

Department of Parks and Recreation

Seattle Board of Park Commissioners Meeting Minutes December 10, 2009

Web site: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/parkboard/>
(Includes agendas and minutes from 2001-present)

Also, view Seattle Channel tapes of meetings, June 12, 2008-most current, at
<http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/watchVideos.asp?program=Parks>

Board of Park Commissioners:

Present:

Neal Adams, Vice-chair
John Barber
Terry Holme
Diana Kincaid
Donna Kostka
Jackie Ramels, Chair

Excused:

Jourdan Keith

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

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

Commissioner Ramels called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and reviewed the meeting agenda topics. **Commissioner Kostka moved approval of the agenda as presented, the October 8 regular minutes, October 8 mini-retreat minutes, and November 5 minutes as corrected, and the record of correspondence received by the Board since its November 5 meeting. Commissioner Holme seconded the motion. The vote was taken, with all in favor. Motion carried.**

Commissioner Ramels has been out of town since the last meeting and asked that she have additional time to review the minutes. If she has any additional corrections, she will notify the Coordinator and Commissioners.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

The Chair explained that this portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had, or are not scheduled for, a public hearing. Speakers are limited to two minutes each and will be timed, and are asked to stand at the podium to speak. The Board's usual process is for 10 minutes of testimony to be heard at this time, with additional testimony heard after the regular agenda and just before Board of Park Commissioner's business. No one testified.

Superintendent's Report

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

Meeting with Councilmember-elect Bagshaw and Mayor-elect McGinn: Superintendent Gallagher and Deputy Superintendent Williams had a very good initial meeting with incoming chair of the Council's Parks and Seattle Center Committee. Councilmember Bagshaw will be invited to attend several upcoming Park Board meetings.

Both will meet with Mayor-elect McGinn on Monday, December 14. Staff have reviewed his position papers and listed his most important issues, and have prepared information that shows how the Department's programs mesh with those issues.

Atlantic Street Nursery Planning: Parks' Planning and Development staff held the first public meeting for the reuse of the Atlantic City Nursery property this week. The nursery, on park land, is being closed, with all plant propagation and holding to be done at the Citywide Horticulture facility at Jefferson Park. The meeting was well attended, and an organized effort to reuse part of the site and some of the nursery facilities for an urban agriculture site was evident. Tours are scheduled for this weekend to allow citizens to see this site that has historically been closed to the public. There is support for wetland restoration, which covers nearly half the site.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Adams on why the nursery is closing, the Superintendent answered that the decision to close it was made during 2009 budget preparations, as the Department has reduced the number of seasonal plants for its parks and has another nursery facility.

Jefferson Park Development Status: The Jefferson Park Phase 1 development construction is well ahead of schedule. Nearly 60% complete, the work has involved all grading, utility and pathway work for the site. The site has been hydro-seeded and work is now moving to renovating two tennis courts and building two new courts, and providing a pedestrian connection to Jefferson Playfield. Other work at Jefferson is now in design, including the creation of the Beacon Mountain spray feature and play environment, conversion of Jefferson Playfield to synthetic turf, and installation of sports field lighting for the field. For more on Jefferson Park, see http://www.seattle.gov/parks/park_detail.asp?ID=114.

Commissioner Holme requested a tour of this site for the Park Board; Superintendent Gallagher will have Parks staff arrange this in the near future.

Langston Hughes Performing Arts Center Task Force: This new task force will hold its initial meeting on December 14, 6:30 pm. Commissioner Barber volunteered to represent the Park Board at this meeting. For more on the Center, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/centers/langston.htm>.

Rotary Viewpoint Totem Pole Stolen: An 18-foot totem pole stolen from Rotary Viewpoint in West Seattle a week ago was found in Oregon, along with another stolen totem. Parks staff is driving a truck to Oregon to bring the totem back and the Rotary Club of West Seattle, which donated the pole to the city in 1976, will pay to have it re-installed. For more on Rotary Viewpoint, see http://www.seattle.gov/parks/park_detail.asp?ID=4465.

Trust for Public Lands to do 10-Month Study of Seattle's Parks: Peter Harnik, Director of the Trust for Public Land's Center for City Park Excellence, will attend the Park Board's January 14 meeting as the start to a 10-month study of Seattle's parks. [In 2000, he authored *Inside City Parks*, a book about the park and recreation systems of the 25 largest cities in the U.S. In 2003 his research resulted in *The Excellent City Park System: What Makes it Great and How to Get There*. Previous to TPL, Harnik was co-founder and vice president of the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy.] The 8-month study will look at how parks affect property values, tourism, public health, community cohesion, clean water, and clean air. For more information on the Trust for Public Land, see http://www.tpl.org/tier2_pa.cfm?folder_id=3208.

City Council-approved Legislation: The Council recently approved legislation for the Center for Wooden Boats and the Aquarium transition, with Executive [mayoral] signature expected by the end of the year.

Lake Washington Boulevard Traffic-calming Study in Progress: The Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee (ABGC) requested Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) to evaluate traffic in the Arboretum/on Lake Washington Boulevard. This study is now under way, with data being collected and a view trip scheduled for SDOT with Parks staff and ABGC members. The tour will look at specific issues and evaluate proposed solutions

for "traffic calming", such as speed control, crosswalks, speed cushions, and other measures. Pedestrian safety and other concerns have been heightened with increased attendance at the Japanese Garden and Pacific Connections, as pedestrians must cross Lake Washington Boulevard to get from one to the other. The Superintendent's bottom line is that Lake Washington Boulevard is a park road and not a thoroughfare to get from point A to point B.

Commissioner Holme asked if it would be helpful for the Park Board to support the traffic-calming. Superintendent Gallagher responded that SDOT is working closely with Parks and the ABGC to determine good solutions. He will keep the Park Board updated on this effort.

Washington Park Playfields/Drainage: Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) is completing design of its Madison Valley drainage control facility at Washington Playfield. SPU will build a large tank structure adjacent to Madison Street and just to the south of the playfield. The design incorporates a viewpoint of the playfield and the Arboretum as well as public art and landscaping. Construction will begin in 2010 on this facility. Superintendent Gallagher noted that SPU has been great to work with on this project and will brief the Board of Park Commissioners at the March 25 meeting. For more information about the drainage project, see http://www.seattle.gov/util/About_SPU/Drainage_&_Sewer_System/Projects/MadisonValleyProject/. For more information on Washington Park and Playfield, see http://www.seattle.gov/parks/park_detail.asp?ID=1100393.

Volunteer Park Encroachments Ordered for Removal: Parks staff recently surveyed park property lines at Volunteer Park and found 15 encroachments along Federal Way. Property owners have been sent letters giving 30 days to remove the encroachments. Some of these are simple, such as plantings. The most extensive is a zip line and others include spas and decks built on park property. Many of the homeowners are already complying with the removal. For more information on Volunteer Park, see http://www.seattle.gov/parks/park_detail.asp?ID=399

Park Naming Update: Superintendent Gallagher announced two recent park namings: Lake City Park has been renamed Virgil Flaim Park, with lots of community support for this change. A new park on Capitol Hill has been name Seven Hills Park.

Commissioner Ramels asked if Virgil Flaim has been deceased three or more years, to conform to the general Naming Policy. Superintendent Gallagher responded that he has.

