

Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2006

Board of Park Commissioners:

Present:

Angela Belbeck
Jack Collins
Terry Holme
Debbie Jackson
Kate Pflaumer, Chair
Amit Ranade

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

Ken Bounds, Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Coordinator

Commission Chair Kate Pflaumer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. **Commissioner Holme moved approval of the Acknowledgment of Correspondence, the January 12 minutes, and the January 26 agenda. Commissioner Belbeck seconded. The vote was taken and motion passed.**

Superintendent's Report

The Superintendent reported on the following:

Move of Summer Nights Concerts to Gas Works Park: The Superintendent distributed a handout to the Board, showing the revised concert layout. A small working group of community leaders is having its first meeting downstairs right now to help address the potential impacts of parking, traffic, noise, and park access.

Commissioner Collins asked when City Council is scheduled to discuss the move of the Summer Nights Concerts to Gas Works. The Superintendent answered that Council is scheduled to act on Monday, January 30. If no action is taken, the concerts will not be held this summer.

Project Bids: Good news is that the Volunteer Park Conservancy Project bid came in under engineering expectations. Several community center expansion projects are going out for bid soon.

Parks-wide Utility Summit: Parks held a retreat with representatives from the City's major utilities. As a result, a Utility Conservation Committee will be developed and a Strategic Utility Conservation Work Plan will be implemented. In addition, Parks will hire a Utility Conservation Manager to oversee initiatives, programs, and Parks' relationship with its utility partners.

Pro Parks Levy: Thornton Creek Acquisition: In early January Parks successfully negotiated the purchase of a 0.33-acre property along Thornton Creek. Combined with the adjacent 0.67-acre property, these purchases preserve another acre along the South Branch of Thornton Creek. For more information on the Pro Parks Levy, please see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/proparks/>.

Plymouth Pillars Park: On Saturday, January 14, Plymouth Pillars Park opened for public use with a celebration hosted by the Superintendent, Councilmember David Della, and approximately 60 community members. Despite wet weather, the new off-leash area was a big hit and many community members brought their dogs. For more information, please see <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkspaces/PlymouthPillarsPark.htm>.

Swanson's Nursery Partnership: On January 21, volunteers in partnership with Swanson's Nursery planted 255 plants and trees in Carkeek Park. During the winter holiday season, Swanson's sells native plants tagged with the "Trees for Salmon" logo. Customers may purchase a native plant and plant it in the park themselves, or donate it to Carkeek Park for planting. For more information on Carkeek Park, please see <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkspaces/Carkeek.htm>.

Cascade Playground Renovation: Cascade Park won the "Gold Award" in the category of "Social, Economic, and Sustainable Design Considerations" from the American Council of Engineering Companies of Washington in their 2006 Engineering Excellence Awards Competition. The Gold Award is the top in the category. The newly-renovated Cascade Park in Seattle's developing South Lake Union neighborhood is the first piece in a planned showcase of restorative urban ecology. For more information on Cascade Park, please see <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkspaces/cascade.htm>.

In addition, Olympic Sculpture Park and the new Ballard Commons Park were recently recognized by the Seattle Design Commission with a Design Excellence Award. The Commission commended the Sculpture Park design for its public access to the water, restoration of salmon habitat, its addition of open space to the waterfront area, and its clear, bold design. The Ballard Commons Park was lauded for its simplicity of design and development of uses by different generations. For more information on Olympic Sculpture Park, please see <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkspaces/OlympicSculpturePark.htm>.

Upcoming Events

Langston Hughes Invites Community to Annual Fundraiser: Over 1,200 invitations were mailed to community members for the 3rd annual fundraiser, "Illuminating Langston", scheduled for February 2. This annual event will feature a performance showcase and art auction. For more information on Langston Hughes Cultural Arts Center and its performance schedule, please see <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/Centers/langston.htm>.

Jefferson Park Expansion Project: The first open house on this project will be held on February 4, 10 am-2 pm, at Jefferson Community Center, 3801 Beacon Avenue South. For more information, please see <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/proparks/projects/JeffersonPark.htm>

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 three minutes each and will be timed. The Board's usual process is for 15 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 signed up to testify.

Briefing/Public Hearing: Beach Fires at Golden Gardens and Alki Park

Adam Cole, Environmental Stewardship Recreation Program Coordinator, gave a brief overview of this policy and introduced Sid Baker, Beach Patrol Supervisor, Joe Green, Parks Northwest District Grounds Crew Chief, and Royal Alley-Barnes, North/Central East District Resources Manager. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing.

[Background information: The Board held a public hearing on the continuation of beach fires at its October 14, 2004, meeting. http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2004/10-14-04_minutes.pdf. At its November 18, 2004, meeting the Board approved that fires at Alki Beach be allowed as they currently are – in appropriate fire pits, with use of fire pits enforced, with education, and with particular reliance on the community. The Board also approved to continue the current policy at Golden Gardens with added effort to increase enforcement, education, and signage. Beach fires will be placed on a one-year probation in this park, after which the Parks Department will present an assessment to the Park Board, and the Board will make a recommendation to the Superintendent.]

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

At this time Seattle Parks is briefing the Board on the affect that the enhanced “beach patrol” efforts at Golden Gardens and Alki Beach had on the environment and park users in 2005. We are also hearing public comment on the recommendation for 2006 and beyond in our **Beach Fire Management Report 2005** which was released to the public through news releases and our website on January 12, 2006.

On February 9, we will be asking the Board of Park Commissioners to approve or amend the Recommendation for 2006 and beyond contained in the **Beach Fire Management Report 2005** report (See Executive Summary, Recommendations on page 2, and Staff Recommendation below.

Project Description and Background

In 2004, Parks staff recommended to the Board of Park Commissioners that future beach fire recreation at Golden Gardens and Alki Beaches be prohibited. This recommendation was formed in a staff report (“Impacts of Parks Beach Fires 2004”) that same year. The report concluded that the frequency of illegal fires (burning outside of provided rings) and the amount of illegal fuels being burned (anything other than “clean, dry, firewood”) significantly contributed to poor air quality events, and at times posed a safety hazard to park visitors.

During the public process which accompanied the Board’s briefing and public hearing, most respondents requested that beach fire recreation continue. The Board’s recommendation, which was endorsed by the Superintendent, was to allow beach fire recreation, and to enhance management and maintenance efforts to reduce illegal burning. The Park Board put Golden Gardens, where most of the illegal burning takes place, on “probation,” and asked staff to submit a 2005 Beach Fire Report to the Board before the 2006 beach fire season.

In 2005, Parks enhanced its commitment to “beach patrol” staffing, public outreach, and policy changes that it hoped would improve the public’s compliance with outdoor burning rules and regulations. The majority of our efforts were focused at Golden Gardens; however, many changes and program improvements benefited Alki Beach Park as well.

