

Department of Parks and Recreation

Seattle Board of Park Commissioners Meeting Minutes February 25, 2010

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
Jourdan Keith
Diana Kincaid
Donna Kostka
Jackie Ramels, Chair

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

Tim Gallagher, Superintendent
Christopher Williams, Deputy Superintendent
Susan Golub, Strategic Advisor

Commissioner Ramels called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and reviewed the meeting agenda topics. The agenda was approved as presented. There were no minutes or record of correspondence presented at this meeting.

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/>.

Discovery Park Wildlife: A couple of years ago Parks and Recreation held meetings in Discovery Park to teach people about living with wildlife, especially the coyotes who roam in the Park. Parks is resurrecting these meetings with a March 4 session on "The Urban Coyote" at the Discovery Park Environmental Education Center. The talk will cover what people can do to prevent conflicts with coyotes, such as keeping trash in enclosed containers and not putting pet food outside.

Magnuson Park Building 11 Artists: On May 1, Building 11 LLC will take possession of Building 11 at Magnuson Park, as authorized by City ordinance. Artists who have had spaces in the building will be moved out at that time. Almost five years ago Parks informed the artists that they would have to leave when the building was redeveloped, and the artists have been on month-to-month leases since that time. In August 2008, Parks met

with the artists and offered to help them find an alternative site. After an extensive search, which included sites all over the city, two closed public schools emerged as potential locations: E.C. Hughes in West Seattle and Viewlands Elementary near Carkeek Park. The artists rejected E.C. Hughes because it was too far away. Viewlands was rejected because the artists thought their relocation there would divert Parks attention from a possible future redevelopment of Building 30 at Magnuson for artists studios.

ARC All-Council Annual Meeting: Over 200 Associated Recreation Council (ARC) volunteers and staff, and Parks staff attended the ARC Annual meeting on February 24. 2009 was a record year for participation in ARC programs and the Department is grateful for ARC's financial support in keeping programs going.

Volunteer Park Encroachments: Parks is getting good cooperation from 13 property owners bordering Volunteer Park whose private use has encroached into Park property. As of February 18, one property owner fully removed an encroachment; five have applied for permits to remove encroachments within 90 days; and staff is working with the remaining owners to achieve encroachment removal.

Arboretum Gateway to Chile Project: Construction of the Washington Park Arboretum Pacific Connections Garden Phase II will begin in the summer of 2010. The main project is Gateway to Chile which will include a colorful display of Chilean plant species. The project is funded by the 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy and a \$290,000 contribution from the Arboretum Foundation. Before construction of the new garden begins, roughly 34 trees that do not contribute to the horticultural collection will be removed. These trees will be replaced with 72 Chilean trees.

Magnuson Building 41: Parks and Recreation has a contract with Seattle Court Sports Unlimited to develop a tennis center at Magnuson Park. The original lease envisioned renovation of Building 41. As detailed structural engineering work was completed it became clear that the cost of renovation did not make sense. New plans to demolish the building and build a new clubhouse on the original building footprint have been developed. Some neighbors are questioning the demolition, as Building 41 has been designated as contributing to the Sand Point Historic District. The State Historic Preservation office has given approval for the demolition, but a nomination for City landmarking has been submitted to the Department of Neighborhoods. An environmental review (SEPA) process is being initiated and will be sent to the City's Historic Preservation Coordinator for review.

NOAAA Access Road: Parks and Recreation is exploring opening up the NOAA access road to provide service into Magnuson Park. Parks, NOAA and the Seattle Department of Transportation are coordinating the project; if for some reason it does not go forward, SDOT has committed to work with Parks to develop an access road north of The Mountaineers Building.

Seafair: Seafair is late paying the Department for park use permit fees and has asked for a fee waiver. Parks has denied the waiver, but has negotiated a 3-year payment agreement to collect the Seafair debt.

Aquarium Transition: By City ordinance, the Seattle Aquarium Society (SEAS) will take over management of the Seattle Aquarium on July 1. SEAS is preparing a report which will describe new exhibits for 2010. Issues regarding transition of employees continue to be worked out, with some Aquarium staff becoming SEAS employees, and some remaining City employees.

Community Gardens: Parks is exploring the issue of community gardens. These are different from p-patches in that individuals do not control spaces in community gardens as they do in p-patches. An inventory of existing community gardens was distributed to the Board.