Arboretum Site of Illegal Tree Cutting: Commissioner Kincaid referred to the recent news article that a very rare tree species was illegally cut and removed from the Arboretum. Superintendent Gallagher confirmed the reports and added that the tree is valued at \$10,000 or more. For more on the illegal removal, see <http://depts.washington.edu/wpa/index.htm>

Environmental Protection Agency Releases Study on Crumb Rubber at Synthetic Fields: On December 3, the Environmental Protection Agency released a limited study that found a low level of concern in samples of recycled tires from ballfield and playground surfaces. To read the EPA press release, see: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/d0cf6618525a9efb85257359003fb69d/c8d28e3f9f3ca0a4852576880053bed4!OpenDocument>.

Presentation: Special Award:

Two members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) attended this meeting for a special presentation to Dawn Bennett, Garfield Teen Development Leader. Ronald Twersky, Assistant Special Agent-in-Charge, and Nakia Ray, Community Outreach Specialist in Western Washington, presented the Community Leadership Award to Ms. Bennett before a standing-room-only audience. Special Agent Twersky stated that the FBI instituted its community outreach program in 1990 and annually recognizes community leaders who have a positive impact. He added that it is a real pleasure to present this year's Washington State award to Ms. Bennett in recognition of her extraordinary work with the youth of Seattle. He announced that Ms. Bennett will travel to Washington,

DC, where the FBI Director will also present her with an award. Ms. Ray described Ms. Bennett's work in helping kids succeed, how respected she is in the community, and asked that her work continue to be supported and encouraged. Many of the youth Ms. Bennett has worked with were in the audience and she asked them to stand and be recognized. A number of her family and friends were also present. Loud applause and cheering followed the presentation, with a short break and reception following.

Discussion/Recommendation: Partnership Development Policy

At its August 13 meeting, Charles Ng, Seattle Parks Grants and Concessions Manager, presented a briefing on this new policy. To read the minutes from that meeting, including the briefing paper and the Board's discussion, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/08-13-09.pdf>. At its November 5 meeting, Mr. Ng and Rebecca Salinas, Seattle Parks Partnerships Manager, presented an update briefing, which was immediately followed by a public hearing. To read the minutes from that meeting, including the revised policy, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/11-05-09.pdf>. Tonight Commissioners are asked to discuss the draft policy and vote on a recommendation to the Superintendent. Prior to this meeting, Commissioners received a revised version of the draft policy, included in these minutes below. Recent changes are highlighted.

Written Briefing and Draft Policy

Department Policy & Procedure

Subject: Partnership Development		Number 060-P X-XX-10
		Effective January 1, 2010
		Supersedes
Approved:	Department: Parks & Recreation	Page 1 of 8

1. PURPOSE
 - 1.1. The purpose of this Partnership Development Policy is to outline for staff and the public, principles and procedures to be followed as Seattle Parks and Recreation considers partnership opportunities with public and private entities to deliver ***and/or support*** department programs and services. This policy provides a framework for expanding opportunities for interested parties to engage in partnerships with Seattle Parks and Recreation that may not only involve monetary consideration but also an exchange of services ***that meet the Department's mission and result in clear public benefits.***
2. ORGANIZATIONS/INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED
 - 2.1. Department of Parks and Recreation
 - 2.2. Board of Park Commissioners
 - 2.3. Department Advisory Councils/***Associated Recreation Council***
 - 2.4. Park Neighbors
 - 2.5. Current DPR Concessionaires and contracting parties
 - 2.6. Potential public and private sector partners
 - 2.7. ***Park Users***
3. POLICY
 - 3.1. Seattle Parks and Recreation recognizes that developing mutually beneficial partnerships with individuals, nonprofit organizations, ***private entities, public agencies, and community groups*** is a viable and appropriate way to increase the variety and quality of parks and recreation programs available to the citizens of Seattle, ***as well as, make physical improvements to parks and facilities.*** Seattle Parks and Recreation will consider partnership ideas and proposals as they are

brought forward and will actively pursue partnerships as deemed appropriate. It is important to evaluate these partnerships on an ongoing basis to assess effectiveness in supporting the department's core mission, achievement of desired outcomes and provision of public benefits. Although, it is a key responsibility of the Partnerships and Business Resources Unit to develop and manage new partnerships, all department staff will take the initiative in seeking new potential partnerships.

- 3.2. The following principles will help determine whether or not to consider a particular partnership:
 - 3.2.1. The proposed partnership is lawful and is consistent with the Seattle Parks and Recreation's overall vision, mission, and values.
 - 3.2.2. The proposed partnership will help the department carry out the Strategic Action Plan, **most importantly, in the area of partnership development noted in Goal 6 (A) of the plan.**
 - 3.2.3. There will be no private use of public land exclusively for personal gain.
 - 3.2.4. Any partnership must include some level of clear, measurable, and significant public benefit that adds value to the park experience and opportunities to recreate.
 - 3.2.5. The proposed activity should not displace existing Parks, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), or other partner programs, unless pursuing the proposed partnership allows Parks to reallocate current resources to new programs and services, **provide more benefit to the public, or increase efficiency of utilization of Parks resources.**
 - 3.2.6. Focused encouragement and support ought to be given to partnerships with non-traditional partners that will help engage populations that are underutilizing Department facilities, programs, and services. The proposed activity should not adversely impact and/or restrict public access to parks, facilities, or programs.
 - 3.2.7. The proposed activity should not adversely impact Parks' **facilities or parkland, including wildlife habitats.**
 - 3.2.8. The proposed activity and partnership agreement meets all city, state, and federal rules and regulations. **All private, for-profit entities must secure a valid City Business license, purchasing adequate insurance that names the City of Seattle additionally insured.**
 - 3.2.9. **The proposed partnership is in compliance with the Department's approved policies and guidelines.**
- 3.3 Seattle Parks and Recreation shall take appropriate action(s) to recognize those partnerships that have resulted in significant benefits to the department and/or the public.
- 3.4 Longstanding and unique partners, such as the Seattle Arboretum Foundation and the Seattle Parks Foundation that provide support that do not directly result in the provision of Seattle Parks and Recreation services or programs, are not subject to this policy unless they are submitting partnership proposal(s) that will result in program or service delivery.**
- 3.5 Partnership proposals which are not initially approved can be renegotiated and submitted to department staff for reconsideration. If staff and a potential partner cannot reach agreement, the proposed partnership proposal will be reviewed by the appropriate Division Director, in consultation with the Partnerships Manager. If necessary, the Superintendent will make the final decision whether or not to accept the partnership proposal.**

4. DEFINITIONS

- 4.1. **Partnership(s)** – as defined in the department's Strategic Action Plan, is a working relationship with another organization that has compatible values and goals and which results in mutual benefits. The partnership may be formed around a single activity or event or it may be long-term and multi-faceted.
- 4.2. **Partner** - an individual, organization, or a group that, through **a written agreement**, provides a benefit to Seattle Parks and Recreation or Seattle's citizens and in exchange gets some benefit from Seattle Parks and Recreation. These may include for profit or non-profit agencies and individuals noted below:
 - 4.1.1 Individuals who can provide services, money, or time.
 - 4.1.2 Businesses or corporations who provide money, time, people, and other goods or services.
 - 4.1.3 Social service or community partners people or services.
 - 4.1.4 Non-profit partnership similar to social service or community partners.