Golden Gardens: Over the past four years, beach fire management at Golden Gardens has been less intensive (mostly in terms of beach patrol staffing) than at Alki Beach, while at the same time the number of provided rings has grown (from six to 12). In 2005, Parks implemented these efforts at Golden Gardens in hopes of reducing illegal burning there:

1. A three-person “beach patrol” was assigned to the park each evening seven days a week from June to September and fires were actively extinguished at park closing time.
2. Removed two of the 12 fire rings to allow more space and staff access.
3. Added improved signage and rock borders to provide better definition of the beach fire area.
4. Contacted drivers entering the beach access road and gave them beach fire “rules” brochures.
5. Actively managed traffic and parking to reduce congestion and improve public safety.
6. Prohibited fires for one week before the summer started, to allow for beach restoration efforts.
7. Improved cooperation among Seattle Parks, Police, Fire, and the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.

Both Beaches: Parks took these actions in 2005 to benefit both beaches:

1. Adopted a rule prohibiting the presence of illegal fuels in all Seattle parks.

2. Held beach fire open houses at each park.
3. Enhanced staff training and coordination with other agencies.

Our 2005 Results at Golden Gardens and Alki Beach (Compared to 2003 Data)

1. 60% fewer illegal fires. 88% less burning of illegal fuel (21.3 tons down from 176 tons).
2. 30% less volume of fuel burned in beach fires (335 tons down from 480 tons).
3. 30% reduction in gross emissions. 155.3 tons less illegal fuels burned (cleaner fuels used).
4. An enhanced user experience through cleaner and safer parks, and greater customer service during peak use times.

Public Involvement Process

On February 10, Seattle Parks will begin communicating, through media outlets and on our website, our Beach Management Plan for 2006. At some point in the late spring Seattle Parks will again hold Beach Fire Open Houses in each park. At that time, citizens will have a chance to communicate in person with the staff who will be managing “beach patrol” efforts this summer.

Public Involvement Process Throughout 2005

Golden Gardens: Parks held a Beach Fire Community Open House May 31 to publicly review our pilot approach to providing better management of beach fire recreation at Golden Gardens, and to answer questions regarding two newly adopted park rules. One rule prohibited any illegal fuels from entering any Seattle park, and the other gave staff working in Golden Gardens the ability to direct traffic to reduce congestion and improve public safety. Following the Open House, Parks staff and volunteers performed intensive beach restoration work for a week; no beach fires were allowed during this time.

Alki Beach: In May, Parks held a pre-beach fire season retreat with all Alki Beach and Golden Gardens beach patrol staff and staff from the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) to train and educate Parks staff on our summer management programs at both beaches and the laws and regulations and park rules that govern recreational fires on our lands, and to define roles and responsibilities of the Beach Patrol.

Both Beaches: Although the open houses at both beaches were heavily advertised via signs in each park, on our website, and covered in nearly all major media outlets in the area, each only attracted a dozen or less attendees. Before peak beach fire season began in early June, Parks staff and staff from Police, Fire, and the PSCAA held an open house at Alki Beach to unveil our approach to managing beach fires in the coming months and answer questions from the beach fire community. Parks also distributed and collected beach fire customer surveys in August of 2004 with the majority of respondents indicating the enhanced “beach patrol” programs at both parks were successful.

Issues

See Project Description and Background section above.

Budget

Assignment of “beach patrol” staffing to both beaches was accomplished by utilizing park resources staff from other programs throughout Seattle, primarily the Pro Parks Enhanced Maintenance Program. Likewise, equipment, signage, printing, and graphic design was paid by existing budgeted resources which created diffuse impacts citywide. For 2007 and beyond, Parks will request additional funding in the 2007-08 budget process to support beach patrol operations so that this is a funded program within Seattle Parks and Recreation.

Schedule

Once we receive approval or amendment of our recommendation from the Board on February 9, Seattle Parks staff will begin planning our 2006 Beach Fire Management Plan for Golden Gardens and Alki Beach Parks based on that approval and any amendments brought forth and confirmed by the Superintendent.

Staff Recommendation

Allow beach fire recreation to continue for 2006 at Golden Gardens and Alki Beach Parks as Parks will allocate resources away from other programs to the beach patrol resources for this year on par with 2005. Parks will continue monitoring and public reporting in 2006. Parks will request a budget addition for 2007 and beyond if this program is to continue. As part of the continuation of beach fire recreation at both beaches, Parks will continue to evaluate additional management options such as seasonal prohibition of fires during non-peak use times, and piloting a fire ring reservation system. Parks may also consider adding one to three additional rings at each beach in conjunction with the 2007 budget request.

Additional Information

Adam Cole: 206-733-9701; adam.cole@seattle.gov. The entire 13 page **Beach Fire Management Report 2005 (and 2004)** can be found at: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/Publications/BeachFires.htm>

Verbal Briefing

Mr. Cole reviewed information in the written briefing paper and introduced the three other speakers who also reviewed the information and gave additional statistics. The illegal fires were reduced from 2,300 to 1,000. Staff removed eight tons of illegal fuels before it was burned at the two parks. Mr. Cole reviewed the recommendation and stated that staff expect good future results from the recommendation. Golden Gardens Park would no longer be on probation; however, staff would continue its evaluations.

Board Questions & Answers

Commissioner Pflaumer requested that, if at any time in the future the Department considers stopping beach fires, it first be brought before the Park Board. Mr. Cole stated that staff will brief the Park Board in early 2007, with the 2006 beach fire results.

Commissioner Holme noted that staff previously reported a number of illegal fires on the north end of Golden Gardens, which is a more secluded area and out of the allowed beach fire area. He asked for more information on results for that area. Mr. Baker answered that staff had a 4-wheel drive vehicle, which allowed them quick access to fires in that area. They were able to quickly put the fires out and clean up the area. The patrols have made a serious dent in those illegal fires. Mr. Holme asked if there are statistics in the reduction of those illegal fires. Mr. Cole answered that there were two issues at Golden Gardens that led to the illegal fires: using the wrong fuels and building fires in the wrong location. Most of the illegal fires at Golden Gardens were located at this north end area and have been reduced by 60%.

Ms. Barnes commented that staff have worked closely with Seattle Police Department (SPD), which is an important partner in this effort. SPD has stepped up its traffic patrols in the parks and this, too, has helped greatly to reduce the illegal fires.

Public Hearing

The public hearing began. The Chair reminded speakers that they have up to three minutes to speak and will be timed. One person signed up to testify. A very brief summary of his testimony is included.

Stephen Lundgren: He is a Ballard resident and past chair of the Ballard District Council. He is supportive of continuing the fires at Golden Gardens. He commented that some people who build the illegal fires in the north end of the park come through the woods, rather than the parking area. He believes the Parks staff effort has been a good balance, but hopes the enforcement doesn't get too heavy. The legal fires areas are clearly marked and the correct fuels are on site. Good work and keep it up!