Discussion/Recommendation: Fees and Charges Setting Policy

Written Briefing and Draft Policy

Requested Board Action

The Board is being requested to gather public feedback and make recommendations on a proposed Fees and Charges Policy. This initial briefing will be followed by a public hearing on February 11, 2010. The Commission will be asked to make recommendations on February 25, 2010.

Purpose

The objective for a fees and charges policy is to establish a consistent and equitable framework for setting prices for parks and recreation programs, services and facility use that recognizes 1) the trade-offs between community benefits and individual benefits and 2) the costs of providing programs, services and facilities.

Background

In response to their request, in June 2009 the Superintendent provided to the City Council a review of Seattle Parks and Recreation fees and charges. That review provided background on the legal context, outlined best practices research, summarized information from other jurisdictions, and described policy options. A formal fee policy proposal was not offered at that time but a general outline was introduced. The fees and charges review was shared with the Board of Park Commissioners and an initial briefing on this topic was provided on September 10, 2009. The Board hosted a public hearing on November 5, 2009. The intent of the earlier briefing and public hearing was to gather input from the Commissioners and the public prior to developing a formal policy proposal. In fall 2009, the Seattle City Council adopted a Statement of Legislative Intent "request[ing] the Department of Parks and Recreation to submit a fee policy proposal no later than March 31, 2010."

The lack of existing policy guidance for setting fees is recognized in Parks and Recreation's Strategic Action Plan (SAP), which calls for an evaluation of fees and charges policies for programs and services (Goal 6.D.1i-v). Specifically it calls on Parks and Recreation to "evaluate current fee structures and establish fee policies that consider equity, cost recovery, consistency, and clear understanding for the public" (Goal 6.D.1).

One of the significant challenges is determining a program cost for fee based programs. This is a critical component for measuring cost recovery and establishing a fee policy. Having cost data directly linked to specific programs would be ideal when assessing cost recovery related to fees and charges. Unfortunately, systems are not in place to precisely assign costs to the programs and facilities for which Parks and Recreation collects fees. Staff has developed a method for allocating costs to programs and facilities that utilizes existing information and provides a benchmark for linking fees with cost recovery goals. The verbal briefing will include walking through the methodology and explaining the information sources and calculations.

Next Steps

- Public Hearing, February 11, 2010.
- Board of Park Commissioners discussion and recommendation, February 25, 2010.
- Policy proposal to City Council March 31, 2010.
- Use the policy to develop fees and charges proposal for the 2011/2012 budget.
- Assess the policy and fee setting process after the 2011/2012 budget process is complete.
- Refine policy and fee setting process as appropriate in 2011.

Additional Information

Eric Friedli: eric.friedli@seattle.gov

Board Discussion

Eric Friedli, Manager of Parks Policy and Business Analysis Unit, reviewed the public comments that were given at the February 11, 2010 public hearing. Commissioner Keith stated she thought the representative from Co-Rec Soccer made a good point in noting that Co-Rec fees have increased 271% since 2001, and there are 800 fewer Co-Rec teams now than there were in 2002. Is Parks inhibiting use due to fees being too expensive?

Mr. Friedli stated that some of the issues related to fee increases include better quality fields and inflation. There is also the question of what profit margin Co-Rec has, which could result in higher fees to participants. Field use continues to rise each year.

Superintendent Gallagher noted that if there was a 50 team decline in teams in one year, Co-Rec included that same 50 for each year between 2002 and now, when counting how many fewer teams there are. As other sports, such as lacrosse and ultimate Frisbee have grown, soccer may be on a natural decline, not related to fees. Also, the proposed Policy isn't related to what fees are charged; it provides the steps Parks will use to establish fees.

Commissioners Ramels and Adams noted the difficulty in separating the conceptual policy from potential impacts. Commissioner Adams applauded the work, noting it was well put together, but citing the difficulty in assessing impacts. He requested a future case study to illustrate how the policy will work.

Mr. Friedli stated one of the benefits of the policy is that users will be able to understand how Parks established a fee. Politics and reality will regulate how the policy will be used; the fees will have to be acceptable to the public, Mayor and City Council.

Commissioner Kincaid expressed a concern about the generally high cost of living in Seattle, expressing worry that sports, which are important for young people, may be less accessible with higher fees. Commissioner Gallagher directed attention to Section 6.6 which provides for scholarships.