4.1.5 Volunteer/neighborhood partnerships—park sponsored volunteer opportunities and “Friends of” groups who provide volunteer time, money, and other resources.

4.3. Partnership Agreement – a **written agreement** memorializing a partnership that is **legally binding**.

4.4. **Public Benefit – an activity or service that accomplishes a public purpose promoting the needs, interests, social, economic and cultural well-being, and health and safety of a community.**

4.5. **Partnerships and Business Resources Unit-DPR staff that is responsible for overseeing and coordinating partnership development and contracts for the department.**

5. RESPONSIBILITY

5.1. Partnerships and Business Resources Unit will be available, as needed, to help department staff review and assess desirability of potential partnerships, and to assist in developing partnership agreements.

5.2. Seattle Parks and Recreation staff shall submit those potential partnership opportunities that exceed the delegated authority of divisions for entering into contracts and agreements, to the Partnerships Manager for review and approval, prior to implementation.

5.3. Seattle Board of Park Commissioners and **Seattle City Council will** review proposed partnerships expected to last over one year or that have a significant change to the use or activity in a park.

5.4. City Attorney reviews templates for recurring contractual partnerships or unique language for non-recurring contractual partnerships.

6.0 PROCEDURE

6.1 Parks staff, when considering entering into partnership agreements shall:

6.1.1 Review and complete the attached “Partnership Criteria and Assessment Checklist” and submit it to their immediate supervisor.

6.1.2 Review Policies 060-P3.9.1 and 3.9.1.1 and follow them as appropriate.

6.1.3 Seek assistance, if needed, from the Partnerships and Business Resources Unit in negotiating and writing the MOA, contract or other type of partnerships agreement.

6.1.4 Staff will consult with the Partnership Manager early in the consideration of a Partnership where there is some degree of exchange of services in lieu of a financial commitment of the parties.

7.0 REFERENCES

7.1 Number 060-P 3.9.1 Department Policy & Procedure-- Concession Contracts and Use Permits.

7.2 Number 060-P 3.9.1.1 Concession Contracts: Public Participation In Request for Proposal.

7.3 Number 060-P 1.5.1 Corporate Sponsorship Policy.

8.0 APPENDICES

8.1 Partnership Criteria and Assessment Checklist.

PARTNERSHIP CRITERIA AND ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

The following are key analytical questions that can assist Department staff in deciding whether or not to pursue a particular partnership, and can help in negotiating a formal partnership agreement. The criteria fall into four categories: 1) how the proposed partnership aligns with established department mission, values and policies; 2) benefits the proposed partnership will provide the department and/or the public; 3) budget considerations; and 4) community relations.

Pre- Implementation Key Analytical Questions

1. Alignment with department mission, values, and policies	Summary response	Go/No-go	
Does the proposed partnership:			
• Support the department's			

mission and priorities? If yes, how?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist the department in achieving the goals of the Strategic Action Plan? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Align with DPR policies? Recommended policies to review: Department Use Management Guidelines (#7-13-01-00 to 7-13-01-12 in the Policy and Procedures Manual); Seattle Department Park Codes SMC 18.10; Public Involvement Policy/Process; Concession Policy; Naming Policy; Donation Policy; Sponsorship Policy; and Park Classification Policy; Fees and Charges Policy Align with the Joint Use Agreement with Seattle School District? 			
2.Benefits to the Department and the Public	Summary Response	Go/No-go	
<p>Will the proposed partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase public access to parks, facilities or programs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower user fees Increase operating hours Add programs/services 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Help meet the needs and interests of underserved and/or diverse populations; add new user groups? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increase variety of programs/services - increase capacity that will expand access by diverse user groups 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve quality of programs/services? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> physical improvements or added amenities to facilities, parks, athletic fields, etc. How will these be maintained? increase safety enhance quality of 			

current program/services			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other benefits to the public and/or department? 			
3. Budget Considerations	Summary Response	Go/No-go	
Does the proposed partnership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a financial benefit to the department? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> bring in additional revenue potentially reduces department operating, maintenance or capital costs 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Compliment efforts by other department partners, including Seattle Parks Foundation and Associated Recreation Council?</u> 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Align with CIP?</u> 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leverage existing resources? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially increase or decrease the department's legal liability? 			
4. Community Relations	Summary Response	Go/No-go	
Does the proposed partnership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the potential for controversy? Why or why not? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Have the potential of being perceived as commercialization of parks without offsetting public benefits? Why or why not?</u> 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require a public involvement process? If yes, how and by whom? How will public feedback be collected and measured? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require a marketing or communications plan? If yes, please describe. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the potential for negative impact to the neighboring community (yes)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased traffic, noise, 			

or reduced available parking			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Have the potential to adversely impact parkland or result in significant change of use?</u> 			
Other Considerations	Summary Response	Go/No-go	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this proposal require review and approval? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>If partnership agreement is for a period of more than 1 year or results in significant change of use or activity in a park, it needs review by the Parks Board of Commissioners, and Mayoral and City Council approval</u> - Law department reviews agreement templates for recurring contractual partnerships or unique language for non-recurring contractual partnerships 			

NOTE: If any of the responses to any of the Analytical Questions 1-3 are a resounding “No-go” then the proposal is deemed unacceptable. If the majority of responses to Analytical Question 4 are a “Yes”, then the proposal is deemed unacceptable.

Partnership proposals which are not initially approved can be renegotiated and submitted to department staff for reconsideration. **If staff and a potential partner cannot reach agreement, the proposed partnership will be reviewed by the appropriate Division Director, in consultation with the Partnerships Manager. If necessary, the Superintendent will make the final decision whether or not to accept the partnership** proposal.

Post- Implementation Partnership Assessment Questions

It is important to monitor ongoing partnerships and evaluate their success. Following are some key questions to help with this evaluation.

1. Benefits

Did the Partnership result in expected benefits to the department and/or the public?

- Were the desired goals achieved? **Are there positive measurable outcomes? Is there data to support outcome achievement?**
- Have overall expectation and goals of dept. staff been satisfied?
- Were the terms and conditions of the partnership agreement between the potential partner/sponsor and parks met and to the satisfaction of both parties?

2. Cost Benefit

- Did this partnership bring in new income to the department?

- Did this partnership achieve revenue and expense reduction expectations?
- Did this partnership result in added short or long term costs to the department?
- Did this partnership result in added or decreased liability to the department?

3. Community Relations

- Was there adequate marketing or public involvement?
- Was there public feedback about the partnership? (i.e., complaint boxes, recreation coordinators' feedback, informal survey, etc.)
- Are the majority of users/ participants satisfied with the partnership program/services, or gave no substantial negative feedback?

Renewal: If the outcome of the evaluation of the partnership agreement is positive, the department may renew by issuing a one year extension or begin the process of a long term agreement that would be legislated.

Verbal Briefing/Discussion

Ms. Salinas and Mr. Ng introduced themselves. Ms. Salinas stated that this is a high-level policy with a two-fold purpose: (1) provide a vision of partnerships for the Department; and (2) give guidance to staff when partnerships are being developed. Commissioners made a number of helpful suggestions following the November 5 public hearing and many are included in the newly-revised draft. Seattle Parks Foundation members also provided helpful input. Ms. Salinas spent some time reviewing the draft policy and its purpose.

Mr. Ng next reviewed each recent change in the draft and noted the source of the suggestion. He noted that the criteria had been formatted and better organized.

