

Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation

Seattle Board of Park Commissioners Meeting Minutes April 11, 2013

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:

Antoinette Angulo
Jourdan Keith, Vice-chair
Diana Kincaid, Chair
Brice Maryman
Caitlin McKee
Tom Tierney
Barbara Wright

Excused:

Yazmin Mehdi

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff

Eric Friedli, Acting Deputy Superintendent
Michele Daly, Acting Park Board Coordinator
Susan Golub, Strategic Advisor
David Graves, Senior Parks Planner
Mark Mead, Senior Urban Forester

This meeting was held at Seattle Park Headquarters, 100 Dexter Avenue North. Commissioner Diana Kincaid called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm. Commissioner Angulo moved approval of the consent items including the April 11, 2013 meeting agenda and the minutes from the February 21, March 14, March 28 meetings and acknowledgement of correspondence. Commissioner McKee seconded; the motion carried.

To hear and view the full meeting, see <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=5591316> Part 1 and <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=6394> Part 2.

Welcome Tom Tierney, New Park Board Commissioner

Acting Deputy Superintendent Eric Friedli welcomed Tom Tierney as the newest member of the Board of Park Commissioners. Tom served as the Executive Director of the Seattle Housing Authority from 2004-2012. During his tenure as Executive Director, the number of households served increased by more than 2,000 even as federal funding was curtailed. Twenty-six high-rise buildings were rehabilitated which serve over 2400 seniors and people with disabilities. Tom was a senior executive with the Port of Seattle from 1998 to 2003. From 1985 to 1998 Tom held high-level positions with the City of Seattle. Eric stated Tom was a significant influence in his personal career. Tom stated he was honored to be appointed to the Board and looks forward immensely to working with the Department in what he considers a hugely important Commission.

Board Announcements:

The Board of Park Commissioners is canceling its May 9 meeting. Board members will be attending the Parks Legacy Plan public meetings in May. The complete public meeting schedule is available at <http://www.seattle.gov/parks>. Because of the meeting cancelation, this is Michele Daley's last meeting. Commissioner Kincaid expressed appreciation to Michele for filling in as the Acting Park Board Coordinator since mid-January, stating she has done a tremendous job for the Board.

Commissioner McKee noted she will be missing the summer Board meetings as she will be in Geneva, Switzerland interning for the United Nations environment program as part of her UW graduate program. Caitlin's *Get Engaged* appointment to the Park Board expires in August. Chair Kincaid stated Caitlin has done a tremendous job and it has been a great pleasure having her on the Board.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience: None

Presentation: Friends of Gas Works Park – National Register of Historic Places Listing

Pat Waddell, from the Friends of Gas Works Park, showed a PowerPoint presentation of Gas Works Park emphasizing continued stewardship efforts at the park. The organization has requested removal of fencing around two of the old gas works towers, is interested in moving the Play Barn project forward, and installing solar panels.

Mr. Waddell described Gas Works Park as the sole survivor of 1,400 gasification plants in the United States. With an international reputation as a prototype for industrial site conversions, Gas Works Park has received worldwide recognition, won numerous design and environmental awards, and attracts visitors from around the world each year. The remaining relics of the former Gas Plant serve as totemic artifacts. Richard Haag and Associates completed the Park Master Plan in 1972. The last phase of Park construction was completed in 1978.

Richard Haag stated the Friends of Gas Works Park are pleased to present the plan for improvement of the outdoor play area and integrate that with the Play Barn. The Gas Works Park Children's Play Area renovation includes soft seat swings, a spray and splash pool, modern play equipment, multiple slides to connect indoor and outdoor play areas. Other major objectives include daylighting dark areas inside the Play Barn, a mural to incorporate history, art education and bring the play area up to current ADA and safety standards for accessibility.

