

BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 8, 2001

Present: Bruce Bentley, Chair

Karen Daubert
James Fearn
Susan Golub
Michael Shiosaki
Kathleen Warren
Staff: Patricia McInturff, Deputy Superintendent
Michele Daly, Park Board Coordinator

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bruce Bentley at 7:03 p.m. The agenda was approved as distributed.

Correspondence: Invitation to unveiling of "Windows on the Savanna," letter from King County Noxious Weed Control Program, e-mails from Marina Skumanich, James Snell, JackragMac regarding Tree Policy comments, Notice of Landmarks Preservation Board public meeting regarding Pier 59, Fees & Charges update notice, e-mail from Inge Strauss regarding Magnuson Park Sportsfields and News Releases from Ellen Taft and Parks regarding Volunteer Park dogs off-leash area.

Oral Requests and Communications from the Audience:

John Spear requests informational signage be mandatory for any tree work permits and not just notifying property owners within 300 feet of the area of work. The public and other residents of the area can be hugely affected beyond the 300 feet notification requirement. He referenced West Raye Street and the lack of public notification.

Rob Cockerham requests department staff contact him regarding field renovation work at Riverview Park in West Seattle as he desires information on the project and how he can propose some ideas for the complex.

Curtis Fukushima is concerned the policy does not provide a process to identify trees that need to be trimmed or removed that interfere in ballfield play areas. He

specifically cited Laurelhurst ballfield spectator viewing area for safety. The policy does not provide a quick remedy for this kind of situation.

Bob Kildall asked if the Park Board's recommendation could be delayed as the revised tree policy was just made available to the public and he would like a chance to review and comment on the revisions.

Bill Farmer, Friends of Athletic Fields, reiterated the Friends' support of the Sand Point/Magnuson Park plans and expressed excitement for the proposed high quality sportsfield complex.

Rick Hemmen stated the policy is a bit "gray" in terms of removing park property trees affecting a private property view. He would like to see better definition in terms of when private property owners can participate in the removal of trees and the size of tree that would be allowed to be removed.

Roger Belanich has concerns about removal of trees by private parties from the view corridors of parks. There are issues about removing trees that are obstructing a view. There seems to be a contradiction in the policies about whether a person can step forward to help the city on issues he thinks the city is remiss in by not maintaining view corridors within the parks and whether a private person can really participate in tree removal with the required plans, expense and community participation. The policies are not clear; no predictability.

John Nicon attended the proposed tree policy public meeting at Miller Community Center and subsequently wrote a letter for which he requests a response. He asked if there was an example in the city where joint planning could happen. He suggests Louisa Boren Lookout site be used as a demonstration of how the policy can work and requests people contact him to get this underway.

Janet Law addressed the liability issue when possibly dealing with unstable land. The liability issue is not clear. It is difficult to have people sign on to something where there may be a landslide or other problem result in their backyard.

Superintendent's Report by Patricia McInturff, Deputy Superintendent

- Superintendent Ken Bounds is in New York for the bankruptcy auction of the Family Golf/Interbay contract.
- **Discovery Park Vegetation Management Plan** – Parks hosted a public meeting on January 29. Over 50 citizens attended and were briefed on the goals and process for development of the plan. Citizens expressed interest in removal of non-essential roadways/pavement but wanted the

retention of blackberries in some areas of the park for recreational picking and eating. Another concern was the use of herbicides.

- **Aquarium** – An article was published in the PI regarding the Central Waterfront Citizens Advisory Committee recommendation of three alternatives for the new Aquarium. The committee recommends the new aquarium be built on a new pier located where the historic Pier 59 is currently located. Pier 59 would be moved south to Waterfront Park. The recommendation will come to the Park Board and City Council in March.
- **Mariners Legacy Project** – The Mariners have committed the Legacy Project to the Department which is a program that comes with Seattle hosting this year's baseball All-Star game. The next steps are to decide upon a specific scope of work, develop some additional funding sources and begin the PIP. Parks presented a \$2 million list of potential improvements for the Lower Woodland Athletic complex to the Seattle Mariners Community Relations team.
- **Pioneer Square Pergola Restoration** - Seidelhuber Iron & Bronze Works has removed the pieces and structure of the pergola under a "declared emergency." We have reopened the park to the public. The pergola is being cleaned, sandblasted and moved into Seidelhuber's shop. They will complete the cataloging of the pieces that can be reused and the ones that need re-fabrication or recasting.
- **Neighborhood Appreciation Day – February 10** – events scheduled throughout the city.
- **Carkeek Park Closure** – Police temporarily closed Carkeek Park on February 1. They had received a call regarding a possible armed man in the park. After a thorough search involving helicopter patrol, dog patrol and several Police units, the hunt was called off.