Board Discussion

Commissioner Ramels asked when partnerships would require a public involvement process. Ms. Salinas responded that, for some partnership proposals that have criteria questions with "no" answers, a public involvement process could be helpful to determine whether the contract will be a "go" or "no go." If the community doesn't believe it is a good idea, the proposal will be red flagged. Mr. Ng added that this procedure will help the Department determine whether to move forward on some proposals.

Commissioner Kincaid complimented staff for their work on this new policy. She asked who is now reviewing the partnerships already in place and what potential partnerships could be beneficial. Ms. Salinas and Mr. Ng answered that they are meeting with the Department's recreation staff (community centers, pools, etc.) to help determine what new partnerships the facilities need to help meet their needs. The Department's Strategic Action Plan is also helpful with this determination. Responding to a question from Commissioner Kincaid on how the different proposals would be weighted, Ms. Salinas responded that it could be weighted for programs that Parks is having difficulty with. Commissioner Kincaid next asked how staff will ensure that the Department has an overall comprehensive program to meet the diverse needs of the communities. Mr. Ng. responded that the partnership policy is modeled after that of the City of Portland and is intentional to bring more partnerships to meet the diverse community. Commissioner Kincaid asked how the Department assesses if it is serving the needs of the community. Ms. Salinas answered that recreation center staff give feedback on the needs of the communities where their facilities are located. Parks staff members currently work with the Department of Neighborhood's 13 Neighborhood Service Center Coordinators to determine community needs and will be more collaborative with the Human Services Department to keep informed and respond to those needs.

Commissioner Holme stated that this is his first opportunity to see the latest revision of the policy. He asked if it has been vetted to the Department's partners and if they gave any feedback. He has reservations on the policy, until it has been reviewed by the Department's partners (Arboretum Foundation, Seattle Park Foundation, and Associated Recreation Council, especially.) He suggested that staff ensure this additional review occurs and then bring the policy back to the Board at a later date for further discussion.

Commissioner Ramels asked if the Board in general is prepared to discuss the policy tonight and vote on a recommendation to the Superintendent. Commissioner Adams referred to the criteria and checklist. He believes the checklist is great and asked what level of staff would review it with potential partners. Mr. Ng responded that it would be frontline staff at the community centers and other facilities, and they will receive training.

Commissioner Barber referred to Section 5.3 which reads "Seattle Board of Park Commissioners and Seattle City Council will review proposed partnerships expected to last over one year or that have a significant change to the use or activity in a park." He asked if this will result in many new partnerships being reviewed by City Council. Mr. Ng responded that City Council already requires legislation for its approval for any contract that is over one year. He does not anticipate a substantial increase in the contracts going to Council. Superintendent Gallagher added that staff will monitor the policy for the first year to see how this aspect goes.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Holme on how many of the contracts might come to the Board of Park Commissioners each year for discussion and a recommendation, Mr. Ng estimated four-five each year. Commissioner Holme asked about outreach to the Department's partners. Mr. Ng responded that he sent the first version of the policy to the Department's 80 partners in August and received 5 responses. One additional partner responded last week. The feedback he has received is that the partners either think the policy won't affect them or don't regard it as important. He noted that it has also been posted on the Department's website for public review.

Commissioner Kostka referred to a letter from the Mountaineers Club which referred to Section 3.2.7 and the 90% base rent offset factor. Mr. Ng believes this comment was addressing special details of a negotiated contract and shouldn't be part of the high level discussion of a new policy.

Commissioner Kostka stated that, during her career, she has prepared criteria and suggested that rather than using bullets, the items be numbered 1a, 1b, 1c, etc., to create a better reference tool. She also suggested that the criteria be written in the most positive manner so that a yes/no answer is given, with room for narrative at the end. This would give staff an easier method to determine any exceptions.

Commissioner Barber and Ramels asked about the legal contracts with the Zoo, Aquarium, Seattle Parks Foundation, and Arboretum Foundation. They noted that the City has legal contracts — and City Council resolutions that apply to these contracts. They asked if this new policy will apply to these and Ms. Salinas believes it does. She noted that the Department already has a contract policy and this new partnership policy complements that policy. Commissioner Ramels noted that the Associated Recreation Council (ARC) is a Department partner, but is called out in this new policy. Ms. Salinas responded that ARC has a different relationship to Parks than the others. Commissioner Adams asked staff to look again at the definition of "partnership" and if the stipulation is that the partnership be "mutually beneficial", to add that language to the definition.

Superintendent Gallagher referred to Section 3.4 which reads "Longstanding and unique partners, such as the Seattle Arboretum Foundation and the Seattle Parks Foundation that provide support that do not directly result in the provision of Seattle Parks and Recreation services or programs, are not subject to this policy unless they are submitting partnership proposal(s) that will result in program or service delivery." He does not agree with this section, as it grandfathers in the existing contract. He asked Ms. Salinas and Mr. Ng to revise the policy and send a new version to the Board and himself the last week of December for Board discussion at the January 14 Board meeting.

Commissioner Adams complimented the manner in which Ms. Salinas and Mr. Ng are working to develop this policy and their good work. Commissioner Ramels agreed.

The policy will be scheduled for additional discussion and recommendation at the January 14, 2010, meeting.

Briefing: Youth Golf Programs

Paul Wilkinson, Seattle Parks Golf Manager, introduced himself, as well as Bill Schickler, President of Premier Golf, and presented a briefing on the Department's youth golf programs. Commissioners received a written briefing prior to this meeting, included below and posted to the Board's web page several days prior to this meeting. For more information on Seattle Park's golf courses, see <http://www.seattle.gov/Parks/athletics/golfcrse.htm>.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

No action is requested. This briefing paper is for informational purposes only.

Program Description and Background

Seattle Parks and Recreation youth golf programs are administered by a loose coalition of partners. These partners include Seattle Public Schools and other schools throughout King County; the golf course contract operator, Premier Golf Centers, LLC.; First Tee of Greater Seattle; Bogey Bear Youth Program; and Fir State. In addition, the Women's Junior Golf Association has an appreciable number of juniors enrolled in programs that play on Seattle courses. Seattle Municipal Youth Golf can generally be classified into five main categories.

1. General Recreation – These are the unstructured visits by players under the age of 18 who play at the full junior rate of \$15.00 per round of golf (½ the full fee for a round of golf.) For 2008, there were approximately 18,000 youth greens fees paid to play at Seattle's four courses.
2. Outreach Programs – First Tee, Bogey Bear, and Fir State are non-profit organizations with stated missions to reach out to underserved, minority, immigrant, or at-risk youth. Their goals are to introduce the game of golf to youth who might not otherwise be exposed to the game, and to teach its virtues. First Tee has the additional goal to teach life skills in a formal classroom setting. These programs reach out to physical education programs in schools, Park Department community centers, and other community organizations. First Tee has also worked with El Centro de la Raza, the Union Gospel Mission, and King County Juvenile Detention Center. Participation in outreach programs for 2008 can be measured by 4,800 paid greens fees.
3. Summer / Holiday Camps and Clinics – These are administered by Premier Golf as part of its annual program offerings. Camps and clinics are advertised through brochures, print and radio media, and targeted internet websites. Paid greens fees in this category are approximately 1,100.
4. High School Programs – High schools in Seattle and throughout King County provide the majority of youth participation in a structured program. Seattle high schools receive a reduced rate for greens fees of \$8.00. These are golf team programs, not physical education classes, and include tournament / competitive play in intramural and league settings.
5. Other – Premier Golf and Seattle golf courses also participate in programs that offer additional opportunities for youth. Generally these programs offer reduced rates and even free golf during non-peak hours. Some are run in conjunction with National Golf Association programs that are a part of the "Play Golf America" initiative. These programs include "Take Your Daughter to the Course," "Family Golf Month," and "Women's Golf Month." "Seniors for Juniors" is an annual event sponsored by Premier and Seattle Parks and Recreation in partnership with Fir State which pairs juniors and seniors to raise money for local youth outreach golf programs.

