cars coming from the underground parking lot before trying to cross the street.

Cal Anderson Park Public Meeting: As part of the City's response to the issues at the park, Parks will host a public meeting in early November at Miller Community Center.

Green Lake Alum Treatment: Parks held an open house/public meeting on the proposed 2004 alum treatment project at Green Lake. Staff will brief the Park Board at the November 13 meeting.

Arab Festival at Bitter Lake Community Center: A successful and well attended one-day festival event celebrating Arab culture was held at the Community Center on October 17. There were many interesting presentations of Arabic-style improvisations.

Wallingford Steps: Parks and the community officially opened the Wallingford Steps art plaza, located just north of Gas Works Park, this past weekend. The plaza is made of concrete pavers with glass and cut-out metal.

Madrona Playfield Improvements: There will be a community dedication on Saturday, November 11, to celebrate the completion of Phase I and II improvements at this playfield. Phase I includes a new play area, basketball court, plantings, and a new plaza area. Phase II features a stairway and ramp connection in the northwest corner of the park and renovation of the small shelter house.

Budget Discussions: The Department continues to have budget discussions with City Council. A public hearing will be held on November 6.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

Bruce explained that the general public comment portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had or are not scheduled for a public hearing. Testimony is limited to three minutes per speaker. One person signed up to give testimony.

Tony Fragada: He is a West Seattle resident and member of the Alki Community Council. He came before the Board to request that the curfew for summer beach fires at Alki Beach be changed to 9:00 p.m. Neighbors of the park are disturbed by the noise, smoke, and light from the numerous fires. Parks Department staff have come to the beach to educate visitors about legal beach fires and this has helped. He distributed a letter to Park Department staff Katie Gray and a copy of her response. Enforcement of the 11:00 p.m. curfew is difficult, as the nearby police precinct changes shifts between 10:00 and 11:00. The community would like to try the earlier curfew for one year.

Bruce stated, as a matter of public disclosure, that he met with Tony and Captain Pryor at Southwest Community Center to discuss this issue.

Presentation: John C. Little Spirit Award

This is the third annual John C. Little Spirit Award presented to an outstanding Parks Department employee. Mr. Little's wife and several other family members were in the audience. Ken described Mr. Little's contributions to Seattle and especially to its youth. The Board also received the following information:

John was accorded many honors and awards during his lifetime. He received King County's first Martin Luther King, Jr. Humanitarian Award; the Washington State University President's Faculty Award for Community Service; the Salvation Army's Torchy Award for Service to the Community; the Bishop Foundation Youth Worker of the Year Award; and the City of Seattle Community Service Award. In 1994, he received

Safeco's Rudy Award for dedicated service to the community which included a \$30,000 prize that he donated to the Seattle 4-H program.

John Little also served the community as a member of the Washington Human Rights Commission, and as a member of the Seattle Board of Park Commissioners from 1990 - 1997. In addition, John was very involved with his community through his church.

John believed that sports competition offered opportunities for youth development, and noticed that there was lack of such programs in the inner city. He worked with others to create the Central Area Youth Association in the 1960s. Always disguised by the success of its sports leagues, CAYA subsequently expanded its programs with a variety of offerings, including one-on-one tutoring of students and job training.

During the early 1970s Mr. Little helped devise a youth conservation corps program in which inner city youth trained and worked in Olympic National Park. Little concluded that he had never seen a program that so profoundly affected the lives of its young participants, and from that day on John Little searched for opportunities to expose young people to wilderness experiences and challenges.

Although he was supporting a wife and seven children, John returned to the University of Washington and earned a master's degree from the School of Social Work. He became director of the Mt. Baker Youth Service Bureau, which pioneered a demanding, realistic job training and placement program for inner-city youngsters.

John Little's next and final career was as head of the Seattle 4-H program, which falls under the aegis of Washington State University and the King County Extension Program. While 4-H traditionally serviced children from farming communities, Mr. Little created a program to deliver 4-H activities to urban youth, many from minority families, and most from families of limited income. Food preparation, urban gardens, an urban fair, job training, performing arts, and outdoor recreation became the hallmarks of one of the most successful and innovative urban 4-H programs in America. Instead of fields, barns, and farmhouses, the program operated out of P-Patches, backyards, kitchens, community centers, schools, churches, and Seattle Center. Seattle 4-H became one of the nation's largest and most successful 4-H programs, with an exceptional level of participation from minority communities."

Don Ganchorre, Senior Gardener at Volunteer Park, was selected as the 2003 winner of this award. Don has worked with youth in the SYEP program, Partners in Participation (PIP) at Stevens Elementary students, park aide program, and YES program. Don said he hopes to continue to make a difference in young people's lives.

Mr. Little's granddaughter also presented a pen and pencil set to Don on behalf of the Little family. The Board and audience gave a hearty round of applause.