Mr. Haig noted the Levy funding is scheduled to be expended in 2014 but the planning should begin now. The Parks and Green Spaces Levy, passed in 2008, includes \$1,400,000 to renovate the play area and improve and address safety. The Friends of Gas Works Park request planning begins now.

Tom Grant, Friends Board member, spoke about the Free the Towers initiative. Removing the fence would allow people to come to the park and have a richer understanding of the energy related history and the industrial history of the park. The Friends request the chain-link fencing be removed around Towers 1 & 2.

To promote more solar energy, the Wallingford neighbors are advocating for alternative energy installations at high profile public places such as Gas Works Park. The Friends have received permission to put solar panels on the roof. The roof needs work anyway so it is a perfect marriage of doing some repairs to the roof and adding the solar panels. They have been working with Wallingford to get funding for the solar panels. The solar modules honor the industrial nature of Gas Works Park and will be 21st century energy generators.

Commissioner Angulo is proud to be a neighbor of Gas Works Park and would be very interested in getting the solar project information.

The Friends asked the Board for a recommendation regarding the play area design. Chair Kincaid stated the Board is not in a position to vote on a recommendation at this time as it needs to gather information from all parties regarding the fencing history, the development of the play area and the solar project.

Commissioner Wright moved the Board form an Ad Hoc Committee to review issues related to Gas Works Park. Commissioner Keith seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Gas Works Park National Register of Historic Places Listing

In 1999 Gas Works became a City landmark; in 2002 a State Landmark, and in January of 2013, it went on the National Register of Historic Places. Patricia Fels of FOGWP stated this is a very prestigious award and makes Gas Works Park an important place for the entire nation. The towers and the gas works are part of the National Register because it is the last intact gas works in the nation. It is the story of energy and seeing what fueled Seattle in the old days. It was a pivotal moment of taking a toxic site and turning it into a park. It set a standard nationally in landscape architecture and design of an urban park.

A letter from the State Historic Preservation Officer was read into the record by Commissioner Kincaid:

Dear Mr. Haag: It gives me great pleasure to inform you that the following property, Gas Works Park, 2000 N. Northlake Way, Seattle, has been listed in the National Register of Historic Places, where it joins other properties, which contribute to the rich cultural heritage of Washington State. The Park is historically significant for its direct association with serving the broad recreational needs of the citizens of Seattle and for its radical reformation of what was considered a park. The design conserved a part of Seattle's industrial heritage along with introducing a groundbreaking experiment in bioremediation into urban life. The Park was listed at the National level of significant as a project that represents the work of master landscape architect Richard Haag and as a resource that embodies the distinctive characteristics of landscape architecture in the 1970's. The creation of the park set a new precedent in landscape design both nationally and internationally.

The National Register records the tangible reminders of the history of the United States and is the official repository for documentation of cultural resources worthy of preservation

I am pleased to provide you with this honor, and to commend your support and stewardship of this significant property. Allyson Brooks, Ph.D. State Historic Preservation Officer

Ad Hoc Committee Report – Proposal to Designate MacLean Park as Viewpoint:

On March 28, 2013, an Ad Hoc Committee of the Board of Park Commissioners conducted a public hearing on a request from the public to designate MacLean Park as a viewpoint. Commissioners Kincaid, Barber and Wright were present. <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=5591312>

Commissioner Wright noted the Board received a great report from the Department about what some of the concerns were regarding creating a viewpoint at MacLean Park. The Ad Hoc committee received very good comments from the park neighbors of why the park and viewpoint is important. The expense of maintaining the views would be significant and in some cases not possible since potential view blocking vegetation is on private property. The park is adjacent to the Northeast Queen Anne Greenbelt. It is important to have vegetation to hold the hillside, and there are other publicly owned properties in the area with the same view.