Kathleen Warren inquired about the report in the newspaper regarding Woodland Park Zoo's elephant "Chai" and her treatment while on breeding loan. The Department is preparing a news release and copies will be forwarded to the Park Board.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of January 25, 2001 were reviewed and approved as distributed. (Approved minutes are now being placed on the Parks and Recreation web page.)

Items of Interest to the Board

Karen Daubert requested a Civic Center briefing be placed on a future Park Board agenda.

Board Retreat is confirmed for March 27, noon. Location to be determined.

Joint City Council Culture, Arts & Parks Committee/Park Board Public Hearing regarding the Arboretum Master Plan is scheduled for March 28, 5:30 p.m., in the City Council Chambers.

Camp Long Sherman Rock – an evaluation of the climbing rock, written by Jim Ishihara on February 7, 2001, was distributed to the Park Board members.

Proposed Land Rights Exchange in Fairmount Ravine - Mac MacDonald, property owner:

Terry Dunning, Parks Real Estate Manager, informed the Board that the Department has received a proposal to exchange certain property rights in the Fairmount Ravine area of West Seattle. An orthophoto showing the Duwamish Head Greenbelt area was distributed and a larger one displayed. In exchange for legalizing Mr. MacDonald's existing driveway, he has proposed trading a parcel above Harbor Avenue SW together with his underlying ownership rights to the unopened street rights-of-way adjacent to his house. The proposed easement would be a 12-foot wide non-exclusive easement to serve a single residence on MacDonald's property. MacDonald would maintain the driveway. The Department and general public would have the right to use the driveway to access the open space but MacDonald would not be permitted to use the driveway to access more than one residence. If, in the future, Mr. MacDonald wanted to build additional houses, he would have to open the street right-of-way. The parcel the City would receive would be approximately 2,275 s.f. together with approximately 4,900 s.f. of underlying rights in the unopened street right-of-way. The City's appraiser has reviewed the proposed exchange and has determined that the land rights received will be greater than or equal to the land rights given up. All costs of the transaction are to be borne by Mr. MacDonald. **The Board of Park Commissioners unanimously approved the land rights exchange.**

Sand Point/Magnuson Park Athletic Facilities – Board Discussion/Recommendation

C. David Hughbanks, Director of the Sand Point/Magnuson Park Division, referenced the proposed sportsfield complex on the displayed graphics. A workshop was held on December 9, 2000, a Park Board briefing was held on January 11, 2001 and a Public Hearing was held on January 25th. The Department was directed by the City Council to recommend the number of sportsfields, type and configuration and return to the Council to amend the plan

adopted in 1999. This action will not end the discussion of what will happen at Sand Point as field lighting and wetland processes are underway. There will be field illumination discussions as part of the citywide Illumination Study and a vegetation study is planned for 2001. There will also be wetland design discussions and a meeting is scheduled with the Viewridge Community Council on March 20. When the Department gets into the design process, an Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared. What is currently requested of the Park Board is approval of the sportsfields "footprint" which will be forwarded to the City Council.

Karen Daubert was impressed by the testimony of the sportsfield advocates, their coming together, and the testimony regarding the wetland area. The issue of Field #11 configuration going into the proposed wetland area is of concern and will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement. The athletic facility complex will be envied by other cities throughout the northwest.