Discussion/Recommendation: Recommendation to Make the Northacres Park and Jose Rizal Off-Leash Pilot Areas Permanent Elements Discussion/Recommendation

Jack Robinson, Parks Department strategic advisor, came before the Board to ask approval of the recommendation. At the Board's September 11 meeting Jack presented a staff evaluation on the recommendation to make the Northacres Park and Jose Rizal off-leash pilot areas permanent elements of each park. This was followed by a public hearing on September 25. Jack previously sent the following written information to the Board:

Written Briefing

Background

The Board authorized the creation of pilot off-leash sites at Northacres Park and Jose Rizal Park in 1997. That authorization was endorsed by City Council Resolution 29628 and included various conditions: community process, fencing, stewardship agreement with Citizens for Off Leash Areas, and an evaluation to be completed after 18 months of operation.

During 1997, a number of criterions were used to evaluate and select off-leash sites. The Park Department and Board of Park Commissioners has used those criteria in subsequent discussions regarding off-leash sites. Those same criteria were used to evaluate these two sites. The criteria are:

- Utilization
- Conformance with Off-leash Adopt-A-Park Agreement during pilot project
- Site stewardship involvement and support for the site
- Deterioration or destruction of vegetation at the site during the pilot project
- Environmental concerns regarding water, dust, air, or noise pollution
- Distance from wildlife habitats
- Distance/buffer from nearby residences
- Availability of parking
- Public safety issues at the pilot site
- Possible offset of illegal activities
- Animal Control experience at the site
- Absence or interference with other Department-sponsored activities
- Distance from children's play areas
- Spillover impacts as a result of this pilot project

In performing the evaluation, Department file materials were reviewed, information was gathered from Parks' crew chiefs, geographic managers, and the Department's Senior Urban Forester, staff at Seattle Animal Control, and North and South Precinct police officers. Multiple site visits were made at different times of the day and on different days and "users" were interviewed. Once the research and the draft reports were completed, copies were made available to people and organizations known to have an interest in the subject. The COLA Board received copies electronically, as well as hard copies during a briefing at its September 3 meeting. Over 2,200 notices were mailed to the mail routes adjacent to each of these two off-leash areas and to the appropriate community councils with notification of tonight's presentation and public hearing before the Park Board.

As a result of the evaluation process and findings, the staff recommendation to the Board is that the Northacres Park Off-leash Area and the Jose Rizal Park Off-leash Area be added as permanent elements of those parks and that they be added to the network of off-leash areas administered by the Seattle Parks and Recreation Department in partnership with the Citizens for Off-leash Areas.

Board Discussion/Recommendation

Jack stated that most of the public comment on the recommendation has been favorable. Seattle Audubon has been the only negative comment. Their opposition is to off-leash areas in any park, not just these two sites in particular.

James moved approval of the recommendation to make the Northacres Park and Jose Rizal off-leash pilot areas permanent elements. Kate seconded the motion. Terry stated that he had visited both sites and asked if there is a Master Plan for Jose Rizal, which is a large park. Jack answered that there isn't. The vote was taken with four votes in favor (James, Kate, Joanna, and Terry). Sarah abstained from voting as she had not had an opportunity to visit the two sites.

BRIEFING/PUBLIC HEARING/DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION: Arboretum Master Plan Implementation

Michael Shiosaki, Parks Department Pro Parks Levy Manager, came before the Board to give a briefing on the Arboretum Master Plan Implementation. He introduced Dr. Tom Hinckley, Director of the Center for Urban Horticulture at the University of Washington, who will discuss the individual priorities and projects. Also introduced was Dennis Meyer, Portico Group, who has been working on both the Master Plan and the Implementation Plan. Prior to tonight's meeting, the Board received a written briefing (included below) and an 8-page draft summary titled "Implementing the Master Plan for Washington Park Arboretum," including:

- Implementation roles and responsibilities
- Principles
- Project priorities
- High priority projects
- Maintenance and operations
- Historic considerations
- Public involvement
- Fundraising
- Communication

The draft summary may be viewed online at
<http://depts.washington.edu/wpa/abgc/files/wpaimppplansummary.pdf>.

Written Briefing

Introduction/Background: Following a lengthy public process, the Master Plan for the Washington Park Arboretum was approved in May of 2001. Attached is a Summary of the Draft Implementation Plan for the Master Plan. On behalf of the Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee, we are asking the Board to conduct a public hearing and submit recommendations concerning the Draft Plan.

The Draft Plan includes the following recommendations:

- **Principles:** Implementation efforts guided by the principles listed in the Summary.
- **Priorities:** Fund raising and the general sequence of scheduling master plan projects will be conducted in accordance with the priorities presented in the Summary. Fund raising realities may cause some projects to be implemented out of sequence.
- **Maintenance and Operations:** No master plan project will be finalized without consideration of maintenance. Options for achieving enhanced maintenance are noted in Summary.
- **Historic Considerations:** The three partners commit to respect the historic elements of the site by following relevant sections of approved Master Plan and developing a process and timeframe for recognizing historic significance and dealing appropriately with historic elements. Report on the History of the Arboretum was recently completed.
- **Working Together:** The key partner organizations (Department, UW College of Forest Resources and Arboretum Foundation) will work together through a newly established Master Plan Implementation Committee (MPIC) and the existing Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee (ABGC) to implement the Master Plan. The MPIC will be responsible for the day to day business associated with implementing the plan and making recommendations to the ABGC. The ABGC will focus on policy issues, public involvement and project approvals. The Japanese Garden Advisory Council will be at the table as appropriate. Each of the partners will continue to retain authority and responsibilities with regard to their particular aspects of development.
- **Public Involvement:** The ABGC will conduct an annual open house probably in the fall of each year outlining Master Plan status and an Action Plan for the coming year. In addition, for projects with potential notable impacts on public use, aesthetics, the environment, the history and other important aspects of the Arboretum, the ABGC will conduct public meetings and offer opportunities for public comment. A newsletter on the Implementation of the Master Plan is also being considered. The intent is to maintain good communications with the public and within each of the three partner organizations.
- **Fund Raising:** The Arboretum Foundation, working with the UW and Seattle Parks Foundation, will be responsible for fund raising. Public funds, as available, will be used to leverage private donations.