Commissioner Kostka expressed concern that the cost recovery guideline could be imposed subjectively. Mr. Friedli responded that the policy is written to provide flexibility in that regard; the guidelines allow for a look at the bigger context of the whole system when setting fees. The market may bear more than cost recovery for some activities. For example, the guideline for adult golf is for 110% cost recovery and the additional revenue could be used to subsidize youth golf.

Commissioner Keith asked where community demographics are considered; where in the policy does Parks look at who the programs are serving? Superintendent Gallagher responded that an example is rowing. This is considered a high individual benefit. However, rowing programs for teens in Southeast Seattle are considered high community benefit and will therefore have a lower fee.

Commissioner Holme expressed a concern about access to select sports programs for low income youth, as Section 4.2.3 included higher skill level programs as having an individual benefit, and it already is difficult for low income youth to join these programs. Commissioner Holme asked what avenues are available for scholarships for non-Park and Recreation programs. Mr. Friedli replied that fee reductions are provided to groups, so low income teams could apply as a targeted population.

Motion: Mr. Holme moved recommending removal of Section 4.2.3 from the policy. Removal of this section would eliminate higher skill level programs from being described as providing an individual benefit.

Vote: The Board unanimously concurred with the recommendation to remove Section 4.2.3.

Neal Adams asked what process is used to communicate fee changes with the public. Superintendent Gallagher explained that when fee changes are proposed, they are first sent by the Department to the Mayor and City

Council and are discussed as part of the Council's budget process. Mr. Friedli stated that after a fee change is approved, posters go up in all facilities and the change is included in facility brochures.

Commissioner Ramels asked how the policy will affect ARC fees. Superintendent Gallagher responded that he approves ARC fees and that ARC will be following the new policy.

Commissioner Holme expressed a concern about classifying specialty gardens as fee-based.

Vote: By consensus, the Board recommended deleting specialty gardens from the fee-based category.

Motion: Commissioner Adams moved to recommend approval of the Fees and Charges Setting Policy, as amended by the Board.

Commissioner Kincaid expressed a concern about guaranteeing enough free activity, noting that public access must be protected.

Commissioner Ramels said she would support the policy, but that doing so was a leap of faith as the consequences for parks users is not clear. Commissioner Holme agreed. He requested that staff report back to the Board after initial implementation. Superintendent Gallagher said staff will come back in two months with an assessment of specific fees, to include case studies for some fee changes.

Vote: The Board voted to recommend the Fees and Charges Setting Policy be adopted. The vote was five in favor and one abstention.

Briefing: SR 520 Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

This briefing is being held at the request of the Board of Park Commissioners. No action is requested from the Board at this time. This briefing is being provided to update the Board on the status of the SR 520 project and process, provide an overview of the options, and answer any questions on the project or the process of submitting comments in response to WSDOT's March 8 comment deadline. Previous briefings were held on September 14, 2006 during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement public comment period, on January 12, 2006 regarding the original Pacific Street Interchange design and on January 22, 2009 and September 24, 2009.

Project Background

The project before the Board of Park Commissioners is the SR 520 Project, formally named the ***I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project***. As you may recall, there were three alternatives originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS):

- A new 4-lane structure with a variety of options;
- A new 6-lane structure with a variety of options; and
- A no action alternative.

For both the 4-lane and 6-lane alternatives, the project limits extend along the SR 520 corridor from I-5 in Seattle to 108th Avenue NE on the Eastside (just west of I-405). The 6-lane alternative also includes minor improvements to eastbound SR 520 between I-405 and 124th Avenue NE. Also, both the 4-lane and the 6-lane alternatives could include a Pacific Street/Arboretum interchange.

The Governor-sponsored the Westside Mediation Process has come to a close and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) prepared a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

(SDEIS) to analyze the three new alternatives which came from the mediation process. The Westside Mediation Process included representatives from neighborhoods surrounding the SR 520 project and the Montlake interchange, the City of Seattle, the University of Washington (UW) and the Arboretum Foundation. The mediation was led by private mediators hired by the Governor's office. They met for approximately eighteen months. The goal of the mediation was to have the participants reach consensus and forward a preferred alternative to the Governor. Instead, the process yielded three alternatives which are variations on the original alternatives. These new alternatives are significantly different from the original that they warranted additional environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act/Washington State Environmental Policy Act.