The public hearing concluded. The Board will discuss the recommendation at its February 9 meeting and make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Seattle Parks.

Briefing/Public Hearing: Lower Woodland Skatepark Site

Susan Golub, Seattle Parks strategic analyst, briefed the Board on a proposed location for the Lower Woodland skatepark site. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing; both are included in these minutes.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

Staff is requesting that the Board confirm the staff proposed location for the Lower Woodland skateboard park. The Board had previously approved the location just west of the proposed new site. On January 26 there will be a public hearing on the location for the skatepark, and the Board is scheduled for a discussion and vote on a recommendation on February 9.

Project Description and Background

Parks and Recreation is planning to build a new skateboard park at Lower Woodland Park. The project began in 2004 with an application for funding from the State Interagency Committee on Outdoor Recreation (IAC). At that time the location for the project was east of the athletic fields at Lower Woodland, north of the BMX bike mounds, a location that has come to be known as the chip site because it was used for wood chip storage (marked as Site A on the attached map).

Parks proceeded with public review and planning for this site, but encountered significant opposition to the location from the skateboarding community. Safety for children was the primary concern because the site was not readily visible from a street or from the athletic fields. Additionally, some skateboarders were concerned that a location so close to the hillside meant that the park would be in shade much of the time and would therefore take longer to dry after a rain.

The Skateboard Park Advisory Committee and a parent organization called Parents for Skateparks recommended that the skatepark be located on property commonly known as the Aurora triangle. Parks opposed locating the skatepark on the Aurora triangle because it is an open, green space used by citizens for picnics and sunning. Additionally, parking and access is not good at this site, requiring visitors do a u-turn if they do not wish to go north on Aurora when leaving the triangle location. The skateboarding community brought their concerns to the Park Board last May. At the June 9, 2005 meeting the Board endorsed the chip site location for the skatepark.

Why the Move to the New Location

After the Board's recommendation, Parks Project Management staff began site evaluation and initial design work. It was at this stage, in perhaps July or August, that staff determined that the skateboarding communities' concerns could be eliminated by placing the skatepark immediately east of the chip site (marked as Site B on the attached map). With the new site there is no shade problem and the location is more readily visible from the street, parking lot, and athletic fields. An internal assessment was done, and the conclusion among the athletics, planning, and Superintendent's staff was that the new site would work.

Compliance with Parks Skateboard Park Policy

Parks Skateboard Park Policy includes criteria for locating skateparks. Relevant to the siting issue at Lower Woodland are the following criteria:

- 6.1 Skateboard park sites should consider adjacent uses and potential noise impacts. Sites should be selected where impacts to surrounding neighbors can be minimized and mitigation measures can be maximized.
 - 6.1.1 Skateboard park sites should:
 - be developed as part of a larger park space that provides other park amenities
 - be located to provide maximum visibility in and through the skateboard park area
 - be located near public transportation (i.e. bus routes)
 - have a code of conduct. (Policy 060-P7.18, effective August 14, 2003)

In the draft design for the new skatepark, the closest skate element is approximately 160 feet from the nearest house, separated by 4-lane Green Lake Way, a double stacked parking lot, and a berm of about 4 to 5 feet. With the original site, the closest skate element would be approximately 360 feet from the nearest house. The question for the Board is how to balance the mitigation provided by the additional 200 feet of separation and the safety concerns of the skateboard community with the concerns expressed by the neighbors.

Public Involvement Process

The debate between the chip site and the Aurora triangle site was discussed at the Park Board in May and June 2005. The decision to shift to the current site was made internally without public discussion. Design for the park has been through our standard public involvement process, with three public meetings in the community: November 15, December 13, and January 25. Notice for the January 26 public hearing was provided via press release and a flyer mailed to the neighborhood.

Budget

The current budget for the Lower Woodland skatepark is \$850,000. A community group is applying for a large development grant from the Neighborhood Matching Fund; and while the project was not funded last year by the IAC (it ranked as first alternate), it is in the running for funding this year.

As noted, the design process is underway. A switch from the current site would result in some necessary redesign and additional costs, possibly \$20-30,000.

Schedule

We expect to break ground on the skatepark in early summer and complete the project by the end of the year. A redesign would delay the start of the project, probably by a couple of months.

Staff Recommendation

In a densely developed city such as Seattle locating new active uses is a challenge. 160 feet of separation provides considerable mitigation for a park planner, but considered to be too close by neighbors. Staff recommends the proposed new location, concluding that the 160 feet of separation provides sufficient mitigation to tip the balance in favor of meeting the skateboarding community's safety concerns.

Additional Information

Susan Golub, 684-7046, or susan.golub@seattle.gov

Verbal Briefing

Ms. Golub briefly reviewed information in the written briefing. At the third design meeting, neighbors voiced unhappiness with the proposed site.

There are three alternatives: (1) keep the proposed new location; (2) shift the skate park back from the street, approximately 50 feet; or (3) return the location to the chip site. One consideration of the three alternatives is the time and cost for a new design, which could cost \$20-30,000. If the site is moved back the 50 feet, Phase I would remain the same size, while Phase II would lose some area. There currently is no funding for Phase II.

Board Questions & Answers

Commissioner Collins asked if this skatepark would be considered a small, medium, or large park. Ms. Golub answered that Phase I would be considered a medium skatepark. If Phase II is added, it would be considered a large one. The Seattle Center skatepark is 8,500 sq. ft. Phase I of this project would be 18,000 and Phase II would be 25-35,000 sq. ft.

Commissioner Jackson asked about the safety issue at chip site and if Seattle Police Department has crime statistics at this site, Ballard skatepark, or Seattle Center skatepark. Ms. Golub answered that the issue at the chip site is the sexual activity nearby that doesn't show up in SPD's crime statistics.

Public Hearing

The public hearing began. The Chair reminded speakers that they have up to three minutes to speak and will be timed. Thirty five people testified. A brief summary of the testimony is included.

Victor Odlivak: He supports a skatepark at Lower Woodland — at the triangle or chip site. Nearby neighbors weren't aware of the most recent proposed location until recently. The proposed site is one of the last bits of green space at Lower Woodland and is very near houses. He is concerned with the skatepark designer's statement that as many as 200 people would be at the skatepark a given time.

Margaret Gingrich: She supports a skatepark at Lower Woodland at either the chip site or triangle. She lives across the street from the newest proposed site. Neighbors use the proposed site to walk through the park. This neighborhood is already heavily impacted by soccer, track, and softball games. Siting the skatepark at this new location would be a safety issue as the soccer team's balls are kicked towards that area. Soccer players retrieving the balls could slip on the concrete, due to the cleats on their shoes. There are many traffic accidents in this area and the parking lot traffic is already a mess.