James Fearn stated the athletic facilities plan is a good compromise and praised the work that has brought all the parties together. The plan is different than what the Blue Ribbon Committee had in mind when it concluded its discussions. The park is a "play factory" on one side and open space on the other side. He has some negative feelings about the "play factory" but he is in favor of proceeding with the proposed plan and endorses it. The process has worked well and the plan is something we can live with in the future.

Kathleen Warren is happy with the plan. She requests the "digging and dumping" be done at the same time and that requirement of the wetland work done in conjunction with the field work be included in the Board's letter of recommendation. Trees and shrubbery are desired between the fields. She is concerned that no determination has been made for field lighting. It is important that the fields be lit, as it would be foolhardy to spend millions on fields and not light them for play. The issue of lighting poles, views and glare will be addressed as the Department goes through the citywide Illumination Study process currently underway. The latest field lighting technology will be used to limit impacts to the adjacent community. Kathleen related players and coaches are also park neighbors.

Michael Shiosaki agreed with what James had stated about the park and the success of how the fields come together and will there be the spaces in between the fields. Will it read as one single huge plain of flat fields or will they be on different planes, will there be berming, will there be pathways so there is some separation to get between them so they feel more integrated to all of Sand Point/Magnuson Park? It is wonderful to have a site with so much area devoted to all the different interests. He endorses the plan.

Susan Golub commended the staff work. She thinks having a place for tournament play is wonderful. She is pleased there will be artificial turf fields. The wetland issue can be worked out during the design phase.

The Board unanimously approved the plan as drafted.

Proposed Tree Policy – Board Discussion/Recommendation

Fritz Hedges, Director of Citywide Division, sent the Park Board a February 2 memo of proposed changes to the original draft policy and a Question and Answer format paper on the issue of private views prior to this meeting. He introduced Duane Penttila, Parks Horticulturist, and Paul West, Urban Forester, of the Horticulture Unit.

Duane Penttila reviewed the policy and identified revisions to what was previously in the proposed policy. Three public meetings were held in advance of the Park Board's January 25 public hearing. A lot of public comment was received on the draft policy, most of which concerned tree work permits that address private views. The related topic of vegetation management also received a lot of comment, as did various topics of tree protection. Overall the public seemed to express a strong desire to protect and conserve trees in parks and had particular concerns about the declining state of our greenbelts and natural areas. Because of the strong and consistent opinion that there is a need to reverse the trend toward loss of trees and urban forest in Seattle, staff amended the purpose of the tree policy to include language to promote an increase in the overall tree canopy, tree health and tree longevity.

Staff added a new policy statement that recognizes trees and the urban forest are an important part of the wildlife habitat in the city. Staff also added a statement that speaks to the "conservation of rare and/or historically significant trees."

The proposed tree policy allows some consideration of private view relief. The view relief issue is not a new policy for the Department. The Department has had in its current policy a practice of providing view relief that goes back 40-50 years. Staff added clarifying language to the proposed policy statement on permits related to private views. Criteria will be used to evaluate the overall public benefit of the proposed work. The statement indicates that the Department's costs associated with processing the permit, including public involvement, are to be paid by the requester. This will mean that permit costs related to private views

will not have a negative impact on the Department's other urban forestry services. Staff also has listened carefully to suggestions that the Department not consider private views in its management of parklands, vegetation and trees. There are mixed feelings amongst staff. The proposed draft policy has not been modified to reflect such a change at this time.

Staff added new language to the section on vegetation management plans. The Department will require the permittee to deposit all funds for tree work, replanting and maintenance in escrow before work begins. The Department can better insure permit performance by securing the project funds up front and controlling their disbursement. Staff added criteria for evaluating when a vegetation management plan will be required and how the adequacy of the plan is to be judged. These were both areas of concern noted by citizens during the public process.

Susan Golub informed the Board that her mother lives uphill from the West Raye development and has participated in a vegetation management plan for that area. The trees did not block her view but she participated to be part of the neighborhood group. Her view is blocked by her own trees she does not choose to cut down. Susan and her mother do not agree on this issue and Susan does not see a need to reclude herself from the Board's discussion of the proposed policy regarding view relief. What is one person's view blockage may be another person's idyllic tree-lined drive to their home. Trees that to some are invasive and not beautiful to others create a forest as they walk by a boulevard. It is very difficult to balance that but when the trees are in a park, Susan thinks the public benefit comes to stand for more than the private view value.