Strategic Action Plan

The Seattle youth golf programs help fulfill Goal 2 of Parks and Recreation's Strategic Action Plan: "Provide Recreation and Learning Opportunities"; and Goal 3: "Actively Engage and Build Relationships with Seattle's Diverse Population." They also directly promote the department's vision: To Build Community through People, Parks, and Programs.

Youth Golf Programs specifically address:

- 2A4i - Communicate the benefits of health and fitness and approaches to maintaining lifelong health to youth and teens.
- 2D1i - Work with other City agencies, nonprofits and community members to create and implement a prevention, maintenance and intervention program for youth.
- 2D1iv – Create programs that build self esteem and other developmental assets needed for youth to make positive choices.
- 2D3i – Develop additional recreation opportunities that allow family members to participate together including hours that suit working families.
- 2G5 - Continue to foster a strong relationship with the Associated Recreation Council, Community Councils and other key partners such as Premier Golf.
- 3A1vi – Coordinate with citywide efforts to reach communities of color.
- 3A3ii – Develop and implement approaches to reach youth who do not currently use Parks and Recreation’s facilities and programs.

Issues

Issues regarding the youth golf programs generally concern greens fees and available playing time. Youth golfers pay less than adult golfers. City public high schools are paying a reduced rate of \$8.00 per round while other youth are paying the full course junior rates of \$15.00 per round; adult golfers generally pay \$35 per round. First Tee pays full greens fees and driving range fees, but is heavily subsidized by corporate supporters such as Boeing, FSN, Virginia Mason, and the Seattle Seahawks. Bogey Bear and Fir State are similar. Seattle Parks and Recreation negotiates discounts for greens fees for tournaments with these and other organizations. The department is often approached for subsidies to enhance and/or expand these programs.

The total number of rounds played at all four courses in 2008 was:

18 hole:	179,824
9 hole:	77,903
Total :	257,727

The total number of rounds played by youth at reduced rates was **31,675**. This represents 12.29% of the total rounds played. The issue concerns the overall revenue expected to be generated by the golf program. If youth golf expands, the total revenue generated can be less. If more rounds are played by adult golfers, the greater greens fees paid will contribute to a greater amount of total revenue.

The youth golf programs will be in constantly changing balance in relation to adult golf. Tee times that are slow for adult programs are targeted for youth and to a large degree have been successfully filled. The programs are generally robust. Improvements may be best directed at the quality of the outreach programs as well as efforts to improve overall participation numbers.

In mid-year of 2010 Parks and Recreation will be issuing a new Request for Proposals (RFP) for golf course management. The guiding principles for the new RFP have been established and are included as Attachment A to this briefing paper. Of note in relation to the youth golf programs is Guiding Principle #5: Increase access to golf programs by low-income populations, particularly youth, immigrant populations.

Budget

Budget issues are largely confined to the difference in revenue generated by adult play vs. youth.

Additional Information

Contact Information: Paul Wilkinson, Sr. Recreation Manager; 206 615-0514; Email – paul.wilkinson@seattle.gov

Relevant Web links:

Seattle Parks and Recreation Golf: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/athletics/golfrse.htm#seattle>; Bogey Bears Golf: <http://www.bogeybeargolf.org/>
First Tee: <http://www.thefirstteeseattle.org/>
Fir State: <http://firststatejuniorgolf.org>

Attachment A

Major Guiding Principles for New Golf RFP

1. Financial viability, achieve revenue goals, and sustainability of golf operations to support Golf Master Plan
2. Reinvestment of the golf courses by making strategic improvements to the courses
3. Encourage potential partnership with new operator for private investment to golf courses
4. Professional and excellent Customer Service delivery to the public
5. Increase access to golf programs by low income populations particularly youth, immigrant populations

Verbal Briefing/Discussion

Mr. Wilkinson briefly summarized the information in the written briefing. He reviewed which of the 32,000 rounds are free and how best to expand the program, including subsidized golfing, teaching pros, using marshalls who would volunteer to teach youth to play golf and receive free rounds in return, and working closely with working with First Tee to develop quality youth programs.

Commissioner Holme referred to the 31,675 rounds, with 12% subsidized, and asked how this compares to other municipal courses. Mr. Schickler responded that Seattle's municipal courses compares highly against other municipalities. Superintendent Gallagher agreed and that, based on his experience in other municipalities, more can always be done. Commissioner Holme noted that the number of subsidized games is important to track.

Commissioner Barber asked if there is a way for any/all youth who want to play golf to do so. Mr. Wilkinson responded that there is. First Tee especially provides lots of golf activities and avenues to play.

Commissioner Adams commented that this is 125% beneficial to the youth and asked if Premier Golf intends to expand its youth golf program. Both Mr. Schickler and the Superintendent agreed that it does.

Commissioner Kincaid asked about outreach to high school students. Mr. Wilkinson responded that there isn't yet infrastructure in place to do outreach to the high school students and track the results of that effort. Commissioner Ramels asked if the high schools have golf teams and Mr. Wilkinson agreed and gave additional information on the teams. Mr. Schickler gave additional information about the relationship between the schools and the golf courses. Commissioner Ramels suggested that youth who are already golfers help teach those who want to learn.

Mr. Wilkinson stated that the University of Washington is interested in running its Pac10 championship track and field competition on one of the golf courses. Superintendent Gallagher noted that a Request for Proposals for golf managements will go out in 2010. Responding to a question from Commissioner Adams on how long the contract will run, the Superintendent answered that a range of time has yet to be determined.

Commissioners thanked Mr. Wilkinson and Mr. Schickler for the briefing and for the good work being done at the golf courses.

Briefing: Lifelong Recreation Programs

David Jensen, Seattle Parks' Specialized Programs Manager, presented a briefing on the Department's Lifelong Recreation Programs. Prior to this meeting, Commissioners received a written briefing which was posted on the Board's web page and is included in these minutes.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

The Board is not being asked to take any action; this is an informational briefing to provide an update on the Lifelong Recreation Programs – programs for people 50 years and older.

Program Description and Background

Parks and Recreation has provided city-wide programs for seniors for over 30 years. Recognizing that changing demographics has resulted in an increase in seniors relative to the general population of Seattle, five years ago a manager with geriatric training was hired to increase, improve and better define services for older adults. Parks and Recreation is currently developing plans to implement additional senior programs and has identified several community centers in each geographic sector of the city to establish a senior-specific program emphasis. This is being referred to as a Hub approach to programming.

Seattle's population shows a growing aging demographic and efforts are in process to plan for the multiple needs of our senior population. Several senior centers have recently closed and there are gaps in service delivery to seniors. There currently are efforts underway among City service providers to evaluate the needs of seniors, while also establishing collaboration among senior service providers, including Parks and Recreation. Parks' programs are essential services for seniors, as best practice research has shown that recreational activities (social, fitness and arts) significantly improve the health and independence of older adults.