John Carr: He supports a skatepark at the new proposed site. He is a homeowner and neighbor to the park. He is also a member of the Skate Park Advisory Committee. The proposal to move the site is for the safety of the kids. Adult skaters can skate safely at the chip site, but kids can't. If the location is shifted back from the newest site, the kids are the ones who will pay, and he doesn't believe shifting the site back will alleviate the neighbors' concerns.

Paula Spina: She lives in the neighborhood and supports a skatepark at Lower Woodland, but opposes the currently-proposed location. Seattle Parks is correct to protect the triangle site, but she urged that it not dump all the uses on one neighborhood. This will be a huge, regional skatepark located in Lower Woodland and puts the burden on one neighborhood. Neighbors of the park already experience noise, light pollution, traffic, and parking problems. She asked that Parks address and fix the existing problems. Parks should enhance a neighborhood and the park is already diminishing life for the neighbors.

Suzann Hamberton: She lives near the park and opposes the proposed site. She thanked the Board for holding the public hearing and stated that until tonight, the neighbors felt shut out of the site selection process. How is the Parks Department being a good steward if it uses the last bit of open space in this park? The skatepark will be used 24 hours a day and at night the bikers will come. Skateboards can jump over a 4' wall and soccer balls will go over the fence to the skatepark. At last night's design meeting, the comment was made that the noise level at the park will be louder than a jet engine (65 decibels or higher.) This is taking away from the neighbors. She cannot trust the Parks Department because it starts a process at one site, and then moves it to another location. And Phase II will make this site bigger and bigger.

Matthew Lee Johnston: He is chair of the Skate Park Advisory Council, a skateboarder, and a Seattle resident. He stated that at last night's design meeting he stated that the noise is not as loud as air traffic or many other noises in the environment. He stated that he is very empathetic to all those testifying against the currently-proposed site. It must be difficult for the neighbors to realize they live next to one of Seattle's busiest parks and it is sad that they can't dictate how the people in Seattle use that park. He asked speakers to stop referring to neighbors of the site as "NIMBY" (not in my back yard). This site is not in the neighbors' back or front yard — it belongs to the public. He addressed the Commissioners and stated he attended the June 2004 meeting where the Board voted approval of the site. Skaters had problems with the site but they went forward with the plan to make the skatepark as good as possible. Skaters were told that the site process was over and this site is where the skatepark is going to be. He asked the Board to stand by their previous decision to locate the skatepark here.

If the Board does change its decision and side with the neighbors, he will question why the Board listens to them and not him. He believes if this happens that it will be a class issue.

The Chair reminded those testifying to refrain from personal attacks or comments.

Ross Gibson: He opposes the proposed site. He has lived in the north end a long time and used Woodland Park often since he was a kid. He was watched the encroachment of activities that the park wasn't designed for. Parks are supposed to be tranquil and peaceful and a place for walks, but it wasn't designed for all these sporting activities. Now the last open space is being asked for at Lower Woodland for the skatepark. He asked that the Board not give in to pressure from the skaters. He referred to other possible sites that would work better (such as at the foot of Densmore Avenue or Magnuson Park.)

Jim Kirkland: He opposes the currently-proposed site. He stated that this is not a class issue; it is an open space issue. Once the open space is gone, it is gone forever.

Hans Bjordahl: He supports a skatepark at Lower Woodland at the chip site. He thanked the Board for holding the public hearing. He lives across from the currently-proposed site and stated that, until recently, neighbors thought the skatepark was being built at the chip site. Some neighbors were wary of having a skatepark at Lower Woodland, but were supportive of the chip site. This new location is the wrong location according to what he has read in the Park Board minutes, skateboarddesign.com, and studies by other cities. It is a bad idea for the neighborhood and wrong to put a large skatepark so close to neighbors' homes. Pushing the skatepark back 50' is not adequate. He and his wife did a noise test from across the street and Greenlake Way is now relatively quiet after traffic slows around 9:00 pm — traffic is not a reasonable noise buffer. The park is already full from other uses. He urged the Board to reconsider this proposal and the alternatives.

Esther Van Dyke: She suggested the skatepark be built at the north end of the park. She is a middle school teacher and realizes that kids need a place to play. She is also a homeowner who bought near the park 10 years ago and made an informed choice when she did so. She supports the athletic fields. She has three issues with the current proposal: (1) process: the neighbors weren't invited to discuss this location; (2) equity: the south end of the park is already saturated with sports uses; and (3) safety: the parking lot is already heavily used and kids' behavior is unpredictable.

Ian Rodihan: He believes a skatepark is more suitable at Ballard, Seattle Center, or Magnuson Park. He was totally surprised when a skatepark was proposed at this latest site and stated the Greenlake area is already carrying more than its fair share of the burden. Neighbors were totally surprised to learn that the skatepark would be so near their homes, as they expected it to be at the chip site or triangle, which are quite a bit further from the homes. Neighbors will have to live with this incredibly noisy skatepark 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He asked the Board to take the issues of safety, crime, and noise seriously.

Kris Fuller: She urged that a better location be found for the skatepark. She has lived near Woodland Park Playfield for 31 years. Originally the nearby fields were used for unorganized sports and play. Now many of the areas are fenced and lit. She referred to the Olmsted Brothers' plan and stated that people need green spots in the parks. She sent the Board a 3-page fax earlier in the day and hopes the Commissioners read it.

Holley Irvine: She requested that another site be found. The City of Albuquerque did a study and found that the community is happy to build skateparks, but skateparks are not compatible with having neighbors nearby. She referred to several studies which recommended that skateparks be isolated from residential areas and read portions from the studies. She asked the Board to reconsider the latest proposed site.

Britta Duval-Hemmen: She is a musician and her family has lived at the top of the hill near Lower Woodland since 1946. This is a bowl area and the park noise carries up the hill. She doesn't mind the noise, but she does mind people who are so desperate for a park and a place to play that they are willing to put it in the wrong site.

Caleb Banta-Green: He is opposed to the most recent proposed location. He lived in the Greenlake area for 9 years and 2 years ago moved to Lower Woodland and lives near the site. He has two small children and wants them to eventually use the skatepark. Skateparks need good locations and this isn't it.

Carl Lawrence: He is opposed to a skatepark at this location. He read from Seattle Parks' mission statement that one goal is to "build community". This is not building community. He attended last night's design meeting and a pro-skater stated that he was dismayed at the extent of the design. The skater had searched websites and could find no information on the design. He wanted more time to review the design. Neighbors feel the same way about the location. He urged that more time be spent on determining the location for this skatepark. Usually there is a large project sign that goes up and there was no information posted that the skatepark would be located at the currently-proposed site. He then quoted information from the Parents4skateparks website.