The SDEIS was issued on January 22, 2010. There are three alternatives, plus a no-build alternative analysis in the SDEIS:

- Alternative A: Similar to the original 6-lane option with the addition of a second bridge over the Montlake Cut
- Alternative K: This alternative moves the intersection from Montlake Boulevard to McCurdy/East Montlake Park; the actual interchange is 60 feet below grade and there is a tunnel under the Montlake Cut which connects to Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard at the entrance to the Husky Stadium parking lot. There is also a land bridge/berm over SR 520 which connects the north and south halves of Marsh Island.
- Alternative L: This alternative also moves the intersection from Montlake Boulevard to McCurdy/East Montlake Park; the actual interchange is elevated and there is a bridge over the Montlake Cut which connects to Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard at the entrance to the Husky Stadium parking lot. Access between the north and south halves of Marsh Island is under the freeway similar to what exists today. Note that the land bridge/berm could be added here.

Public Involvement Process

WSDOT has held and continues to hold numerous public meetings with community groups, organizations and public agencies. Seattle Parks and Recreation is one of the many public departments and agencies which has been and continues to work with and comment on WSDOT's proposal.

Impacts

There are potentially significant impacts associated with the project, particularly to the Arboretum and other parks within the SR 520 corridor. The project will impact the following Parks/park facilities:

- Bagley Viewpoint;
- Montlake Playfield
- East Montlake Park
- McCurdy Park
- The Arboretum
- Lake Washington Boulevard (Park Boulevard)
- The Japanese Garden
- Arboretum Waterfront Trail

Impacts to these Parks and park resources include:

- Loss of Bagley Viewpoint;
- Impacts to submerged park lands/loss of aquatic recreation opportunities at Montlake Playfield;
- Structure width - Shading of vegetation, impacts to terrestrial and aquatic habitat and passive recreation areas at Montlake Playfield and the Arboretum;
- Structure height (positive & negative)
- Through traffic on Lake Washington Boulevard in the Arboretum;
- Noise and traffic impacts on the Japanese Garden and the Arboretum;

- Permanent closure of the Lake Washington Boulevard on/off-ramps to SR 520 (reduces traffic through the Arboretum - positive impact);
- Visual impacts of noise walls on the Arboretum;
- Pacific Street/Arboretum Interchange – direct impacts to the north end of the Arboretum, particularly Marsh and Foster Islands and East Montlake and McCurdy Parks; spillover traffic impacts throughout the Arboretum;
- Loss of the MOHAI building;
- Loss of McCurdy Park;
- Impacts to East Montlake Park;
- Use of the WSDOT peninsula; and
- Construction and construction staging impacts.

Note that there are also potentially significant natural resource and cultural impacts which are being reviewed by State and Federal agencies and the Tribes. The City is comprised of many agencies and Parks is coordinating with the other departments to ensure that we speak as a coordinated whole.

Mitigation/Compensation

All three alternatives result in the complete loss of Bagley Viewpoint. Bagley Viewpoint is approximately 0.1 acre and located on Delmar Drive. The viewpoint provides views of the UW, Lake Washington and the Cascades. WSDOT is proposing a lid over SR 520 in the same location to mitigate for the loss of the viewpoint.

The north end of the Arboretum is a mixture of property ownership: City of Seattle, UW, Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Arboretum Foundation. The Port of Seattle also owns property along the Montlake Cut which is potentially impacted by the project. Of particular importance is the Arboretum Waterfront Trail which runs from the parking lot in McCurdy Park, across Marsh and Foster Islands, along the east side of Duck Bay, ending approximately at the intersection of Arboretum Drive and Foster Island Road. This trail was originally constructed with funds from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund and then rehabbed with Washington State Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) funds which gives the area special protection under Federal (Sec. 6f of the Land & Water Conservation Fund legislation) and State legislation and requires very specific mitigation for impacts to this resource.