At the conclusion of the March 28 hearing and discussion, the Ad Hoc committee made a motion:

Commissioner Wright moved the ad hoc committee recommend the Department work with the community and come back to the Board with ideas of how we could preserve the views, stabilize the ground and address the issues of the slope stability, and also look at how we can accomplish the goals of the greenbelt for the funds

that were used to buy those properties. Commissioner Barber seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

David Graves, Senior Parks Planner, and Mark Mead, Senior Urban Forester, answered questions from the Board. Commissioner Wright noted the Board would like to work with Mark to come up with a plan that would be agreeable to the neighborhood to manage the vegetation without designating the site as a viewpoint.

Mark was first approached about making MacLean Park a viewpoint 13 years ago. A platform was built but the area was not designated to be a viewpoint. If the park were designated as a viewpoint, the Department would be responsible for maintaining the trees to preserve the view. The work required to maintain the views would include topping and/or full removal of trees and the care of extremely steep slopes covered by invasive species.

The Viewpoint Naming Policy was recently prepared by David Graves. The Department has done an extensive amount of work on viewpoints throughout the city. On Queen Anne there is Kerry Viewpoint, Louisa Boren and most of the boulevard. There is also a very nice viewpoint up around the corner from MacLean Park that is maintained by the Department of Transportation; there is a power line that goes down the hill, which helps keep that viewpoint maintained. It needs to be determined how the trees should be maintained if the MacLean Park is designated as a viewpoint. The trees have been topped/trimmed before. One issue is balancing the amount of work required to preserve the view with the amount of traffic the Park gets.

Commissioner Wright asked if the greenbelt could be managed such that as the trees die or get diseased they could be replaced by trees that would not add to the obstruction of the view. Mark replied that the majority of the native trees in the Pacific Northwest are going to grow over 60-feet, and this area is a native forest. A landscape could be created that would not interfere with the view if that is what is decided, but it would not be native-growing trees. The issue of trees on slopes is a combination of biology and geology. If there is underlining geological instability of the slope, trees are not going to add or detract from that. What trees will do is hold on to the surface soil and reduce erosion. The trees intercept the water preventing erosion. The Big Leaf Maple does a good job of holding the slopes and soils.

Mark stated the Department can do a Vegetation Management Plan for MacLean Park and work with adjacent property owners to suggest appropriate pruning to maintain the views.

Commissioner Wright asked Mark to meet with the neighbors as a place to start and then come back to the Board and report what kind of an agreement has been worked out. Chair Kincaid noted the Ad Hoc committee was talking about a Vegetation Management Plan (VMP). The community is very interested and active in helping to do the volunteer work. They also spoke very highly of working with David Graves. The Board is aware of Mark's schedule and some work would have to be shifted to allow time. Vegetation Management Plans do cost staff time and someone assigned to do the work. There is a Vegetation Management Plan for the Greenbelt but it is not for management of a view.

Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli noted the Board is recommending not designating the park as a viewpoint; the recommendation is for the Department to work with the community to develop a VMP that helps preserve the views and preserves the forest restoration goals. Commissioner Wright said the Ad Hoc Committee recommended tabling the viewpoint designation until after Parks develops a VMP.

Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli suggested part of the Board's recommendation could include coming back to the Board only if there are unresolved issues. The Ad Hoc Committee agreed and requested to be informed in the future about the Park.

Discussion/Recommendation: Parks Legacy Plan – Vision & Mission

Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli commended Susan Golub, Susanne Rockwell, Joel Hart and other staff who have been working on the Parks Legacy Plan for a year. Staff had to meet many deadlines and got the project done on time and of high quality. It was decided the Department had the expertise and did not have to hire a consultant. The Department got a better product than a consultant could have done for a fraction of the cost. He cannot applaud staff enough for the work they did.