Karen Hoffman: She supports a skatepark but would be against any complex going in the proposed area. She went to Seattle Parks' website and it gives no indication that a skatepark is proposed for this area. She urged that the proposed site be reconsidered, as it is a negative impact to the area.

Marshall Longtin: He is opposed to a skatepark at the proposed site. He and his family live nearby and use the park almost every day. He is a real estate agent for Windermere and stated that sellers and buyers he is working with are concerned that a skatepark will be located near the houses — the location of the skatepark is also an economic issue. This park area is becoming more and more crowded, with thousands using it on a good, sunny day. A skatepark would bring more traffic and congestion to the area.

Ryan Barth: He apologized for the large failure in outreach and that neighbors didn't know the skatepark is proposed at the current site. This lack of outreach harms all those who have worked so long on the skatepark. He understands that neighbors are frustrated. However, there is a large flaw in the neighbors' logic about moving the skatepark site to alleviate traffic congestion. There are several possible sites in Lower Woodland for the skatepark. Even if the site is moved to the chip site, cars will still come to the neighborhood to drop off kids. If you go to skateparks, such as the one at Burien, parents drop off their kids and leave — they don't park. Parents feel safe dropping off their kids because it is in an urban area. The objections sound like NIMBY-ism to him. It is difficult to find spaces for skateparks and this site was selected because the area is already an area with active sports usages. Noise: skaters can't skate 24 hours a day — lights for this skatepark is just a wish list, it isn't in the budget. Soccer players will be playing on the fields at 10:00 pm at night, but there won't be skateboarders in the skatepark. In addressing the loss of green space, he stated that Seattle is a very active city and he thinks that community is created by having active spaces.

Scott Shinn: He is a member of the Skate Park Advisory Committee. Skaters are asking the Park Board and the Superintendent for consistency. In June, 2005, skatepark supporters asked the Board to consider a variety of sites. Instead, the Board supported the Parks staff recommendation and the skate community moved forward on the process. \$20-30,000 of the skatepark funding will now be wasted if the site selection process is re-opened. The decision to expand the Lower Woodland site was a Parks staff decision and should not be overturned at the 11th hour. The Board has set a precedent in the past of supporting the Parks staff recommendations and he is asking that it do so in this decision. He presented the Board a letter signed by 22 Seattle residents who live near the recently reopened Ballard Bowl. As he was skating on Sunday, he easily obtained these signatures from residents passing by the bowl. The letter indicates that skaters are good neighbors and that they contribute to a positive park atmosphere.

Kate Martin: She presented the Board written testimony and displayed several visual aids. She commented that she has lived and breathed this project for more than a year and it is her other full-time job. She is trained as a planner and landscape designer. She stated that she is "trying to inject some insanity [sic] into the process that Parks goes about, should I say lack of process and lack of outreach with which they handle themselves." Several personal remarks were directed towards a staff member and Superintendent Bounds, and the Chair

reminded Ms. Martin to stay within the time allowance and that her comments should not be personal. Ms. Martin stated that this process doesn't have to be followed in other communities — simply need to follow a logical planning process and protocol for outreach to communities. She named various community council meetings she has attended on numerous occasions. She stated that she and other landscaper architects and architects had two charrettes to work on this process. Skateparks can go in almost anywhere except hidden, shady, or wet areas. She found five sites around Green Lake and begged the Department to follow a logical process for site selection. All five of her sites would work and she pointed them out: (1) by the community center; (2) across from Gregg's Greenlake Cycle; (3) triangle site; and pointed out the other two sites. She stated that "you" will probably be afraid of a lawsuit and buckle under pressure, but there is no precedent for a lawsuit opposing the current site. She asked that the skatepark be allowed to move forward at the site.

Barbara Martin: She supports the skatepark at the new location. She is a new resident of the area, is the previous speaker's mother, and the safety of the skaters is her main concern.

Greg Rubstello: He opposes the skatepark at this site. He has lived in the Green Lake neighborhood most of his life and currently lives across from the site. He loves the area. He questions why money has been spent to design the skatepark at this site. He urged that the process be stopped and the skatepark be put at an appropriate site. He referred to the lack of crime statistics at the chip site and stated that he rides his bike through the area at night. The sexual activity referred to in earlier statements occurs further up the hill from the chip site and occurs at night. He stated that his stepson loves skateboarding and he believes that different ages don't mix well at the skateparks, as older kids shove the younger ones. He urged that the proposed site not be cemented.

Susan Rubstello: She suggested that Gas Works Park be looked at as a skatepark site and doesn't want a skatepark at Lower Woodland. She lives across from the proposed site and her house has a glassed-in porch. Two daycares with toddlers and babies use the proposed site as a play area. She believes a skatepark can be good, but it has created a division in the neighborhood.

Lori Langberg: She is opposed to the skatepark at the proposed site. She lives across from the site and only heard about the proposal yesterday. She stated that she receives notification when sex offenders move to the community or there are housing changes but received no prior notification about this. She is very offended and hates it when the government spends her money, then must go back and re-do its efforts.

Bob Langberg: He is opposed to the skatepark at the proposed site. It is a beautiful area and this is already a busy park. Concrete would change the appeal and tone of the park. The area cannot accommodate the extra traffic this 40,000 square foot facility would generate.

John Butterworth: He is opposed to the skatepark at the proposed site. He lives ½ block away from the parking lot entrance and has lived there for 21 years. He enjoys the various activities in the park, but this is too big for the open space left in Lower Woodland.

Daniel Barnett: He supports the proposed site. He is a skater and it has taken two years effort to get this site. The current design was prepared for this site. It will be a waste of money if the design must be done over for a smaller skatepark. He stated that there are many skateparks closer to homes than this one will be. This is not the last green space in Lower Woodland, as stated in earlier testimony — there are other open space areas at Lower Woodland. This site is consistent with Parks' policy that active uses be grouped at parks. Crime has decreased in the area around the Shoreline skatepark, since the skatepark was opened.

Gary Dunlap: He supports the skatepark at the proposed site. He lives at 5311 Woodlawn and held up a skateboard and dropped it. He stated that soccer field lights shine in his window at night and the players are noisy. There are other noisy uses at the park, too. He referred to the concerns about parking, as heard in earlier testimony. He sees many soccer players dropped off — if it is dangerous for skaters to be dropped off, then it is

also dangerous for soccer players to be dropped off. He believes many kids come to the park on bikes or walk and doesn't believe the parking will be an issue.

Jeff Guinn: He opposes a skatepark at the proposed site. He has lived across from the park since 1949. Small groups of people have stopped what he loves best about the area and now a small group of skaters want to put in a skatepark. There are lots of other places and he recommended the skatepark be in another site.