Susan lives on Queen Anne hill, not on a bluff, and during the winter she can see the sunrise through the trees on Bigelow which she cannot see during other times of the year. She wondered how she could ask those trees be pruned or cut so that she can see that view year-round when those trees are such a beautiful asset to the community. She also sees that sometimes the parks can get some value. If we do have a need for vegetation management perhaps that need can be dovetailed with private interest. Susan reviewed 6.5.3 "Threshold Criteria" that requires some public benefit. Perhaps that should be looked at as the only criteria that is used to allow this process. If the need can be demonstrated to get rid of dangerous trees or for slope stability, or something else listed in the policy, maybe the department can take advantage of private parties' interest in obtaining their view and helping us pay for some of the work. That is the only time she feels we should allow tree pruning for private views.

Karen Daubert thinks that times are changing and this is an opportunity to take the environmental protection seriously. She understands this might take some time and education of the public. Karen reread the League of Women Voters "Keeping the Green in Seattle" and is troubled by the loss of tree canopy statistics. We have an opportunity as public stewards to take care of these lands

and to act as examples to the public. DCLU is undergoing a review of policy where they are looking at protecting private property trees and Parks is looking at allowing public trees being cut. Karen currently has a view of a green area but that area's trees will be cut down and a development built in that area in the near future. A person does not simply have a right to a view and if you live next to a park that should be understood. Karen took to heart the numerous communications the Park Board has received regarding this issue. The policy is supported overall except for private views. Karen would like to see Section 4.11 "Permits" eliminated. She likes the idea of being able to work together on vegetation management plans.

Michael Shiosaki agrees with Susan Golub's comments. He thinks it is quite a burden for the Senior Urban Forester to have to make all the decisions. The policy seems loose as there is a lot of discretion and flexibility. A lot of pressure would fall on one point person. The overall health of the urban forest should be the primary issue that is being dealt with and if people benefit by increased views that is fine. He thinks the policy document needs to be tightened significantly. The whole issue of tree clearing for private views should not be allowed.

James Fearn agrees with a lot of what has been said by the Park Board members. It is true the pendulum has begun to swing the other way in terms of pruning trees for views and he thinks it is time for that to happen. The problem is the pendulum may swing too far. If trees are being pruned or trimmed contrary to the health and welfare that should not happen. He does not know if it has to be demonstrated that there is a benefit to the public health and welfare in order to trim trees for private views. There may be circumstances where it would be totally arbitrary to deny a person the ability to prune a tree and certainly when it is in the public's interest. The policy is very complicated and there is a lot of discretion. He thinks the policy is a great step in the right direction. There will be problems concerning implementation that will come back to the Department and Park Board but it is something that needs to get started. He found words he would change as an attorney but the policy would end up being a lot longer. The policy will be subject to amendment. He thinks it is time to proceed and see how it works.

Kathleen Warren thinks it would be easier to just say we are not going to allow any public trees to be cut down for private views. It looks like another layer has been added and it will be difficult for one person to make decisions. She has no problem removing a tree that is diseased or dangerous. She is concerned about the noxious weed issue and is also concerned about the non-native invasives. She wonders if there may be times when trees would come out as ivy is being removed as those trees may be considered damaged. She thinks times have changed and we cannot accommodate people's private views. Kathleen inquired how many trees were involved when the Department approved eleven requests last year and if the trees were damaged, dying or dangerous, or simply for view purposes, and if they met the public benefit criteria. Paul West stated most of the

permits were in areas where trees had been previously cut for views and those trees were compromised from previous view cutting. Kathleen stated we should not be bound to continue repeating our mistakes. Kathleen referenced public view corridors. Paul West stated the Department is committed to maintaining established viewpoints. There are in SEPA. DLCU is starting a process and looking at SEPA view corridors and potentially proposed revisions. The Board may want to look at increasing public views. Kathleen stated she appreciated the Question and Answer document regarding private views which was provided to the Park Board. She understands views as consideration in the tax base. There is no discussion in the document of how the overall canopy affects taxes, standards and quality of living. Kathleen questioned noxious weeds. Duane Penttila stated the State requires control of noxious weeds and there is a policy for that. Kathleen questioned if there is nothing wrong with a tree how it could be a public benefit to remove a tree. Paul West stated he has not allowed a healthy tree to be cut down during his tenure. Kathleen stated the escrow requirement is a good idea.