The three alternatives have very different impacts in the Arboretum. Depending on the alternative, the different property owners and properties are also impacted differently. At this point WSDOT has only provided a summary of the park areas impacted, it is not broken out by property owner¹:

	Temporary	Permanent
Option A	6.51 acres	2.82 acres
Option K	10.90 acres	3.50 acres
Option L	8.12 acres	4.62 acres

Mitigation

The Arboretum area presents a unique suite of mitigation requirements across a variety of jurisdictions. The project will impact wetlands in the area of the Arboretum and Montlake Playfield. Impacts to the wetlands are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Washington State Department of Ecology and potentially the Seattle Department of Planning & Development if a Master Use Permit is required. Impacts to wetlands must be mitigated by enhancing existing wetlands/wetland buffers and/or creating new wetlands at legislation-specified ratios depending on the rating (functions & values) of the impacted wetland. The focus of

¹ Note that this does not include the area known as the WSDOT peninsula. This area is owned by WSDOT and includes the R.H.Thompson ramps to nowhere. While it is owned by WSDOT, Parks maintains the area as part of the Arboretum and it is used for recreation purposes making it ineligible as replacement property under 6f.

the wetland mitigation will be in the Arboretum/Montlake playfield area first before looking outside of the area. The UW natural area on the north side of Union Bay may also present wetland enhancement opportunities.

Lake Washington is a migration route for Chinook salmon which are listed and thus protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act. Any potential impacts to listed salmonids are the jurisdiction of the US Fish & Wildlife Service/National Marine Fisheries Service.

There are going to be less quantifiable impacts to the Arboretum, both in the short term and in the long term, such as construction noise and highway noise from vehicles. There are also view impacts; i.e., views from and within the Arboretum may change significantly depending on the option chosen. The higher the main line of the highway, the more visible the structure. That said, a higher structure may lessen the noise impacts and could actually improve recreational access by making the area under the highway more open for canoe and kayak access and open up the area of the trail that passes under the highway to connect the north and south portions of Foster Island.

Portions of the Arboretum and East Montlake/McCurdy Park will be used by the contractor for long periods of time for temporary staging and/or construction of the new highway and demolition of the existing structure. All of these impacts will warrant mitigation pursuant to NEPA. The SDEIS has begun the process of identifying mitigation. Temporary construction impacts may be addressed with compensation which could fund improvements to the Arboretum based on the Arboretum Master Plan. In addition, a contractor will be required to return any areas used but not retained by WSDOT to their pre-construction state regardless of any required mitigation.

If there is no direct access to SR 520 from Lake Washington Boulevard; i.e., no Lake Washington Boulevard ramps, traffic through the Arboretum will likely decrease (Option A). However, with SR 520 access from Lake Washington Boulevard as designed in Options K and L, traffic volumes through the Arboretum will increase as drivers travel through the Arboretum to get on/off SR 520. These traffic impacts will also require some form of mitigation.

One opportunity for mitigation is the tolling. Due to the ongoing impacts to the Arboretum from SR 520, both the mainline through the north end of the Arboretum and the access to and from the on/off ramps on Lake Washington Boulevard, a surcharge could be added to the toll which would then be used to fund ongoing operations and improvements within the Arboretum as identified in the Arboretum Master Plan.

Compensation

Section 4f of the Federal Highways Act provides that no park land can be taken for transportation purposes unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative. For any park property that is taken for the SR 520 project, WSDOT will have to pay the property owner the value of the property.

A City ordinance, often referred to as Initiative 42, precludes the conversion of park property to a non-park use without replacement of like property. In the end, WSDOT will have to compensate the City for any loss of park land. The UW owns a significant portion of property in the north end of the Arboretum and a large portion of Marsh Island and East Montlake Park are owned by DNR.

The MOHAI building and underlying property is owned by the City but operated by the museum. The MOHAI building will be demolished as part of the project and WSDOT will have to compensate the City/MOHAI for the value of the building and the underlying property. Note that the Arboretum Master Plan envisioned the MOHAI building as future space for Arboretum functions once the building was no longer used by the museum.

Finally, as previously noted, the north end of the Arboretum receives unique status due to section 6f of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. If property that is protected under 6f is converted, i.e. taken for other than

recreational purposes, property of similar recreational utility must be provided. Monetary compensation is not an option. Property of similar recreational value must be provided as compensation. Equal value but not equal acreage is required. In this case, replacement property must be waterfront property with similar recreational utility. An additional point is that WSDOT can not condemn property for mitigation purposes; they have to find a willing seller and pay fair market value. Property that has previously been in recreational use is not eligible as replacement property. Finally, temporary impacts are mitigated by paying the lease value of the property. However, "temporary" is limited to 180 days by statute. The National Parks Service has the final say in the appropriateness of the replacement property, with input from the State Recreation & Conservation Office (RCO) and the City and UW. The local branch of the National Parks Service is pushing to loosen the "temporary" definition to allow greater flexibility. In the SR 520 case, there are areas that may be occupied by WSDOT for up to five years for construction, but ultimately the property will be returned to the underlying property owner.