Tom Paulson: He opposes a skatepark at the proposed site. He only recently heard about the proposal and went to last night's design meeting. He thinks the design is good — only not at this site. Seattle Parks didn't follow its own public involvement policy and has pitted neighbors against each other. The community is not unilaterally opposed to a skatepark, as many favor the chip site. Placing the skatepark there would alleviate some of the neighbors concerns. He asked that the proposed site be reconsidered — (1) re-open discussion about site and let neighbors help decide; and (2) develop a master plan for skateparks.

Tamara Adlin: She opposes a skatepark at the proposed site. She was jazzed about a skatepark at Lower Woodland, but the current design is enormous. She urged that a drawing be prepared that includes the nearby playing fields. Put the skatepark back near the BMX course. Other sports share uses — She knows of no other sports where kids are dropped off by parents and left unsupervised — there is always a coach or parents to supervise. She believes the nearby neighbors are being asked to be the eyes and watch out for these unattended kids. The community is being asked to patrol the site.

Teresa Sumerall: She supports a skatepark at this site. She lives in Ravenna and drives her children to Shoreline and other skateparks. Kids need skateparks.

Stephen Lundgren: He is a resident of the Ballard area, is involved with the Skateboard Advisory Council, the Ballard Commons Park, and Ballard Bowl. He has watched the public process during the evolution of the City policy for skateboarding as a recognized, legitimate sport. They are learning a lot at the new Ballard Commons Park (which contains a skatebowl). They are still learning and working through issues such as garbage cans, lights, and impact issues at this new site. He believes a really strong design and involvement can come up with a great result. When funds are being put into public facilities, be careful that it is being done correctly. He reminded those present that community members can and do file appeals to major projects and not to dare them to legal action. As a long-time community activist, he has seen many public projects appealed and sometimes removed after they were built. He is a proponent of safety helmets at skateparks and would not drop his young son off at a skatepark or let him skate in a wet, soggy area. If a citywide skate policy isn't produced, we will have failed.

Isaiah Wishen: He supports a skatepark at the proposed site — it is a great site. He is 8 years old and has been skating 4 years.

The public hearing concluded. The Board will discuss the proposal and make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Seattle Parks and Recreation at its February 9 meeting. Written testimony will be accepted through February 8.

Briefing/Recommendation: Policies & Procedures Revisions/Eliminations

Eric Friedli, Director of Seattle Parks' Enterprise Division, briefed the Board on several policies and procedures and asked for revisions or eliminations of some policies. The Board received three written briefing papers and copies of the policies with proposed changes highlighted.

Written Briefing

#1: Concession Contracts and Use Permits

Requested Board Action

The Board is being requested to review and recommend action on Concession Contracts and Use Permits # 060-p3.9.1.

Project Description and Background

Parks Policy and Procedure # 060-p 3.9.1 establishes procedures for selecting concessionaires at park facilities. It was effective June 1973, modified in December 1977 and has not been updated in 28 years. Staff have reviewed the policy and concluded it is generally still appropriate but in need of some revisions. Attached is a copy of the policy for the Boards' review. The attached red-lined copy offers recommendations for changes to the policy.

The policy revisions being recommended update the names of positions with certain responsibilities and deletes references to a concession review board that has not been used for some time.

One concept to note is the proposed deletion of section 7.1.2 that outlines a process for reviewing capital improvement projects during the design phase in view of concession opportunities.

Public Involvement Process: This is predominately an administrative policy, no public review was conducted. **Issues** There are no issues with these policy revisions. **Budget:** There are no budget issues associated with this decision. **Schedule:** The policies would be revised as soon as possible. **Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends revisions to Concession Contracts and Use Permits # 060-p3.9.1 as attached.

#2 – Golf Operations

Requested Board Action

The Board is being requested to review and recommend action on certain policies related to operation of the City golf courses:

- Individual Reservations and Starting Times 060-p7.5.1 (1973)
- Golf Tournaments and League Play 060-p7.5.2 (1980)
- Golf Carts for Disabled Golfers 060-p7.5.3 (1983)

Project Description and Background

Three Parks Policy and Procedures as listed above each direct certain aspects of the operation of the golf courses. Copies of the policies are attached for your review.

1. Individual Reservations and Starting Times 060-p7.5.1 was effective July 1973 and has not been updated in 32 years. It specifies that tee-time reservations can only be made in person. Staff have reviewed it and determined it is obsolete and our current practices are counter to its direction. Current reservation practices are managed by our golf course management firm, Premier Golf of Seattle, and utilize a variety of reservation systems including internet and automated telephone systems. Staff recommends it be deleted.
2. Tournaments and League Play 060-p7.5.2 was effective in September 1974, updated in July 1980, and has not been revised in 25 years. It outlines working guidelines for golf tournaments and league groups. Staff have reviewed the policy and determined it is obsolete and should be deleted. Current practice is to have our golf course management firm manage the scheduling of the courses and manage tournaments and league groups. There is no need for a departmental policy independent of the golf course management firm.
3. Carts for Disabled Golfers 060-p7.5.3 was effective October 1983 and has not been updated in 22 years. This policy directs the use of carts on the golf courses by disabled people to minimize course damage by use of carts during wet periods. Currently there are special carts available for use by people with

disabilities when the course is open for cart use. This process is managed by the golf course management firm.

Given the evolution of the Departments management of golf courses, it is appropriate to delete these policies. The concessionaire maintains an operations manual which is reviewed by the Department and is the appropriate avenue for addressing policies related to the management and operations of the courses.

Public Involvement Process: The Golf Course Advisory Committee was consulted on this proposal and registered no comments or objections. **Issues:** There are no issues with these policy deletions. **Budget** There are no budget issues associated with this decision. **Schedule** The policies would be deleted as soon as possible. **Staff Recommendation** Staff recommends deletion of the following policies:

- Individual Reservations and Starting Times 060-p7.5.1
- Golf Tournaments and League Play 060-p7.5.2
- Golf Carts for Disabled Golfers 060-p7.5.3

#3 Red Barn Ranch

Requested Board Action

The Board is being requested to review and recommend action on Parks Policy and Procedure # 060-p 7.7.3 which directs the use of Red Barn Ranch and was effective December 1973.

Project Description and Background

Parks Policy and Procedure # 060-p 7.7.3 directs the use of Red Barn Ranch and was effective December 1973. It has not been updated in 32 years. Staff have reviewed the policy and concluded it is out of date and recommend it be deleted from the Policy and Procedure manual. A copy of the policy is attached for your review.

The Department currently makes no use of Red Barn Ranch and it is managed through a concession agreement with Camp Beracha. The Red Barn Ranch facilities do not lend themselves to use as anticipated by the policy.