Examples of programs Parks and Recreation offers include the Sound Steps senior walking program, theater, arts, food and fitness programs, and special events such as the annual senior picnic. Statistics from the 2008 Lifelong Recreation Program reflect the extent of these efforts:

- Registered classes served 4,600 people with 107,726 hours of class;
- Total participation in classes, drop-in programs, single day events and trips was 14,406.

Provision of Lifelong Recreation programs is done largely in cooperation with partners. The Associated Recreation Council (ARC) is a primary partner, and is committed to increase marketing and programming for seniors; additional partnerships and coordination occurs with senior service organizations, businesses and Red Hat groups.

Parks and Recreation is currently working on a proposal to establish hubs to further integrate senior programs into community center programs. The goal of the hubs is to increase programs serving and working with people 50 plus and to show improvement in the health of participants. Strategies being evaluated to implement senior hubs include: modifying staffing, adjusting operational hours, making the centers more elder-friendly, identifying areas for program development, establishing a marketing plan and making intentional efforts to blend ages and to program intergenerational activities. Assessing measurable outcomes of the senior hub project will be done as a pilot of the logic model of evaluation that is being developed as part of Parks Strategic Action Plan implementation.

Strategic Action Plan

Increasing Lifelong Recreation is a priority item in Parks and Recreation's Strategic Action Plan (SAP), most specifically in Goal 2:

Goal 2.A.5: Encourage health and fitness through Lifelong Recreation Programs in partnership with community centers, environmental learning centers, other Parks and Recreation programs, and other senior serving organizations.

Goal 2.D.4: Develop and implement a plan to offer services in coordination with senior center programs.

Public Involvement Process

Lifelong Recreation has an ongoing public involvement effort, including:

- Establishing a customer survey in 2009; over 1500 participants have responded, providing input on health benefits, giving opinions on program quality and requesting additional programs.
- At recent public meetings in the community being held by the Superintendent, seniors have requested an increase in services.
- Two open houses have occurred with demonstrations of Lifelong Recreation programs and opportunities for input from seniors; 175 seniors attended the Delridge Community Center open house.
- Parks staff continue to perform outreach to underserved populations; specifically through the four Food and Fitness Programs and Sound Step Walking Program.

Issues

Senior stakeholders are supportive and actively involved. A recent concern has been expressed regarding not wanting the hubs to be the only access points for senior programming. We have assured people that existing and future senior programs at other community centers will not be affected by establishing the new hubs and, in fact, the hope is that the hubs will create enthusiasm for other community centers to establish more senior programs.

Budget

Lifelong Recreations' goal is to creatively use existing staff (Recreation Specialists, community center staff, Title V workers, contracted Associated Recreation Council (ARC) instructors and volunteers) for programming and that the hubs will be budget neutral. There is discussion to seek grants and other community sponsors and to perhaps request current levy funding with a focus on physical plant and access improvements for facilities.

Schedule

Planning has begun for senior service hubs in Southwest Seattle to begin in the next several months, and locations are being identified in Central and North Seattle. The marketing plan developed through ARC has been proposed and is set to begin in December of 2009 and continue through spring of 2010.

Additional Information

Contact information: David Jensen, Manager of Lifelong Recreation and Specialized Programs; 206-615-0140; E-mail David.Jensen@Seattle.Gov; Web page <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/seniors/index.htm>.

Verbal Briefing

Mr. Jensen introduced himself and gave a Powerpoint presentation, with additional information and statistics on the Lifelong Recreation Program. He noted that the Lifelong Recreation and Specialized Program have seven full-time staff and nine part-time staff. He gave a number of statistics, with several included below:

- The population aged 65+ is projected to double over the next three decades from 35.3 million to more than 70 million in the United States.
- The population aged 85+ is the fastest growing segment of the population.
- The first of 77 million baby boomers will turn 65 in 2011.
- People aged 50+ in Seattle: comprised 26.4% of the population in 1990, or 136,280 people. This amount increased to 33.5% in 2005, for 191,254 people or 1/3 of the City's population!

- By 2010, almost half of all women will be at least 50 years of age.
- 14 million people age 50+ are caring for grandchildren an average of 13.7 hours a week.

Mr. Jensen reviewed accomplishments for 2008 for the unit:

- offered 107,726 hours of service in registered classes to over 4,600 50+ individuals.
- offered 349 classes, 1599 'drop-in' programs, 283 single day events, and 149 trips, which provided activities to 14,406 people age 50+.

Due to time constraints, the Park Board chair suggested that Commissioners e-mail any questions to Mr. Jensen. The Board thanked him for the informative briefing.

Briefing: Seattle Parks Planning and Development Division

Kevin Stoops, Seattle Parks Planning and Development Division Director, presented information on the Department's major maintenance needs, especially those at community centers and comfort stations. He distributed a written report at the start of this meeting, included below.

Written Briefing

Seattle Parks and Recreation Master List of Capital Projects Major Assets (11.30.09)

Facility Name	Total Development Cost Estimate (2009 \$) (Planning Level Estimates)
COMMUNITY CENTERS AND ONE POOL	
Green Lake CC and Evans Pool	\$5,100,000
Hiawatha CC	\$1,200,000
Jefferson CC	\$2,200,000
Loyal Heights CC	\$4,400,000
Queen Anne CC	\$3,260,000
Parks Administration/Belltown CC	\$3,900,000
Other Community Center Renovations	\$5,000,000
TOTAL CC'S & ONE POOL	\$25,060,000
OTHER BUILDINGS AND POOLS	
Comfort Station Renovation and Replacement Program	\$15,000,000
Conservatory –East Wing and East Potting Shed Replacement	\$3,200,000
Green Lake Bathhouse Theater Renovation	\$1,800,000
Green Lake Small Craft Center	\$2,200,000
Lake City CC (Lions Building) Renovation (Sr. Ctr.) 12531 28 th Avenue NE	3,720,000
Madrona Dance Studio (Spectrum)	\$750,00
Magnuson Building 30	\$10,000,000
Pools Enhancement at Two Pools	\$2,100,000
Magnuson CC- Building Renovation	\$2,200,000
Pools Enhancement at Two Pools	\$2,100,000
Pools Renovation	\$10,500,000
Pratt Fine Arts Center	\$5,000,000
Seward Park Art Studio	\$1,000,000
TOTAL OTHER BLDGS AND POOLS	\$57,470,000

ZOO/AQUARIUM	
Zoo	\$7,000,000
Aquarium	\$7,000,000
TOTAL ZOO/AQUARIUM	\$14,000,000
GRAND TOTAL	\$96,530,000

Community Centers and One Pool

The 2008 facility study Green Lake CC/Evans Pool, Hiawatha CC, Jefferson CC, Loyal Heights CC, and Queen Anne CC assessed the structural, mechanical, electrical, civil, and architectural condition and made recommendations for both short and long term improvements. Renovation needs to convert the Parks Administration Building into the Belltown CC are also identified in this list of projects. In addition, other community center renovations are needed and an estimate is included. The total estimated cost of the recommendations is approximately \$25.1 million and is broken down by center as follows.