Given this 6f requirement, WSDOT is interested in identifying early acquisition sites to replace the three to five acres of park property that will be converted. Note that the three to five acres are not exclusively Parks' property; it is also UW and DNR ownership. Beyond the typical waterfront lots around Seattle there may be other types of property to suggest to WSDOT as potential early acquisitions.

The above is a sketch of the scope of mitigation/compensation requirements associated with the SR 520 project. As the project moves forward and the final alternative is chosen, the impacts will become more well defined and the requirements clearer. At this point, Parks is working with the UW and the other City departments to ensure that the impacts to Parks' and thus City property are accurately presented so that we are prepared to work through the mitigation and compensation requirements, options and opportunities with WSDOT.

Schedule

The public comment period was originally scheduled to end on March 8, 2010; however, WSDOT will be extending the deadline to an as yet determined date, perhaps the end of March. The issue at hand is the alternatives outlined in the SDEIS. The City will coordinate its internal review of the project such that we can provide a coordinated response to WSDOT. The SDEIS is also an opportunity for the Board of Park Commissioners to comment on the project.

Additional Information

If you any questions regarding the SR520 project, contact David Graves at 684-7048 or e-mail to david.graves@seattle.gov.

WSDOT's SR 520 Project Website is:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/bridgeproject.htm>

Verbal Briefing

David Graves, Parks Senior Planner, informed the Board that the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the SR520 project was issued in January. The deadline for public comments is April 15, 2010. The SDEIS analyzed three options: A, K, and L.

The Board has the opportunity to submit comments on the SDEIS; the City will be providing comments representing the concerns of all departments, and the Arboretum Botanical Gardens Committee (ABGC) will be submitting comments as well.

Commissioner Kincaid asked Mr. Graves to describe the A+ option that has been in the news and the possibility for light rail to be added to the bridge. Mr. Graves described A+ as having a higher slope than option A, and so would require less storm-water pumping. It is more open underneath at Foster Island. A+ has been supported

by the State legislature. Mr. Graves further noted that options K and L have ecological problems, more so than option A.

Regarding light rail, Mr. Graves stated that there is no assessment of light rail in the SDEIS; it could be considered in a supplemental or addendum environmental review. He noted the pontoons for the floating part of the bridge are being designed now for high capacity transit so that they will be able to accommodate added weight.

Old/New Business

Board Vice Chair Election: The Board voted on who should be vice-chair of the Board. The vote was three for Neal Adams and three for Diana Kincaid.

Motion: It was moved and seconded that Commissioner Adams and Commissioner Kincaid split the year, with each taking the position for one-half of the remaining ten months of the year.

Vote: The motion was approved by a vote of seven in favor and none against. Mr. Adams will serve as vice-chair through July 2010; Ms. Kincaid will serve as vice-chair from August 1-December 31.

Time Limit for Public Comments: The Board discussed changing the rule that people speaking during the public comment period be limited to two minutes. Commissioners Holme and Kincaid spoke in favor of allowing three minutes, and restricting the comment time to fifteen minutes at the beginning of the meeting, to be resumed at the end of the meeting if not everyone who wanted to had the chance to speak.

Motion: It was moved and seconded to allow speakers during the public comment period of the meeting to speak for three minutes. Public comment will be allowed for a maximum of fifteen minutes at the beginning of the meeting, to be resumed at the end, if needed. If a lot of people sign up to speak, the Board chair will have the flexibility to reduce the permitted speaking time to two minutes.

Vote: The motion was approved unanimously.

Committee Reports:

ARC Annual Meeting – Commissioner Adams noted that the ARC Annual meeting was an impressive event, highlighting people's commitment to the work of ARC and to parks. The awards given to volunteers were impressive.

Waterfront Committee: Commissioner Kostka stated the work of the Waterfront Committee was moving forward. A public meeting/workshop is to be held this Thursday and next Saturday to explore what people want to see on the waterfront.

Downtown Parks Committee: Commissioner Ramels noted that the Downtown Parks Committee created a subcommittee to analyze the management structure for downtown parks. The subcommittee will be meeting next week.

Parks and Green Spaces Levy Oversight Committee: Commissioner Holme stated the Levy Oversight Committee was working on the Opportunity Fund Program. 150 initial applications were received, a record number. The deadline for complete applications is April 1.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

Jackie Ramels, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____