Next Steps: To date, the ABGC has hosted public involvement associated with the Implementation Plan. The public hearing will be considered by the ABGC in their

recommendations to the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, the Dean of the College of Forest Resources and the President of the Arboretum Foundation. The Board's recommendations to the Superintendent will be considered prior to final approval of the Implementation Plan by the three partners. Both the Seattle City Council and UW Board of Regents will be briefed on the Implementation Plan.

Following approval of the Implementation Plan, the partners will proceed with developing an interpretive plan for the Arboretum, initiating schematic design of the highest priority projects, undertaking an aggressive fund raising effort, further consideration of historic designations and scoping use of approximately \$2 million in Pro Parks funds designated for the Arboretum and Japanese Garden.

Additional Information: Hard copies of the complete Implementation Plan notebook are available for review at 100 Dexter Avenue North (Denny Park) and the Visitors Center in the Arboretum. The document is also available for review by accessing the Washington Park Arboretum-ABGC web site (www.wparboretum.org, see "ABGC"). This web site contains the monthly agenda and minutes for the ABGC and will be another means of communication with the public during implementation of the master plan.

Verbal Briefing

Michael gave a broad overview of the Master Plan, which is also known as "Renewing the Washington Park Arboretum." It was adopted by the Seattle City Council and the University of Washington Regents in May 2001. Implementation of the Master Plan is the next big step in seeing changes at the Arboretum. This Pacific Northwest treasure not only has one of the best woody plant collections in the United States, it also serves as a 230-acre park site that meets a wide variety of community recreational needs.

The three key partners in the history of the Arboretum are the University of Washington College of Forest Resources, Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Arboretum Foundation. Michael described the joint and cooperative management of the Arboretum: the University owns, maintains, and manages the plant collections and manages the educational programs; the Parks Department owns the land and buildings and maintains the park functions; and the Arboretum Foundation is the main support organization. The Foundation will be the lead in raising funds to implement Master Plan projects.

The group that has brought these three partners together over the years is the Arboretum and Botanic Garden Committee (ABGC), providing oversight of development and operation. As a part of the Implementation Plan, it is being asked that the ABGC's role be expanded to include direction on the specific implementation of the Master Plan projects. One of the ABGC's main accomplishments, which happened in January 2003, is the completion of the Working Together Agreement, authored by Neal Lessinger. This agreement has helped the three partners move forward with the Implementation Plan. It describes roles and responsibilities and coordination in implementing the Master Plan. It also stipulated that a working group representing the partners come together and implement the Master Plan. This Client Group includes Michael Shiosaki and Fritz

Hedges from the Parks Department, Tom Hinckley from the University, and Deborah Andrews, Executive Director of the Arboretum Foundation, and Dr. John Wott, Arboretum Director. These five are known as the Client Group and have been working with the Portico Group and Jerry Ernst.

The main purpose of the Implementation Plan is to package all those potential capital improvements in the Master Plan for incremental implementation. It looks at the sequencing, scheduling, and fundraising. The primary ranking focuses on: high visibility projects that will create momentum and excitement; projects that reflect the overall mission of the Arboretum (education, conservation, and recreation); projects that match funding possibilities for capital cost and operations; and projects that increase maintenance and operation's capabilities.

Dennis Meyer of Portico next gave a very brief overview of the Master Plan, completed in 2001. The Plan's goal is to renew the Washington Park Arboretum. This is not a quick or simple task and has involved seven to eight years of efforts. The Plan that has culminated from these efforts is a plan that addresses the three key functions of the Arboretum. He pointed to a large map of the Arboretum and said that thinking of the Arboretum as a microcosm of northwest environment became the springboard for the Plan.

Dennis described the key components of the Master Plan as the need for increased accessibility in the Arboretum; improved automobile circulation; making the Graham Visitors Center the "front door" to the Arboretum; and maintenance and operations of the buildings.

Next, Dr. Hinckley discussed ranking and prioritization of projects. The Client Group was charged with the difficult process of bringing together the details of the Master Plan, the broader concepts of the outline, and the mission of the Washington Park Arboretum. Once the Master Plan was approved, the next step of implementing it proved to be a difficult task. The Working Together Agreement provided the framework for the three partners to go forth in a very directed way.