Community Centers and One Pool Facility Improvements Costs

Facility Name	Total Development Cost Estimate (2009 \$ - Planning Level Estimates)
Green Lake CC and Evans Pool	\$5,100,000
Hiawatha CC	\$1,200,000
Jefferson CC	\$2,200,000
Loyal Heights CC	\$4,400,000
Parks Administration Building/Belltown CC	\$3,900,000
Queen Anne CC	\$3,260,000
Other Community Center Renovations TBD	\$5,000,000
TOTAL	\$25,060,000

Green Lake CC and Evans Pool (\$5,100,000) Green Lake CC was built in 1929 and Evans Pool was added on in 1954. Due to their location in Green Lake Park, the center and pool are extremely busy. The recommended improvements include adding ADA access to the gym, restrooms, locker rooms and reception desk, improving lighting, replacing the main boiler and controls, upgrading electrical, and space reconfiguration. Some seismic upgrades are needed. An ADA-accessible, stand-alone comfort station (similar to Cal Anderson Park) would add approximately \$800,000 to the total cost estimate.

Hiawatha (\$1,200,000) Hiawatha CC was built in 1911. It is in relatively good condition, even though it was originally built nearly 100 years ago. The recommended improvements primarily will improve programming at the center. Expanding the kitchen area, replacing selected windows, replacing gym lighting, upgrading the electrical and mechanical controls, ADA improvements, and improving the security camera system, are among the key recommendations.

Jefferson CC (\$2,200,000) Jefferson CC is approximately 40 years old and a gym was added in 2004. The center needs significant repairs of its mechanical, plumbing, and electrical system. Among the main needs are replacing the boiler and pump, replacing the electrical branch panel boards, adding an ADA elevator, reconfiguring the second floor rooms and lobby stairway, adding second floor restrooms, and improving site drainage. [Note: If seismic is funded in the FEMA grant, the total estimated needs should be reduced by \$405,000.]

Loyal Heights CC (\$4,400,000) Loyal Heights CC is a large, two-story center built in 1950 and its design is similar to Queen Anne CC. The major needs include replacing the boiler, replacing galvanized piping, upgrading the seismic, upgrading the electrical system, and reconfiguring the child care classroom, teen/game room, and

restrooms to provide better programming spaces. Improved lighting and security systems have also been identified as needs.

Parks Administration Building/Belltown CC (\$3,900,000) The Parks Administration Building is a two story building with approximately 15,000 square feet. It was built in 1948/49. The roof, windows, boiler, domestic water, and electrical system need replacement. An elevator may be needed. The major renovations will be on the main floor to convert it to a community center and the basement level may remain as offices, but they will need some renovation as well.

Queen Anne CC (\$3,260,000) Queen Anne CC is a large, two-story center built in 1949. It has many rooms built off a long corridor. Recommended improvements include replacing the boiler, upgrading electrical, fire alarm system, and emergency lighting, upgrading gym and facility lighting, and reconfiguring space (childcare classroom, weight room, and restrooms) for better circulation, safety, and improved programming options. [Note: The original estimate included seismic work, and that work was funded via a FEMA grant, so the estimate for the work at this center now excludes the seismic.]

Other Community Centers Renovation (\$5,000,000) This allocation will be used to renovate other community centers (not listed above). Renovations could include roofs, HVAC, electrical, plumbing, lighting, finishes replacement, etc. The specific sites are to be determined, however, priority should be given to Magnolia CC and other older community centers.

Other Buildings and Pools Capital Needs

Major buildings and pools need renovations. Some of these buildings are owned by Parks, but leased out to a concessionaire (Pratt, Spectrum Dance, Bathhouse Theater). In general, Parks is responsible for the building envelope (e.g., roof, windows, exterior) and major systems (e.g., HVAC, electrical). Some of the projects identified below have specific estimates and others have been estimated on a square footage cost basis. The total estimated cost of these facilities is over \$57 million in 2009 dollars.

Other Buildings and Pools Improvements Costs

Facility Name	Total Development Cost Estimate (2009 \$ - Planning Level Estimates)
Comfort Station Renovation and Replacement Program	\$15,000,000
Conservatory –East Wing and East Potting Shed Replacement	\$3,200,000
Green Lake Bathhouse Theater Renovation	\$1,800,000
Green Lake Small Craft Center	\$2,200,000
Lake City CC (Lions Building) Renovation (Sr. Ctr.) 12531 28 th Avenue NE	3,720,000
Madrona Dance Studio (Spectrum)	\$750,00
Magnuson Building 30	\$10,000,000
Magnuson CC- Building Renovation	\$2,200,000
Pools Enhancement at Two Pools	\$2,100,000
Pools Renovation	\$10,500,000
Pratt Fine Arts Center	\$5,000,000
Seward Park Art Studio	\$1,000,000
TOTAL	\$57,470,000

Comfort Station Renovation and Replacement (\$15,000,000) There are approximately 50 existing comfort stations that are in dire need of renovation or replacement. This number of comfort stations represents about 40% of the total comfort stations in the Parks system. A 2001 study showed that many of the Parks Department's comfort stations are over 50 years old and have not been renovated over the years. The array of

improvements may include new roofs and windows, ADA improvements, lighting, ventilation, exterior and interior painting, and new fixtures. The specific sites are to be determined.

Conservatory-East Wing and East Potting Shed Replacement (\$3,200,000) The east wing of the Conservatory structure is failing and needs to be replaced. The East Potting Shed (located north of the Conservatory) needs a new structural system and glazing. These are the last sections of the two buildings that need to be replaced. The project is designed and permitted and it will provide a new structural system and glazing, consistent in size and form with the respective structures, similar to the renovations of the west wing of the building. The Conservatory and Potting Shed are designated as a Seattle Landmark.

Green Lake Bathhouse Theater Renovation (\$1,800,000) The Bathhouse Theater was built in 1927 and part of it is used as a private theater. The restrooms and changing rooms on the south side of the building are open to the public at the swim beach. The entire building contains approximately 7,000 square feet. Renovation would include a new roof, exterior painting, interior restroom/changing area upgrades, HVAC and electrical upgrades.

Green Lake Small Craft Center (\$2,200,000) The current facilities located on the southeast side of Green Lake, near the Aqua Theater, were built in 1950/51. The facilities are aging and deteriorating, and programming is limited due to the small size of the facilities. Renovation of the Office Building (Building west of the Aqua Theater and east of the comfort station/Launch House): (\$1,600,000 includes adding a second story to the existing 3,100 square foot space for a meeting space and an office, resulting in better visibility and accessibility to the facility. The current facility has a truss system, so some architectural modifications will be needed. Renovation of the Launch House (\$600,000) involves removing the two bay launch house and replacing it with a four-bay house.

Lake City CC – Lion’s Building (Senior Center) (\$3,720,000) The facility is owned by Seattle Parks and Recreation. The building is 12,400 square feet in size. Located in the heart of Lake City, the site is easily accessible by bus. Some Parks Life Long Learning programs are offered at this site now. Renovation of the facility will include creating meeting and activity rooms.

Madrona Dance Studio (Spectrum) (\$750,000) The Madrona Dance Studio building is owned by Parks, but operated by Spectrum Dance. The building was originally a bathhouse for Madrona Beach. Built in 1927, the building contains 3,705 square feet. The renovation allocation may include exterior repair, interior systems and finishes replacement, and roof repairs.