Staff intend to review and make recommendations on the long term use and development of Red Barn Ranch in 2006. This is an underutilized department asset. Enterprise Division staff, working with Planning and Development Real Estate section, will develop a plan for this property in 2006.

Public Involvement Process There has been no public process to review the existing policy; there will be an appropriate public involvement process to develop a long term plan for Red Barn Ranch. **Issues** There are no issues with this policy deletion. **Budget** There are no budget issues associated with this decision. **Schedule** The policy would be deleted as soon as possible. **Staff Recommendation** Staff recommends deletion of Parks Policy and Procedure # 060-p 7.7.3.

Additional Information

Eric Friedli, 684-8369, or eric.friedli@seattle.gov

Verbal Briefing, Discussion and Discussion and Recommendation

Mr. Friedli introduced himself and reviewed the information in the written briefing. The reason for this briefing and recommendation is that some of the policies are being deleted and some are being amended. The Commissioners made the following motions and votes:

Commissioner Belbeck moved approval of the proposed changes to the golf policies. Commissioner Jackson seconded. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Collins moved approval of the proposed changes to the Red Barn Ranch policies. Commissioner Holme seconded. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Collins moved approval of the proposed changes to the Concessions Use and Permits. Commissioner Holme seconded. Commissioner Belbeck made a friendly amendment to add language to clarify and Commissioner Collins accepted the amendment. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

The Commissioners thanked Mr. Friedli for the briefing.

Final Briefing: Piers 62/63

Kevin Stoops, Seattle Parks Major Projects and Planning Manager, and David Graves, Seattle Parks project manager, introduced themselves and gave an update briefing on the Feasibility Study for renovation of Piers 62/63. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing.

Written Briefing

The January 26 presentation to the Board is the final briefing before the Board on the Feasibility Study. No action is requested at this meeting.

Project Description and Background

The entire piling system supporting Pier 62/63, which was the home of Summer Nights on the Pier and other major public events, is deteriorated and public use has been restricted. The Mayor proposed undertaking the Pier 62/63 Replacement Project, beginning in 2005, in the proposed 2005-2010 Capital Improvement Program. During the 2005 budget process, the City Council approved a \$500,000 expenditure from the Cumulative Reserve Fund for planning and preliminary design for the project. In addition, the Council adopted a Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) requesting “that the Department present alternative design concepts for a renovated Pier 62/63 open space prior to proceeding with the project.” And, in the beginning of 2005, the Mayor directed Parks to coordinate planning for the pier replacement with the Central Waterfront planning work under way by the Department of Planning and Design.

During 2005, Parks undertook a feasibility study of future planning concepts for Pier 62/63, the Waterfront Park, and for a new parks space atop the Alaska Way/SR 99 tunnel lid from the vicinity of the Aquarium to Steinbrueck Park and the Pike Place Market. This effort was coordinated with the Department of Planning and Design’s Waterfront Concept Plan effort, and involved previous presentations to the Board of Parks Commissioners as well as various meetings and presentations with their Waterfront Partners group. In late June, however, when intermediate findings of the study were presented to the City Council’s Committee of the Whole on the Alaska Way/SR 99 project, the Council indicated that that the feasibility study was moving too fast, that it should not be submitted for decisions on Pier 62/63 before the Waterfront Concept Plan was in place, and that there should be more public involvement in the process of working toward a new master plan.

As a result of the Council’s reactions, we have completed the feasibility study, are now ready to forward design guidelines to the Seattle Department of Transportation for the Alaska Way lid, and embark on an environmental impact statement (EIS) process for the waterfront public spaces at Pier 62/63 and Waterfront Park.

The EIS will further evaluate the planning concepts outlined in the feasibility study (see attached); further investigate key environmental issues such as marine habitat and land use compatibility; and provide a forum for broad public input. Following the EIS, we will recommend a new master plan for the central waterfront parks to replace the obsolete “Portal to the Pacific” plan that was adopted in 1996 and called for a new aquarium at Pier 62/63. Since that plan was adopted, decisions have been made to focus the Aquarium at Pier 59, which is now undergoing extensive structural repairs and which will be remodeled by the Seattle Aquarium Society in the next two years.

Schedule

We anticipate completing the EIS in mid 2006, making recommendations later that year, and submitting legislation to the City Council for adoption of the master plan in the first quarter of 2007. We would like to brief the Board in August after comments are received on the Draft EIS, and then present staff recommendations on a preferred master plan in October and November. A public hearing before the Board on the staff recommendation would be in order at that time to help the Board to formulate its recommendation to Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds. We anticipate a Departmental recommendation to the Mayor, and submittal of legislation to adopt the master plan in early 2007.

The EIS process will be funded with monies previously appropriated for planning and preliminary design of Pier 62/63. Any future redevelopment of the site of Pier 62/63 and Waterfront Park will require new funding.

Decision Timeline:

- Determination of Significance: issued January 12, 2006
- EIS Scoping meeting: February 2, 2006
- Draft EIS: May 2006
- EIS Hearing/Comment Period: June 2006
- Final EIS: September 2006
- Staff Recommendation: October 2006
- Parks Board Review, hearing and recommendation: November 2006
- Parks Recommendations: December 2006
- Mayor's Recommendation: January 2007
- City Council legislative action: March 2007

Additional Information

Kevin Stoops, 206 684-7053 or e-mail at kevin.stoops@seattle.gov, or David Graves at phone 684-7048 or e-mail at david.graves@seattle.gov

Verbal Briefing/Discussion

Mr. Stoops gave a brief verbal report. He stated that the Park Board has heard three briefings on the condition of the piers in the past year. He displayed several large drawings showing three schemes: waterfront use, the connector (land uses), and aqua link (land uses). He described all three and noted that they are described in detail in the Feasibility Study. He next showed the timeline for the project, which described tasks, which City department would lead the task, and the end date. Parks has reacted to City Council's concerns that it slow the process down and has done so. It is doing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and he described the five alternatives that Parks could take.

Mr. Graves gave details on the EIS process. The first step is scoping and taking public comments on the scope. The technical memos should be out on April 1 and the draft EIS (DEIS) will go out to the public on May 31. Parks staff will come back to the Board after the scoping process and after the close of the DEIS. City Council action is anticipated for the first quarter of 2007.

Commissioner Pflaumer asked when the Commissioners want the next briefing. Commissioner Collins answered that he would like a briefing when the preferred alternative starts to "jell." Mr. Graves agreed with this and will also bring the preliminary estimated budget information to this briefing. Commissioner Holme commented that the Park Board is another means for the public to hear about this project.

The Commissioners thanked Mr. Stoops and Mr. Graves for the briefing.