The Client Group met several times and made two important decisions: (1) bring back Dennis Meyer of Portico, who had worked on the Master Plan; and (2) hire Jerry Ernst, who has worked extensively with Seattle Center, as a consultant to put the framework around the Client Group's plans.

A three-day workshop was held in May 2003, with the principles from which to work being outlined. Using these principles, the group discussed which specific projects would be selected, how they would be funded, and how they would be outlined. Four highly visible and highly acclaimed projects with common elements rose to the top: the South Entry-Madrona Terrace, the Ridge Top Trail, irrigation mainlines, and an Arboretum-Wide Interpretive and Wayfinding Plan. Dr. Hinckley discussed the logistics of sequencing projects to meet the needs of the public, the Master Plan, and the group

assembling the projects. The Client Group is also cognizant of the funding issues facing the City, State, and University of Washington.

Kate asked for clarification on the difference between the multi-use trail and the Ridge Top Trail. Dennis pointed out the trails on the diagram. Kate asked if the Ridge Top trail will continue to be a natural trail. Dennis said the Master Plan calls for the multi-use trail to be a hard surface trail. The other trails are recommended to be a crushed surface, accessible by wheelchairs.

Terry asked if the projects shown on the high- and medium-priority lists are in any particular order. Tom answered no. Terry asked how the projects will be prioritized within the lists. Tom said that the four highest priorities are marked by an asterisk. One donor has already challenged this. The Client Group has been discussing the prioritization process for several weeks.

James stated that, after all the thought that has already gone into the prioritization process, he hopes donors don't decide they like the "future" projects best, which resulted in a round of laughter. James said that it is clear to him that much thought has gone into the Implementation Plan and he would be very reluctant to re-order any of the priorities. He doesn't have any fundamental issues with what has been presented.

Sarah is the Park Board's representative to the ABGC and also attended the three-day workshop in May. She was impressed with the way everyone worked together at the workshop and the way the priority projects clearly rose to the top.

Terry noticed that the children's arboretum, a medium priority project, will be located in the northwest corner of the park and asked where visitors to this area will park. It appears to him that they will have to cross a street to reach the area. Dennis pointed out the location on the map and said this is adjacent to the Montlake neighborhood, whose residents are major users of the park. There is a pedestrian bridge near the site and neighborhood visitors can walk to the site.

Terry asked if the children's arboretum will be a draw. Dennis talked about how Lake Washington Boulevard divides the Arboretum in half and how the existing pedestrian bridge and the two proposed bridges will provide better means to access different areas of the Arboretum.

Terry said that the McGilvra Soccer Club is interested in replacing the sand soccer field at Washington Park with a synthetic surface. After a brief discussion, Ken said that this field is not part of the Arboretum's Master Plan. The soccer club would come to Parks Department to ask to change this field's surface.

Bruce stated, as a point of clarification, that several years earlier the Master Plan came before the Board. At that time, the Board discussed various aspects of the plan: buses, roads, Foster Island, and other issues. The Park Board approved the Master Plan and now the Board is being asked to approve the Implementation Plan. Ken said the proposed

projects are all consistent with the Master Plan. The Seattle City Council, Arboretum Foundation Board, and the University of Washington Regents have all approved the plan. Now the question is how do we implement the plan and what do we do first?

Public Hearing

Iain Robertson: President of the Japanese Garden Society. The Society strongly supports the Implementation Plan. The Japanese Garden is a unique and valuable cultural resource and one of the 10 best Japanese Gardens in the United States. It is one of the few Japanese gardens outside Japan that Japanese gardeners consider to be authentic. Part of this is due to the design of Mr. Juki Iida. The Garden's plan was never fully completed and the gatehouse and pavilion included in the Implementation Plan will help with the completion. The Plan will also allow programs and use of the Garden to be much more extensive than before. He invited everyone to visit the Japanese Garden to see the maples in their prime. He believes the Garden is a hidden Seattle treasure.

Elizabeth Moses: Kirkland resident and volunteer at the Japanese Garden. This is a wonderful park in the middle of Seattle, which has many visitors from the United States and around the world. She has been volunteering at the Garden for quite a few years and has to admit that she is embarrassed that the Garden is 43 years old and still has outdoor plumbing (portable toilets). It is difficult for the many volunteers who work a great number of hours to get water in the Garden. This is one of her high priorities and she is delighted to see it on the Implementation Plan's high priority list.

There used to be only two festivals held in the Japanese Garden. This year there are 30 programs between March and November, with 15 of these involving the teahouse. She invited everyone to visit during the Maple Viewing Festival on Monday, October 27, noon-4:00 pm. There will be tours, refreshments (including green tea), and two sessions of traditional Japanese music.

Fred Isaac: President of the Arboretum Foundation. He believes this is a good opportunity to discuss how well the three partners are doing in moving forward from approval of the Master Plan to implementation. He believes that it is important for the Park Board to stay focused on the Implementation Plan. The three partners are working well together and are right on track. He thanked the Board for holding the public hearing and listening to the presentation and appreciates the Board's support of the Master Plan. He also voiced appreciation for Sarah as a member of the Arboretum and Botanic Garden committee, for Michael Shiosaki, and for Ken's support.