Susan related the Department started working with the Board last October to evaluate and perhaps revise Parks' Vision, Mission and Values statements. The Board came easily to consensus on the Values statement: Access, Opportunity and Sustainability. In October, the Board could not come to consensus around new Vision or Mission statements so the task was forwarded to the Board's Strategic Planning Committee, which met in late February and came back in March with recommendations. When the recommendations came to the Board on February 7, there was limited time for discussion at the end of a long meeting and no consensus around the Committee recommendations. The April draft of the Plan has the Department's current Vision, Mission and Values statements. The second draft of the Plan will be coming out in mid-June so it is possible at that time to have revised Vision and Mission statements or affirm the existing Vision and Mission. The Final Plan will come out in the fall.

Commissioner Wright reported on the Strategic Planning Committee's proposals. There was quite a bit of discussion about calling the Plan, Parks Legacy Plan. Calling it the Parks Legacy Plan implies that it is the legacy of the future. In listening to the Superintendent and the Department talk about the plan it is also the legacy that already exists and answering the question as how to protect it. The Committee wanted to get their arms around both things. The Committee included Commissioners McKee, Barber, Wright and Heahlke.

The recommendations from the Strategic Planning Committee are:

Vision: (existing: Creating Community through People, Parks and Programs)

1. Honoring the legacy; innovating for the future
2. Honoring the legacy, enriching the human spirit; and innovating for the future
3. Enriching the spirit through people, parks and programs.

After considerable discussion, Commissioner McKee made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Wright, that the Department consider the proposed Vision:

Honoring our parks legacy; enriching the human spirit; and innovating for the future.

Mission:

Seattle Parks and Recreation provides welcoming and safe opportunities to play, learn, contemplate and build community, and promotes responsible stewardship of the land.

Commissioner Tierney noted a new version of the Plan will be out in June and inquired what would the Vision and Mission statements motion be used for; would it be used in June for the second version? Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli related these statements will be put forward and people will be asked what does this mean to you; how does it make you feel, are there other options? The Department has a series of staff meetings scheduled to talk about the first version of the Legacy Plan and will use that opportunity to get reactions to these proposals. This is a significant step and is greatly appreciated. Commissioner McKee requested the statements be presented as proposed by the Park Board but it is up to the staff to choose their Vision statement.

Board members provided reports on their attendance at the Department of Neighborhoods District Council meetings; Board members attended the meetings to inform the public about the Legacy Plan and the upcoming public meetings. Commissioner McKee and Commissioner Kincaid attended the NE District Council meeting on April 4th. There were many questions about the Legacy Plan. There were concerns about what was going to be happening and what the Commissioner's role would be. It was a good way to start a conversation. Commissioner McKee encouraged people to attend the meetings and give their thoughts. Some of the questions were about budget – what is the purpose behind the Plan and how does it relate to money and how the Department manages money. Commissioner Kincaid added it was friendly and welcoming. The Legacy Plan meetings are an opportunity to voice ideas, concerns and really look at the Plan and give input about priorities, what really matters to them. The Commissioners talked about the survey as some people thought the Department wrote the Plan without any input, so the Commissioners clarified that there was a survey to obtain public input for the Plan.

Commissioner Maryman went to the Ballard District Council on April 10th. It was a perfect night to attend, as it was their 20-year anniversary so there were many people in attendance. There was a woman at the meeting who is a member of Friends of Burke-Gilman Trail and she was concerned about the on-going maintenance and wondered about how the plan would affect the trail. There was a question about funding options, which was a little bit of the cart before the horse question. The Plan is trying to assess what the community's expectations are - in terms of level of service and what they want to see out of the Department. How do we calibrate the resources to that level of expectation?

Commissioner Wright attended the Lake Union District Council meeting. The District Councils bring in all the people within the district who have a variety of special interests: people who are working hard and making great contributions in the community. Councilmember Bagshaw also attended this meeting. There was confusion between the Parks Legacy Plan and an upcoming levy committee. The issue about a Metropolitan Park District was quite a spark as there were people there that thought the decision had been made and were convinced certain people had taken certain positions. It was a little contentious at times but an interesting discussion. Everyone was engaged and being encouraged to attend the May meetings. It was a great experience to prepare the Board members to start talking with the public and understanding different viewpoints. Commissioner Kincaid noted there has not been a lot of interaction between District Councils and Parks and she thinks that this is an important step to bridge and bring the communities out and start interacting with them – it is a healthy step. Commissioner McKee added that many people at the NE District Council were curious about the Park Board and when it met, so it was nice to bridge that gap.

