

Seattle Parks and Recreation
 Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners
 Subcommittee: Investing for the Future Q&A (From 4/10/22 Meeting)

Proposal Title	Request for Follow-up Information	SPR Response
Climate Conscious Buildings (Andy)	<p>Q (Deepa) For this proposal can we get more information re:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projection of greenhouse gas emissions overall 2) Cost of proposal without solar array 	<p>1. OSE estimates that SPR’s greenhouse emissions is as follows. OSE estimates the electrification of SPR’s buildings (excluding the 2 outdoor pools, comfort stations, Aquarium, Zoo and some small buildings) could achieve approximately 92% in carbon savings and 36% in energy savings over the long run. Note that the current proposal as funded estimates being able to electrify 1-2 buildings annually assuming outside leveraged funding.</p> <p>kWh: 13,043,209 Therms: 668,548</p> <p>Carbon: 8,251,484 lbs / 3,750 MT CO2e Energy: 111,371,311 kBTU</p> <p><u>Estimate of Electrified Case</u></p> <p>kWh: 20,878,408</p> <p>Carbon: 676,954 lbs / 308 MT CO2e Energy: 71,258,408 kBTU</p> <p>Carbon Savings: 92% Energy Savings: 36%</p> <p>2.Solar array is estimated at \$250K annually, so the proposal without it would be about \$2.87M.</p>
Water Reuse Partnerships (Andy)	<p>Davon/Deepa: Could SPR get back to us about possibly scaling this proposal if we want to fund the locations deemed middle and lowest disadvantage?</p>	<p>The proposal is currently funded to address the 3-4 sites currently deemed middle and lowest disadvantaged. Reductions to the proposal would reduce the number of sites depending on the scaling.</p>
Inclusive Outreach & Engagement (Justin)	<p>Sean asked about ways to share best practices and learning among community applicants to help share</p>	<p>Many grant applicants are currently connected to their communities through the work they do . We also connect new applicants with returning</p>

Proposal Title	Request for Follow-up Information	SPR Response
	<p>information and increase community capacity in the future.</p>	<p>applicants and gather annual feedback from awardees.</p> <p>If the proposal is recommended, the goal is to host 4 networking and information sessions for the grant awardees one in Spring/Summer and one in Fall/Winter which will allow awardees to come together to meet, have open dialogue, and engage in a topic such as marketing, community outreach, program development, technical assistance, budget development, etc. Topics will be based on an awardee survey.</p>
<p>Seattle Conservation Corps Expansion (Andy)</p>	<p>Members expressed support, but several wanted to more information from the department about the SCC program: how people get into program, program outcomes, whether enrollees return to homelessness, relation between SPR involvement in removing encampments vs. this program, what the partnership among various City agencies looks like (what are their roles), how money will be spent.</p>	<p>To address the questions and requests below, Brian will send the link to the SCC web site to the group and Andy will prepare a 10-minute presentation about the SCC to the group at the 4/16 meeting.</p>
<p>New Park Development (Andy)</p>	<p>1. Deepa: Can we get a list/more info on the top 3 or 4 of highest disadvantaged sites?</p> <p>2. Sean: Also a breakdown of how investments applied; how</p>	<p>1. High level estimates to invest in 3-4 of the highest disadvantaged sites (Bitter Lake Reservoir, Duwamish Park Waterway, Lake City Floodplain, Cayton Corner, and or Gateway) would range between \$10-\$11M over 6 years (or \$1.7M-\$1.8M annually). Note the two high priority sites, Bitter Lake and Duwamish are the most expensive because of size, existing site conditions, etc.</p> <p>2. For projects at very early planning stage, we haven't determined the exact breakdown of their budgets at this point. Our standard budget estimate form includes the following breakdown for the total cos</p>

Proposal Title	Request for Follow-up Information	SPR Response
	<p>much going to design, administrative costs.</p>	<p>t of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3% for planning (design program, administration, public involvement), • 15% for design (10% for design contract + 5% permit, surveys, reviews, administration, etc.) • 80% for construction (62% for base contract + 6% tax + 7% contingency + 5% for inspections, administration, close out).
<p>Acquisition Funding (Michele)</p>	<p>Deepa: I understand that property acquisitions present themselves when opportunities arise. How can these opportunities be leveraged in a more equitable way?</p>	<p>As described in the proposal summary, SPR’s acquisition priorities include opportunities to add parkland in equity areas, opportunities to acquire land within existing greenbelts and natural areas, and opportunities to expand existing parks and opportunities to increase park and recreation space through donations, easements, transfers of jurisdiction, etc.</p> <p>The below properties were included in the Cycle 1 End Report and aligned with these categories (equity areas in bold):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Inholdings in existing greenbelts and natural areas</u>: Kiwanis Ravine, Delridge Wetland, Burke Gilman Greenway, Madrona Ravine, Orchard Street Ravine, Thornton Creek North, Thornton Creek – Kingfisher, Leschi Natural Area/ Greenbelt, West Duwamish Greenbelt – SW Marginal Way, Cheasty Greenspace, SW Queen Anne Greenbelt, , Longfellow Creek Natural Area and E Duwamish Greenbelt • <u>Opportunities to expand existing parks</u>: Genesee Park, Schmitz Park, Duwamish Waterway Park, Terry Pettus Park, North Rainier • <u>Opportunities to increase park and recreation spaces through donations, easements, transfers of jurisdictions, etc</u>: SUN Park (donation)