Bruce stated that it is great to see the positive relationship between the three partners. The public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion

Kate moved approval of the Implementation Plan. Sarah seconded. Bruce commented that this is a "great job" and has been a long time coming. Joanna asked about the timeline of the asterisked high priority projects. Dr. Hinckley said the steps for the asterisked projects are that specific funding will be sought and a pre-design team set up. The three partners are working on an addendum to The Working Together Agreement that translates the Client Group's role forward from presenting the Implementation Plan to bringing the asterisked projects to the forefront for development. Michael discussed funding sources. There is Pro Parks funding for a variety of projects and those funds may be used to "jumpstart" the four highest priority projects. With the initial design work completed, the Arboretum Foundation can then begin marketing those projects. Joanna asked how long it will take to complete the four high priority projects. Tom estimated three years. Michael said that it may take 20 years to implement the entire Master Plan. Joanna said she used to live near the Arboretum and it is one of her favorite parks. She is excited about the multi-use trails.

The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously. Terry said the maps provided in the Board's agenda packets were very helpful. He suggested that directional designations (north, south, east, and west) would be helpful on future maps.

Bruce thanked Michael, Dr. Hinckley, and Dennis for the presentation.

Sand Point Magnuson Park Drainage, Wetland Habitat, and Sports Field Complex Project: Discussion/Recommendation

Sand Point Magnuson Park Director Eric Friedli came before the Board to ask for a recommendation on the Sand Point Magnuson Park Drainage, Wetland Habitat, and Sports Field Complex Project.

Bruce stated that he wanted to put two things in context. Firstly, on October 21 a "conflict of interest" was filed against one of the Park Board members to the Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission. Bruce heard verbally today that the Ethics and Elections Commission has ruled that the Board member may vote on this issue and it does not see any conflict of interest. Bruce commented that he, himself, donates money each year to his Advisory Council and community center. If issues regarding his particular interests come up, he hopes that the Parks Department would call on his experience and expertise in making a recommendation. Each Board member comes from different interest groups and has different perspectives they bring to the Board.

Secondly, some of the e-mails and letters the Board received regarding the Sand Point Magnuson Park project stated that the Board's decision on Sand Point Magnuson Park was postponed because of the volume of e-mails and letters received by the Board. Bruce stated that the decision was not postponed because of the volume of correspondence. Rather, it was the desire of a number of the Commissioners to have all six members present to weigh in on this issue that will impact Seattle for decades to come, not only the Magnuson Park area, but surrounding areas and Eastside residents.

Eric gave a recap of the process leading up to tonight's meeting. The Park Board has had numerous briefings and held a public hearing in 2002. (January 11, 2001; January 25, 2001; February 8, 2002; July 25, 2002, and August 22, 2002.)

http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkboard/minutes/01_11_01_Minutes.htm

http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkboard/minutes/01-25-01_Minutes.htm

http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkboard/minutes/02-08-01_Minutes.htm

http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkboard/minutes/2002/07-25-02_Minutes.htm

http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkboard/minutes/2002/08-22-02_Minutes.htm

The Board received both a written and verbal briefing, including possible recommendation the Board could make, at its September 11, 2003, meeting.

http://www.cityofseattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2003/09-11-03_Minutes.htm

The Board also held a discussion at its September 25, 2003 meeting.

http://www.cityofseattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2003/09-25-03_Minutes.htm

Tonight the Board is being asked to make a recommendation on the Plan to Superintendent Bounds (Ken). After the Board has made its recommendation, Ken and the Mayor's office will put together a final recommendation to present to City Council.

Eric introduced the consultants working on this project: Guy Michaelsen and Jeff Girvin from the landscape architecture firm, The Berger Partnership, and Diane Sheldon of Sheldon and Associates, an environmental consulting firm that specializes in wetland analysis and restoration.

Board Discussion

James asked that Eric state specifically what the Board is being asked to do this evening, as he believes some citizens think the Board is voting on the Plan itself, and that is not the case. Eric stated that the Board is being asked to make a recommendation on the schematic design of the Plan. If the Board votes to approve this design, Parks staff would take that recommendation, review it, and determine if any further public comment needs to be considered. James' understanding is that the Board is not being asked to vote on fewer fields, it is being asked to vote on the layout of the fields. Eric said the Board could make any recommendation it wants and could recommend not having fields at a particular area.

Kate said her understanding is that the schematic is based on three phases of implementation, beginning at the north and south ends of the park and moving inward. In each of the three phases, any impact to wetlands must be mitigated within that phase. Kate believes this is important and that some citizens who e-mailed the Board didn't understand this. Eric agreed and stated that a subsequent phase would not begin until any mitigation from the prior phase is completed.

Kate asked Eric to review the timeline of the three phases. Eric said that construction of Phase 1 (the Sports Meadow) would begin as early as spring 2004. Construction would require approximately six months and the establishment of the turf would take another 12-18 months, depending on weather conditions. Construction of Phase 2 would begin in 2006, 2007, or 2008. Construction of Phase 3 is dependent on funding.