There is a special email address: parkslegacy@seattle.gov People invited to comment. Commissioner Maryman asked when feedback is due on the document. Comments are due May 22nd. At the June 13 Park Board meeting there will be a more detailed discussion; the second draft is hoped to be completed by June 15th. The community draft contains no recommendations; there are a series of questions. The June version will have recommendations. For the funding proposal, the Department will prepare a series of investment initiatives that will be linked to recommendations in the Legacy Plan. The Department will not take every recommendation in the Legacy Plan and expect it to be funded but what they want to be able to do is take those investment initiatives, link them back to a recommendation in the Legacy Plan. We will have the Plan and then the investment initiatives that will provide the basis for a ballot measure.

Commissioner Maryman inquired if the investment initiatives will identify which items are able to be invested by a ballot measure versus what can be invested in through other measures. Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli replied yes, and it may not be new money. It might be more linked to efficiency; something that the Department is going to do differently or more efficiently.

Superintendent's Report:

Legacy Plan: The Department is going to have a special working lunch with representatives from the key partnership groups: Aquarium, Zoo, Forterra, the Arboretum Foundation, Associated Recreation Council, the Park Foundation and the Park Board Partnership Committee in mid-May to focus on the plan and look at some of their special needs and special opportunities. Commissioner Angulo asked what meetings the Friends of groups will be invited to attend. They will be invited to the environmental focus meeting on May 16. Everyone is invited to all the meetings.

Mentorship Program: The 2013 Mentorship program began today. Staff were asked if they would like an opportunity to be mentored by someone in the Department. The Department requires all the Strategic Advisors and Executives to be mentors. If there is anybody that has been with the Department and has particular experience and is interested in being a mentor, they are also asked to participate. Staff have been given 80 hours between now and October of their work time that they can meet with their mentor to form a partnership to develop personal and professional success. They can do job shadowing or whatever activity they and their mentor agree is helpful. 43 staff members have expressed interest in this year's mentoring program. It is a fun and successful program.

Magnuson Park Radiation Contamination: Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli informed the Board of a news story last week about low levels of radium contamination at Magnuson Park. The Department has been dealing with this issue for three years. There are a couple of buildings that the Navy used for painting glow-in-the-dark (radium) instruments. The Navy is responsible for the cleanup and communication with the State Department of Health and Department of Ecology. The contamination is in Building 27 where Arena Sports is now. The area used by Arena Sports is completely clean; there was a contaminated shed and the Navy has done a lot of remediation in that building already. Hangar 2 has some contamination also and they have found some outside. The speculation is that the custodian cleaned the paint, mopped the floors and spread it around, then dumped their mop bucket outside.

Magnuson Park/NOAA Access Road: Several letters have been written and a number of follow-up conversations have been held regarding park access via the NOAA road. The facilities manager from NOAA headquarters visited Seattle and did a walk through assessing Parks need to use the NOAA road for access to Magnuson Park. He was clear we should be able to work this out and have a pilot by June 1st. However, he has since moved to the Department of Commerce so he is not in the picture any more. The person who has stepped in for him does not have the same collaborative approach so we have taken another step back. Commissioner Kincaid will be writing another letter to NOAA from the Board requesting use of the access road.

Alcohol Use in the Parks: One of the challenges in our parks is alcohol use; and especially as we get into the spring, it is underage drinking. Children's Hospital has developed a great program where they are trying to do educational programs on underage drinking, currently focused on northeast Seattle. They are having a program on April 25, from 6-9p.m. at Magnuson Park reaching out to underage drinkers by trying to educate them and their parents.