Discussion/Recommendation: Draft Viewpoint Designation Procedures

David Graves, Seattle Parks' project manager, briefed the Board at its September 22, 2005, meeting on this designation. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

The central issue is that while the Parks' Policy & Procedures Manual contains procedures for naming a new park, there are no procedures or decisional criteria to assist Parks staff and community members in designating a park as a viewpoint. Currently a park could be named as a viewpoint, such as Ursula Judkins Viewpoint, without any analysis as to the cost of creating the viewpoint and the long term operation & maintenance costs. Included herein are Draft Decisional Criteria for the Board's review.

The requested action is a recommendation from the Board that these be adopted as an interim measure. Staff will then work together and with community groups as appropriate to analyze the four suggested pilot projects and return to the Park Board for a final recommendation to the Superintendent.

Project Description and Background

Seattle Parks and Recreation owns and manages a number of parks which are named as viewpoints or overlooks, that contain developed viewpoints or view areas, or which merely afford views of prominent natural and man-made features. Views and viewpoints receive unique status under the City of Seattle's regulatory framework. However, we as a Department don't have a consistent policy and procedure for the designation of new viewpoints. Existing viewpoints such as Betty Bowen Viewpoint at Marshall Park have also suffered from a lack of vegetation management over the past several decades. Due to a lack of such maintenance, recapturing the view is much more expensive in time, resources, and capital outlay than ordinary ongoing maintenance.

During the course of the summer, I visited over fifty (50) parks to assess the quality and character of the views. I also convened a mini focus group to learn what people expected when a park or portion of a park was designated as a viewpoint. In general, we agreed to a working definition of a viewpoint, as follows:

People expect to see something that they can't see from their back yard. A viewpoint is an endpoint or destination; when you get there you expect to see something scenic or interesting. The view doesn't have to be Mount Rainier, Lake Washington, Puget Sound or the Olympics, but it does have to be commanding in some sense.

Public Involvement Process

Preliminary analysis of viewpoints was presented to the Board of Parks Commissioners on September 22, 2005 with an outline of decisional criteria as to how a new viewpoint could be designated. I have also met with Parks' Senior Urban Forester (Mark Mead) to review the criteria. Finally, I have met with the Magnolia Community Club, and their Executive Committee, to discuss these criteria as they have an interest in the Ursula Judkins Viewpoint. Based on these meetings, the decisional criteria have been refined.

Issue

The following are the draft decisional criteria and analysis. I have also attached a spreadsheet that begins to show how the four pilot sites fit the draft decisional criteria.

Draft Decisional Criteria:

- *Park name, history* (if relevant, i.e. was the site purchased/given as a viewpoint), *size & location, slope stability and/or other ECA issues*;
- *Where is the optimal view on the site*; Define the viewpoint and viewshed (horizontal and vertical). The viewpoint should be physically located on a map with the horizontal and vertical view sheds to enable the Senior Urban Forester to accurately determine the amount of vegetation removal that is

needed. Vegetation management should be consistent with the Vegetation Management Plan Guidelines contained in the parks Policy & Procedures Manual;

- *What is the object of the view, either existing or after vegetation management; Include an analysis of the potential for a view, i.e. if the site is currently vegetated, what the view could become in an ideal situation where there was only low growing vegetation that would not obstruct the view. How does the view compare to other parks/viewpoints in the area. Is the view duplicative of views from surrounding areas or is it in a priority area which is lacking in services/facilities. How much “bang for the buck” is involved, i.e. do we open up a lost view of Mt. Rainier or is it merely a view of Capitol Hill.*
- *Is the view/viewpoint potentially a local or regional attraction; Additionally, what does/would the viewpoint contribute to our overall park system. What are the existing site amenities;*
- *What are the surrounding amenities/attractions; i.e., parking, Metro Bus access, etc.*
- *Is the view the central focus of the park or merely one of the amenities;*
- *What site improvements are needed; e.g. on-site parking, ADA access, etc.*
- *To what extent is vegetation removal needed (now or future); The analysis should not be an all or nothing approach – could the view/views be recaptured over time such that the incremental cost would be relatively low. Additionally, could this be done with volunteer labor (is there a Friends of ____ group).*
- *Is vegetation to be removed to create or enhance the view in public or private ownership;*
- *Estimated cost of vegetation removal, both initially and long-term maintenance; are outside funds and/or volunteer labor available such that Parks can reduce its initial capital and/or operation & maintenance expenditures (e.g. has a Friends of ____ group formed?)*
- *Estimated cost or description of need improvements; Both initial cost and estimated long-term maintenance*
- *Staff recommendation for/against viewpoint designation & rationale.*

Four pilot sites have been identified on which to test these criteria. The four pilot sites are:

- Horiuchi Park
- Mount Baker Ridge Viewpoint
- Ursula Judkins Viewpoint
- MacLean Park

All of the chosen sites are new or relatively new parks with a view. While two have been named as viewpoints, there has not been a formal designation as such.

Budget

Adoption of the Draft Decisional criteria will give Parks staff tools by which to estimate the short term and long term costs associated with a potential viewpoint. Staff time to undertake the analysis will have budget impacts but they are anticipated to be small in comparison to the value of the information that will be provided to the community and decision makers regarding any new park/viewpoint.

Schedule

If these draft Decisional Criteria are adopted as an interim measure, staff will begin immediately to work through the analysis and with any community group as appropriate, on any or all of the suggested pilot sites. SEPA review and determination will also be done on the Decisional Criteria prior to any final action. Analysis could be presented to the Board in March/April 2006 for final action.

Staff Recommendation

Staff requests the Board recommend the draft Decisional Criteria be adopted as an interim measures and direct staff to analyze one/all of the suggested pilot sites to determine if they should be designated as a viewpoint.

Additional Information

If you any questions, contact David Graves at 684-7048 or e-mail to david.graves@seattle.gov.

Verbal Briefing

Mr. Graves briefly reviewed the information in the written briefing. The Board suggested several minor revisions and asked Mr. Graves to come back to the Board with a new version of the policy that reflects these revisions. Mr. Graves agreed to do so.

Board of Park Commissioners' Business

None.

New/Old Business

- Park Board Retreat/Brown Bag Meeting Postponed: The Board decided to postpone both its February 2 events: the annual retreat and the brown bag scheduled with Councilmembers Della and Godden. It was anticipated that the vacant position on the Board would have been filled by the previously set date for the retreat. The Board decided to re-schedule the retreat once the new member has been selected. The brown bag was previously scheduled with two of City Council's Parks, Neighborhood, and Education Committee. Because that committee membership is currently changing, the Commissioners decided to wait and meet with the new committee members.
- Park Dedication Update: Commissioner Holme noted that the dedication of the new Ballard Commons Park has been changed to Saturday, March 4, 1:00-2:00 pm.
- Budget Discussions: The Superintendent noted the 2007 budget process meeting scheduled for Saturday, January 28.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

APPROVED: _____
Kate Pflaumer, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____