Kate asked which phase would be the main impact to wetlands. Eric answered Phase 3, with some impact in Phase 2. Kate asked if the wetland mitigation in Phase 2 does not succeed, will this impact construction in Phase 3. Eric said the regulatory agencies monitoring the establishment of the wetlands would not look favorably on additional construction work if the mitigation isn't succeeding in the prior phase. Kate asked if this happened, would the public be given another opportunity to be heard. Eric answered yes. Ken said there are two steps: one is the mitigation of wetlands impacted by other improvements and the second is mitigation of the remainder of the 65-acre area. Eric said it is important to remember that the 65 acres is not all wetland, by legal definition it is largely habitat.

Sarah asked for further clarification on what the Board is being asked to vote on tonight. Earlier in the evening, Eric stated that the Board could vote not to do anything at the Park; however, her understanding is that City Council and the Pro Parks Levy has already defined that fields will be built, including the number, type, and how and whether the fields will be lighted. Eric stated that his earlier comment was too broad in context. The Board can recommend anything it decides; however, the Plan itself has already been approved. Sarah said she understands that the Board is being asked to vote on the specifics of the Plan. Eric agreed and stated that the Pro Parks Levy, which is the primary funding source for this project, allots \$9 million for five athletic fields and \$3 million for wetlands. Sarah read the description of the fields from the City Council's resolution on this Plan.

Kate said it is important to keep in mind that (1) the Board of Park Commission represents one place for public opinion and there are other places for the public to voice its opinion, and (2) the Board is an advisor to City Council, the Mayor, and the Parks Department. She doesn't believe the Board is in a position to contradict what the City Council has passed and what voters passed in the Pro Parks Levy. Joanna stated that the voters didn't vote on individual items in a project, only to allot a certain amount of money to a certain park.

Ken stated that it would require a 2/3 vote of the City Council to decide not to build any athletic fields at Sand Point Magnuson Park. The issues that are being dealt with tonight are configuration, synthetics, lighting of the fields, etc. The City Council has gone through a lot of process over the years on this project. The Council passed a resolution, voters approved the Pro Parks Levy, the Environmental Impact Statement identified impacts and issues, and now Parks staff and the consultants have altered the Plan to address the specific impacts. The Board could look at the plan and say there are too many impacts and provide this communication to the City Council or it could look at the plan and say there are no impacts and change nothing. He believes the Board's

recommendation is a "value added" process, even though Parks will go back to City Council, which will have the final say, based on recommendations from the Mayor and the public.

Joanna asked what opportunities there are in monitoring the implementation. Eric said a group meets monthly, comprised of representatives of groups operating programs on site, as well as representatives of community councils and district councils around Sand Point Magnuson Park. Parks presents regular updates to this group on what is happening at the Park. There is also a Project Advisory Team (PAT) that deals specifically with this project that meets regularly. The PAT, or some evolution of it, will continue to meet through finalization of the development and phasing of the plan. Many permits will also be required.

Diane said the public can also call for another public hearing, as the process moves forward.

Joanna stated that she is most interested in - and believes that it is very important - that there are long-term opportunities for citizen input during the implementation. She is optimistic about the sports fields, but believes the wetlands and habitat need ongoing community support and expertise. Many parts of the Plan are vague, and intentionally so, but the key to success will be monitoring. Diane briefly discussed the long-term permit monitoring process that will be required.

Terry asked if there will be an annual set-aside budget to provide this scientific analysis. Eric said that budget accommodations would have to be set aside for the ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the wetlands.

Using hypothetical numbers for acreages, Terry asked if the 55 acres that are designated non-wetlands must have the same permit process and meet the same standards as the 10 acres designated as wetlands. Diane said this is an excellent question and described "non-compensatory mitigation". This would be when the new wetland is created and another wetland is not affected as this is being done. Pointing to the diagram, Diane gave the proposal at the commissary as an example. Located in the south end of the Park, the commissary would be taken down and new wetlands installed. This is not part of the "compensation mitigation". There is no permitting requirement through any of the other regulatory agencies requiring the City to monitor the new wetlands through a regulatory process.

Terry asked how many acres must have required wetland mitigation. Diane said the challenge with this site is that a portion of the existing area will be converted to ballfields. The adjacent area has wetlands and the delineations in this area are not yet complete because of the complexity and the City's budget. That is a sequence that the City is obligated to go through under its own codes, as well as the State and federal codes. She and Eric have discussed that it would not cost that much more - and would increase the public's goodwill for the project - to monitor the non-compensatory mitigation areas as the required monitoring of the compensatory takes place.

Conversations are also being held with the University of Washington where some of its graduates and under-graduate students would gather scientific data as part of this monitoring process.

Recommendations

The Board voted on the recommendations presented at the September 25 meeting.

- Recommendation: WETLAND HABITAT COMPLEX: There are no proposed changes in the 65-acre wetland/habitat complex (from what was presented to the Board at its June 12, 2003, briefing.)