James Fearn stated if a tree has been topped two or three times, it may be a healthy tree, but it is not contributing as it should and it may be better to take that tree down and plant another tree which could be part of a vegetation management plan. Duane Penttila informed the Board that there are a lot of trees that appear healthy from a distance but when you get up close you see cavities, rot, etc. Paul West stated many maples and alders are getting to the end of their life span even though they have never been touched.

Paul West stated this proposed policy is a lot more clarifying than previous policies and helps the Senior Urban Forester. Karen Daubert stated that is not taking into account the possibility of having the Forester say our policy does not allow cutting down public trees for private views. Paul stated there is the other issue of illegal cutting of public trees and vandalism which may increase if some view trimming is not allowed. It is unlawful for any person to remove, destroy, mutilate or deface any shrubs or trees in any park. Any person convicted of such crime may be punished by a fine in any sum not to exceed \$5,000. There is a State law that allows substantial monetary penalties be given to the person caught doing illegal tree cutting as well. Duane Penttila stated if the department is put into the reactive mode to take care of illegal cutting that someone has done and has not been caught, then the department has to use its resources to go in and clean up someone else's mess. The department ends up paying for that person's view instead of hopefully entering into a planning process where the property owner gets a reasonable view and the department gets a restored forest.

Susan Golub hopes that potential criminal activity does not set policy. If there is an increase in vandalism the city may have to react in some way. Susan questioned 4.9 "Tree Replacement" where the overall mature canopy volume will be maintained or increased. Paul West replied that view corridors could have

lower vegetation and higher vegetation could be in other areas of the site so that overall the canopy volume would be maintained.

James Fearn inquired if canopy is related to height or to spread. Paul West stated you can have canopy spread but if you replace a Douglas Fir with five cherry trees you would be covering the same amount of ground but would have lost height. People are decrying the loss of very large landmark trees in the city. We want to keep the stature of the forest as well as the cover.

Susan Golub would like to propose an amendment. She thinks park public viewpoints are being confused with the private view issue and they need to be pulled out and dealt with separately. Susan suggested in 4.11 "Permits" language be added that would state the only time public trees would be pruned or removed for private views is if there is a demonstrated public benefit.

Kathleen Warren inquired what a public benefit would include. Overall public benefit would include habitat, slope stability, tree protection, tree replacement and other items listed in

Section 6.

Karen Daubert suggested Section 4.11 be eliminated. Karen stated persuasive citizens and lawyers can make an argument that any tree cutting can be a public benefit. Paul West has refused permits and the Horticulture Unit makes the determination if the tree is healthy or not.

Michael Shiosaki agrees that you could say there is public benefit to just about any vegetation management plan, e.g. removing one tree and putting in four others, making the slope more stable because more of it is covered. That should not necessarily be the criteria. Michael referenced the Question and Answer document regarding protecting the public park resource if the Department allows consideration of requests for private view relief and the statement "in general, if a public benefit cannot be associated with the proposed work, the request is *likely* to be denied" rather than it *would* be denied. Michael referenced the statement regarding it is not the Department's intent to accommodate uninterrupted panoramic views but will consider requests related to "framed" views. He wondered how it would be implemented as it is not in the policy.

Kathleen Warren inquired about snags. If a tree is diseased or dying in an area where it is not going to fall down on people, like the Green Lake Cottonwoods, are they going to be left as snags? A private property owner may not want a snag to remain. Kathleen likes to see the language added for habitat protection. Paul West stated snags are covered in the Wildlife and Habitat Management Plan.

Karen Daubert made a motion that the Board direct the Parks Department to delete Section 4.11 "Permits" on Page 5 and revise the policy appropriately. There was no second to the motion.