Old/New Business

Elections: Susan Golub referenced the Board's by-laws: the Board's Chair and Vice-Chair terms run from April 1 through the next March 31st. Diana and Jourdan are just finishing their first term and, according to the by-laws, they can run for a second term. Susan sent notices out to Board members asking if anyone was interested in running against them and no one was interested, which was taken as a vote of confidence.

Commissioner Maryman made a motion that Diana serve as Chair and Jourdan as Vice Chair until March 31, 2014 for the Board of Park Commissioners. Commissioner Angulo seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Partnership Committee Report:

Commissioner Wright noted that about a year ago the Park Board formed subcommittees. The committees provide an opportunity for small groups of Park Board members to meet and discuss draft ideas for consideration by the full Board. Each committee is responsible for developing a work plan and timeline for approval by the full Board. The Partnership Committee formed to help recommend actions on how Parks can strengthen existing partnerships and cultivate other potential partnerships. Members of the committee are Brice, Antoinette, Diana and Barbara. The goal of the Partnership Committee is to strengthen a shared vision between Parks and major community partners, with a clear implementation framework. To this end, the Partnership Committee interviewed Park's major partners on how to reach a shared vision. Interviews were arranged with leadership from the Seattle Parks Foundation, Associated Recreation Council, and Forterra during the week of February 25, 2013.

Partnership Committee members used a semi-structured interview guide comprised of the following questions that were asked of all three partners:

- a. How would you define your role in providing park and open space opportunities in Seattle?
- b. Would you like to change your role?
- c. What does your organization need from the Department of Parks and Recreation and/or the Board of Park Commissioners to be successful?
- d. What works well now?
- e. What are the impediments to getting your work done?
- f. What best practice partnership models do you know of, if any, that could be used in Seattle?
- g. How would you describe a successful partnership model?
- h. How can a shared vision with the Department of Parks and Recreation and/or the Board of Park Commissioners be strengthened?

The following is a summary of the results from these interviews, organized in a non-attributed report by Partnership Committee members.

- Partners highly value their partnership with parks. Generally, the partnerships are working well due to unwavering shared values and a trusting relationship at the highest levels of leadership.
- Parks leadership is supportive of partners. All partners feel they are well supported by the Parks Superintendent's Office.
- Seattle parks system is wonderful but undervalued.
- Sustainable parks funding: parks partners recognize the imminent need for sustainable funding.

- Partners are in it for the long haul and want to be more engaged. Parks partners want to be in the room to share the future “[we've gone] from standing in the hall to wait for the reality, to standing in the room to help shape the reality.”
- Parks partners agree: Good partnerships make a good impression on the public (e.g. leveraging funds and other resources).
- New ideas and fresh perspective are needed constantly in a dynamic partnership.
- Organizational culture and sector differences. Non-profit organizations are very different from government agencies and the cultural differences can cause tension and create opportunities.
 - They have different worldviews, structures, and strategies. The relationship can be synergistic due to what each partner is able to do. Government is organized in a way that makes moving quickly difficult (e.g. budget process, capital projects, etc.). Non-profit organizations are more nimble by nature and necessity. Non-profits are undercapitalized and need to make decisions well and move quickly. Leaders have to be dedicated to the partnership to allow this tension to be manageable and used in creative ways.
 - Differences in budget cycles and processes. The City budget process can be disruptive to Parks partners with respect to shared strategic planning and program implementation.