Terry moved to recommend the wetland/habitat complex as proposed. James seconded. Joanna asked to add a friendly amendment that "a Technical Advisory Team is to be established to monitor the long-term affects of the mitigation". Terry accepted Joanna's amendment and added "**with an emphasis that the maintenance is provided to the degree needed to insure the success of the project**".

(Note: the amended motion reads **Terry moved to recommend the wetland/habitat complex as proposed, with a Technical Advisory Team to be established to monitor the long-term affects of the mitigation, with an emphasis that maintenance is provided to the degree needed to insure the success of the mitigation.**

The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

- Recommendation: SPORTS MEADOWS: There are no proposed changes to the 15-acre sports meadow (from what was presented to the Board at its June 12, 2003, briefing.) It is proposed to be grass surface with no lights.

James moved to recommend the sports meadows as proposed. Kate seconded. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

- Recommendation: SPORTS FIELD COMPLEX (descriptions copied from September 11, 2003, minutes:)

The Board agreed to vote on the sports field complex in two parts: (1) configuration and (2) hours of operation.

Configuration description and motion

- Configuration: The most substantial proposed change is in the configuration of the 11 sports fields proposed to have synthetic surface and be lighted. The proposed reconfiguration is in response to issues highlighted in the EIS pertaining to potential noise and light impacts on close-by existing residential buildings. The

primary concern was the proximity of the full size baseball diamonds to the transitional homeless housing building to the west. The housing is operated by the Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI). LIHI originally appealed the EIS but after working with the Department on the proposed reconfiguration they withdrew their appeal and have agreed to support the new configuration.

In the revised configuration

- the five baseball/softball diamonds are moved to the south end of the site
- the 4 soccer and 1 rugby field are moved to the north end of the site
- the parking lot across the street from the housing is moved north across from the recreation center parking lot
- a more neighborhood-park like area is created immediately east of the residential area that will include the youth soccer field, the basketball and volley ball courts and other park amenities such as benches and picnic tables
- the pedestrian circulation is modified to fit the new configuration
- a stronger connection is created between the existing children's playground and the wetland/habitat complex
- the parking lot immediately across the street from the transitional homeless housing area has been moved north so it would be across from the community recreation center.

Terry moved approval of the sports field complex configuration as shown on page 5 of the September 11 minutes, adding "rotate Field 11 so that home plate is at the northeast corner of the field to reduce the potential for noise impacts on the neighborhood south of 65th Street." Motion was seconded. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Hours of Operation description and motion

- Hours of Operation: The proposal recommended for analysis in the EIS left unresolved the hours of operation. The analysis conducted in the EIS assumed that all 11 fields could potentially be lighted until 11 p.m. with no restrictions as to seasons of play or days of week. As a result of the EIS analysis and working with LIHI the following revised proposal for hours of operation was developed.

The hours of operation revised proposal:

- The lights on the youth soccer field (#10) will be turned off no later than 9 p.m. year round
- Lights on the 10 remaining fields may be on until 10 p.m.
- Lights on 5 fields only may be on until 11 p.m.
- Lights on the soccer (#7) and the little league field (#11) closest to the residential area would be the last ones to have lights on.
- Minimal security lighting would remain on for 15 minutes after the main fields light are off.

- ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The Department has prepared a preliminary addendum to the EIS that provides a summary of the differences in the environmental impacts between the proposal as analyzed in the FEIS and the revised proposal. As documented in the preliminary addendum the revised proposal results in similar or less potential environmental impacts. Following the recommendations of the Board a final proposal will be prepared and the addendum will be updated and issued in final form prior to its transmittal to the City Council for their final review.

Terry moved that the hours of operation be adopted as shown on page 6 of the September 11, 2003, minutes. James seconded.

Kate spoke against allowing the lights to remain on until 11:00 p.m. The Board has received a great deal of testimony regarding the late hours, glow from the lights, and the noise. She will vote against keeping the lights on until 11:00 p.m. Kate said that usually the Board would not make a recommendation on the hours of lighting but in this case she cannot recommend that the lights remain on until 11:00 p.m. One of the things you get from allowing this many fields in one area is having a great deal of people there at one time. A lot of people would be leaving the area at 11:00 p.m. if five fields are left lit until then, slamming car doors, disturbing wildlife, yelling at each other, etc. She would like to see the lights off at 9:00 p.m. She could push this back to 10:00 p.m., but won't agree with 11:00 p.m. She believes the Board should weigh in on this issue.

Terry agreed that the Board has received lots of input on the hours of operation. He believes the final decision will be made by politicians, not by the Park Board. He hopes that the Board sends a clear message tonight that it does endorse the light systems on these fields. He would be very disappointed if the fields end up with no lights at all, due to backing down to the point that there isn't a practical consideration of lighting. If a 9:00 p.m. limit is set, it would push the limit of viability of the fields to provide adequate scheduling. He would be surprised if the fields are anywhere nearly as effective if they are turned off any earlier than 10:00 p.m.

Kate said the Board heard lots of testimony that there aren't enough soccer fields. In the winter the lights at these new fields would be turned on at 4:30-5:00 p.m., which would add four-to-five hours of playing time at each field. This is not a negligible amount of additional hours. These fields are being added in a natural area with lots of neighbors, creating a "Safeco Field" in the neighborhood. She believes there must either be fewer fields or the lights turned off earlier.