Magnuson Building 30 (\$10,000,000) Renovations include a fire alarm system and fire suppression sprinklers throughout the building, egress improvements for the East Wing, ADA, seismic, energy and tenant improvements to bring the building up to current codes. This estimate is based on a 2008 needs assessment report by S.M. Stemper Architects.

Magnuson Community Center – Building Renovation (\$2,200,000) Magnuson CC was built in 1941 and was partially renovated in 2003. Remaining work includes the completion of the south wing of the building (5,900 s.f.), renovation of the kitchen/lounge (750 s.f.), and renovating the restrooms (560 s.f.), for a total of 7,200 square feet. Additional optional elements are conversion of the training pool into an indoor pool, renovation of the lower floor locker rooms and restrooms, and soundproofing the gym or meeting rooms above the gym (Cost TBD).

Pool Enhancement at Two Pools (\$2,100,000) Madison and Evers Pools are two large pools with a bulkhead and large pool decks. The bulkhead at each pool would be removed and replaced with a permanent bulkhead. The smaller end of the divided pool would be converted to a warm water training tank to allow patrons to move comfortably in a pool that is warmer than normal. Children and senior patrons are the primary users of such pools. Related work is pool plumbing, electrical upgrades, chemical controls, and heating system renovation.

Pools Renovation (\$10.5 million) There are 10 pools in Seattle, but Rainier Beach will be replaced in 2010. The remaining pools need work that was identified in the 1998 Swimming Pool Study by Berona Engineers, Inc and the 2000 Structural and condensation Study by URS. Additional projects were identified via the Asset Management Plan effort. The project work includes roof and wall vapor installation, new pool liners, deck and wall repair, finishes upgrades, lighting replacement, electrical and controls upgrades, and pool roofs. Utility conservation projects such as pool covers and lighting retrofits to reduce operating costs for the pools are also included in the estimate.

Pratt Fine Arts Renovation (\$5,000,000) The Pratt Fine Arts Center was built in 1977 and it is used for arts resource center offering classes and work space for beginning and experienced artists. The building contains approximately 9,000 square feet. The renovation allocation may include exterior repair, interior systems and finishes replacement, and roof repairs. (Most of the art rooms are utilitarian and wouldn't be upgraded with finishes that you might find in a community center.)

Seward Park Art Studio (\$1,000,000) The Seward Park Art Studio (aka Seward Park Clay Studio) is owned by Parks, but operated as a non-profit education ceramics studio. The building is 6,548 square feet, of which the western side of the building is the beach bathhouse/comfort station. Renovations may include exterior repair, interior systems, and roof repairs. [NOTE: The location of the Studio near the Lake Washington shoreline limits expansion, but certain renovations would likely be allowed.]

Verbal Briefing/Board Discussion

Mr. Stoops introduced himself and noted that the Board had asked for information on the schedule for replacing park comfort stations (restrooms housed in separate facilities in parks.) The Board also asked about the replacement schedule for the Department's community centers that have not yet been remodeled. Mr. Stoops gave a brief review of several of the Department's aging buildings in need of major repairs/remodels, with several of these at least 50 years old: Hiawatha and Jefferson Community Centers were built in 1911; Green Lake Community Center in the 1920's, and Loyal Heights, Alki, and Magnolia Community Centers, as well as Evans Pool, built in the 1950's. The Volunteer Park Conservatory and Green Lake Bathhouse were built in the 1920's and 1930's.

Park Headquarters at Denny Park (100 Dexter) was also built in the 1950s and is in need of repairs. The Belltown community wants a community center, estimated to cost \$3.9 million for property and the building; however, there is less than \$2 million funded for the new center. There has been discussion of moving Parks staff from Park Headquarters, and spending the \$1.9 million to convert the Denny Park site to a community center.

Comfort stations: The Department has 100, with many of those built in the 1930's WPA-era. Many of the buildings are structurally sound, but the fixtures and interiors are old and need interior renovation and upgrades.

Swimming pools: Most of the pools were built in the 1950's and need enhancements to bring them up to modern standards. The City's aging pools must compete with other area pools that have multiple pools, pools with different water temperatures, etc. Both Madison and Evers Pools need modifications and there is an additional \$10 million in needs at the other pools.

Mr. Stoops estimated a total of \$100 million is needed for the maintenance he described and this is not a comprehensive list. While the park levies bring new land and facilities to the Department, the levies include no funding for current or future maintenance.

Commissioner Adams commented that \$100 million is a huge need and asked what portion of that, if any, is doable at this point. Mr. Stoops answered that not a lot of it can be accomplished in the short term. He spent some time discussing the City and Department's reduced budgets, with the Real Estate Excise Taxes (REET)

only 1/3 of what they were expected to be for this year. Parks staff estimates are that by 2012, 10-12 of these projects can be in progress.

Commissioner Adams asked if it is difficult for the public to grasp the maintenance needs and if it is a hard sell to garner support for maintenance funds. Mr. Stoops answered that generally it is; however, the public was generous in voting for the Community Center Levy that provided funds to replace nine of the Department's 26 community centers.

The Superintendent supports proposing a renovation levy that would be less than the \$100 million figure and include \$40 million to renovate/remodel restrooms and update an additional pool. Commissioner Holme asked how many comfort stations the \$40 million might include and Superintendent Gallagher responded approximately 50 to include major renovations of most and replacement of a few. Responding to a question from Commissioner Ramels whether this would include the golf course comfort stations, Superintendent Gallagher answered that it wouldn't. Commissioner Kincaid suggested that the Board start discussing its support of such a levy. Superintendent Gallagher added that the School District is scheduled to replace plumbing systems in some of its schools and for those facilities that are part school/part community center or pool, the work could coincide.

Commissioner Ramels noted that Alki Community Center, located in West Seattle, is very important to the community and she doesn't see it on the list. Commissioner Barber asked if the Department received stimulus funding for any of these projects, how quickly it could begin work. Mr. Stoops responded that some of the designs are ready and the work could begin within a month or two of receiving funding.

Commissioner Ramels asked that the Board be kept informed of efforts on the levy and thanked Mr. Stoops for the informative briefing.

Old/New Business

Support of Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee's Guiding Principles re: SR520 Project: **Commissioner Kincaid read this document and moved that the Board of Park Commissioners concurs.**

Commissioner Holme seconded. The vote was taken with Commissioners Barber, Holme, Kincaid, and Kostka in favor. Commissioner Adams abstained. Motion carried. Staff will draft a letter for the Chair to sign to be sent to the ABGC, Councilmember Conlin, Mayor-elect McGinn, and the Legislature.

Letter of Support for Superintendent Gallagher: **Councilmember Kincaid next read a letter of support and moved that it be sent to Mayor-elect McGinn urging that he retain Tim Gallagher as Parks Superintendent. Commissioner Barber seconded.** Commissioner Adams suggested one revision to the letter. **The vote was taken and was unanimous in favor. Motion carried.** Parks staff will finalize the letter for the Chair's signature and forward it to Mayor-elect McGinn.

Park Board Committees: Superintendent Gallagher noted that the new Magnuson Park Advisory Committee will begin meeting in January. Commissioner Adams is the Board's representative, with Commissioner Barber as the alternate.

Commissioner Barber also volunteered to represent the Board on the new Langston Hughes Advisory Committee.

There being no other new business, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

Jackie Ramels, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____