Opportunities to Further Leverage Partnerships:

- Shared vision. There is a need for a shared vision for the Seattle parks system that is articulated and out in the public.
- Fundraising. Non-profit partners are able to raise funds episodically, but are not well-suited to raise regular operating funds.
- Flexibility and turnaround. Non-profits are more flexible than public sector agencies and deserve to move more quickly in project approval and completion processes.
- Open communication about the differences. A constant dance exists between Parks and its non-profit partners with respect to agreed-upon deliverables, roles, and the level of expectation given the two different environments. “Partnerships between non-profit organizations and governments are now in a cultural transition. For things to work, it is important to discuss the differences openly.”
- Deepen the partnership. Partners are interested in being more than contractors; they want to be real partners with Parks, grounded on emerging needs and a deep connection to all of the communities that Parks serves.
- Public education and advocacy. Partners can assist with developing a brand for Parks in a way to energize parks and public space. They can also help advance the conversation about public space to the top of agendas. A vision for Parks needs to be sexy and aspirational. “Currently, a vision hasn't been articulated. There is a long history of civic leaders running the agenda.”
- Lobbying. Non-profits can have conversations with elected officials in different ways and this can be beneficial to government agencies. Partners can find alliances with other broad civic approaches.

- Accelerate capital projects. Individual park capital projects can languish if they aren't completed timely and partners have difficulty sustaining donor interest.

Critical Elements for a "true" partnership - What is a "true" partnership?

- The missions, visions, and values for the individual partner organizations should be aligned among leadership.
- A successful partnership model is interactive, mutually supportive, and trusting with consistent quality of efforts among partners.
- It is critical for the partnership to stay intentional and relevant.
- Role clarity is critical; roles must be clearly defined.
- A true partnership is not looking for partners that are a "mini-me".
- The impact of a true partnership with Parks is felt across the whole Parks system.

Recommendations:

- Regular communication to enhance coordination. Set up and maintain standing meetings with major Parks partners for optimal coordination of activities and programming.
- Quarterly meetings. A high level quarterly meeting with all major partners could address successful models for interactive, mutually supportive and trusting partnerships
- Trust. Intentional activities and meetings addressing trust building could help strengthen relationships and provide different approaches to working with new partners.
- Roles. The roles within the partnership need to be clearly defined on joint ventures.
- Integration. Establish a way to integrate major partners into the Parks system. This could look like board representation by partners in an ex-officio capacity.
- Decision-making. Involvement of partners in major decision-making could strengthen partnerships and bring fresh, new ideas.
- Sustained funding for Parks. "The never-ending budget battles and process are exhaustive" [for Parks partners]. It is critical to find an alternative funding strategy that is critical to quality of effort and is a vote of confidence in the programs.
- Messaging. For creating a successful future funding package, a good message to the public would be how clever government is with partnerships and how much more you can get when government partners with non-profits.
- Pilot accelerated capital project. Pilot a capital project on an accelerated schedule to see if ideas could be gained from the pilot to accelerate other public/private projects in the future. Reducing project completion time could address donor fatigue when projects take several years to realize.

Future Discussion for Partnership Committee

- To learn more about the multitude of partnerships that is less well known.
- Develop relationships with leaders at other organizations where partnerships could be cultivated.
- Identify what other partnerships need to be cultivated to realize the Parks Legacy Plan.

Commissioner Wright noted when the report was presented to the Superintendent and staff they were enthusiastic about the recommendations the Committee made and Christopher had many ideas how to take this information to the next step. One of the ideas for the Legacy Plan was to bring in the major partners and meet with them separately in addition to the other public meetings as a way to really hear from them.

Much of the Partnership's work has been included in the draft Legacy Plan. Christopher and Susan reviewed the Partnership report with the Department's Executive Team so the Department's Division Directors and Strategic Advisors have a copy of the committee's report. They have been directed to think about it and how the Department can work on implementation strategies. This report was also sent to the Department's Partners. Commissioner Angulo thanked Commissioner Wright for being the Committee's chair and keeping the committee on task. Commissioner Wright said everybody on the Committee worked hard. Commissioner Angulo organized the final report from the Commissioner's notes. The Board commended the Committee on its work.

Commissioner Keith moved the meeting be adjourned; Commissioner Maryman seconded the motion and the motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm.

APPROVED: _____

Diana Kincaid, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____