James said in the summer if lights are on until 11:00, the lighting impacts are significantly less. In winter, the baseball fields won't be used. Kate said there have been different estimates on the winter field use. Joanna asked if James were recommending leaving the lights on until 11:00 p.m. in the summer. James said that it is difficult to determine, from the EIS, the impact of the lights. There is nothing in the EIS that indicates that there will be light spillage - the problem is the glare and glow. According to

testimony heard by the Board, the five softball/baseball diamonds will not be used during the winter months. This means that only three fields would be lit until 11:00 pm in the winter months. The Board further discussed how much light or glow might possibly spill out of the fields.

Joanna suggested that the Board could vote to support five fields lit until 11:00 p.m. in the summer hours and in the winter months, only five fields could be lit until 10:00 pm.

James suggested that the Board discuss lights and operations as two separate issues. After discussion, it was agreed that it is difficult to separate the two.

James said that according to the EIS, neither noise nor traffic constitutes a significant adverse impact. People can say "I don't believe it," but he hasn't seen scientific data otherwise. He would vote to approve the operating hours as presented. If it turns out to be a problem, City Council and the Parks Department will adjust accordingly. This issue is not being decided for now and all times.

Joanna can't support having the lights on past 10:00 pm. If the demand requires a future decision to extend the hours to a later time, then it should be done in the future. These fields don't currently exist now. They are a brand new resource and she believes 10:00 p.m. is adequate.

Terry talked more about the evolution of this policy and the give and take that has already happened. The Department has accepted recommendation from user groups, its own athletic division, and the scheduling realities. If baseball games are cut off at 10:00 pm, there are games that will not be played because the time won't be adequate. For soccer fields, cutting the lights off at 10:00 pm cuts out about 20% of play time. He believes it is important to note that the Department has an 11:00 pm shutoff policy for ball field lights. Prior mitigation for this site resulted in the current recommended hours. Kate agreed that the proposal has been mitigated, but she doesn't agree that the lights be on until 11:00 p.m. The Board may not be able to avoid a split vote on this issue.

Terry said he would like to reach consensus. Terry said that adult users are the ones impacted by the shutoff time, as Parks consciously gives youth the best options for the fields. The consequence of shutting the lights off at 10:00 p.m. is to either tell adults they don't have adequate time or bump youth time.

James believes that reaching this consensus does not reflect what the Park Board is being asked to decide, which is: does the proposal have environmental impacts that are not acceptable. He doesn't believe that unacceptable environmental impacts have been shown. Board members may each have their own preferences of what they would like, but he doesn't believe that the Board is doing what it is called to do. He doesn't agree with this consensus. Terry believes that the Department has made a diligent effort in making accommodations.

The question was called. **The vote was taken, with two in favor (James and Terry) and three opposed (Joanna, Kate, and Sarah.) Motion failed.**

Terry moved to amend the hours of operation to read that all ballfield lights must be off by 10:00 p.m. Sarah seconded. The vote was taken with three in favor (Joanna, Kate, and Sarah) and two opposed (James and Terry). Motion carried.

The hours of operation revised proposal was revised to the following:

- The lights on the youth soccer field (#10) will be turned off no later than 9 p.m. year round
- Lights on all fields may be on until 10 p.m.
- Lights on the soccer (#7) and the little league field (#11) closest to the residential area would be the last ones to have lights on.
- Minimal security lighting would remain on for 15 minutes after the main fields light are off.
- ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The Department has prepared a preliminary addendum to the EIS that provides a summary of the differences in the environmental impacts between the proposal as analyzed in the FEIS and the revised proposal. As documented in the preliminary addendum the revised proposal results in similar or less potential environmental impacts. Following the recommendations of the Board a final proposal will be prepared and the addendum will be updated and issued in final form prior to its transmittal to the City Council for their final review.

This completed the voting. The Board thanked Eric and the consultants for the presentations and thanked the audience for attending.

Park Board Business

- The Board asked if a selection has been made to fill the vacant Park Board position. Ken will check with the Mayor's staff and report back to the Board.
- A brief discussion was held on the Alki beach fires. Bruce met with Tony Fragada, who testified during tonight's oral communications, and the Captain at the West Precinct. Ken said that the Park Code reads that beach fires are to be extinguished by 10:30 p.m. Terry asked how the Park Code is adopted. Ken said it is an administrative policy that can be changed by the Department. If the time is changed, notices would be posted and the police asked to monitor. Alki Beach, unlike Golden Gardens, has homeowners nearby who are impacted by the noise, size of the fires, and smoke. Bruce said that Golden Gardens Park can also be gated - Alki cannot. James asked if the fires can be eliminated completely. Ken said that the Department has discussed this. The Park Board could schedule this for a public discussion to receive input before making any changes. Parks staff will work on this and report back to the Board.
- Ken has recommended to City Council that the chapel at Discovery Park be torn down as part of the West Point Settlement Agreement.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

APPROVED _____ DATE _____

Bruce Bentley, Chair