Kathleen Warren asked if that Section was taken out, would you not want private citizens to get a permit in the case where a tree is damaged or diseased. Kathleen suggested just taking out the second sentence "Reasonable options for preserving vistas in private views impacted by the growth of parks vegetation will be considered" or adding a line that public trees will not be cut for private views unless they are dangerous or diseased.

James Fearn stated no one would ask to cut a tree for a private view; they will request a tree be cut for reasons cited in the policy. Arguments can be made for anything. The issue is how are we going to respond to those arguments and have we given enough direction to the people who make the decisions to be able to say "no" when we think no is appropriate. James thinks the proposed policy does this as well as we can with words and our understanding right now.

Karen referenced Bellevue's no private view relief policy and stated trees are important to us and Seattle is the "Emerald City" because of its trees. Kathleen stated we have cut trees in the past for views. James indicated that was included in the Department policy.

Karen stated the policy is more or less codifying the Department's practices. Fritz Hedges related a lot of changes are directly the result of the public process, e.g. escrow account, thresholds. Kathleen asked if there would be an appeals process. There is no formal appeals process in the Department. There is access to the Park Board every meeting. Citizens can appeal to the Mayor and City Council. The Public Involvement Policy will be followed as it relates to signage and public notification.

Karen thinks the purpose statement is excellent: "to maintain, preserve and enhance the urban forest within parks. To increase the overall tree canopy, tree health and tree longevity and to ensure that parks trees are managed in a manner that is consistent with other departmental and municipal policies." After the "Definitions" section is the "Policy" section and Karen thinks everything in the policy is fantastic except for Section 4.11 – Permits for preserving vistas in private views. Karen does not think we should give private property owners the option of obtaining a permit to cut trees for private views. James stated people can still come forward to ask for trees to be cut or pruned for all the reasons expressed in the policy. The question is if a citizen can initiate the pruning of trees and he does not know why a citizen cannot initiate that process. The Parks Department will make the decisions as to whether it will happen. The Board is not hearing persuasive arguments from the other side but those arguments will come. James thinks the decision-making authority should be left in the policy. Paul West related anything that substantially impacts a park falls under the

Public Involvement Policy and requires notification and the opportunity for comment from people who are not the stakeholders. Kathleen cautioned the "substantially impact" definition and referenced the Queen Anne Bowl situation. Kathleen recommends deleting the second sentence in 4.11, "Reasonable options for preserving vistas in private views impacted by the growth of parks vegetation will be considered." It does allow citizens to initiate a process. Kathleen recommends the policy be reviewed in one year to see how it is working, how many trees were taken down, what were the circumstances, the money issues and the how the vegetation management is working out.

Kathleen Warren made a motion to remove the second sentence from Section 4.11 and in its place say "no trees will be cut solely for private views." The motion was seconded. Michael Shiosaki inquired if there was a piece about public benefit being the overriding criteria used for tree cutting or removal. Susan Golub would like to have the public benefit spelled out and recommended the motion be amended to include public benefits. **The motion was amended to read: Remove the second sentence from Section 4.11 and in its place say "no trees will be cut solely for private views. In order for a permit to be approved, the public benefits that will be considered are as listed in Section 6.** Karen Daubert feels we have an opportunity here to truly change things and still favors denying any request by a private property owner. **The motion carried;** Karen voted no, Bruce did not vote as Chair. The policy will be reviewed throughout and revised appropriately.

Karen Daubert pointed out the draft 6.5 and the revised 6.5 are different. It was determined that it was a mistake and will be corrected to include "public process."

Kathleen Warren moved the Park Board hold a formal review of the tree policy, including vegetation management, one year after the policy is adopted. The motion carried unanimously.

The comment about signage and public notification will not be included in the policy as its falls under the Department's Public Notification Policy.

Report on Gaps in Seattle Open Space

Kate Kaehny, Parks Planner, distributed "An Assessment of Gaps in Seattle's Open Space Network, dated February 7, 2001, to the Board members.

In Resolution 30181 which adopts the Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan 2000, the department was directed by the City Council to report to the Culture, Arts and Parks Committee with a review of the distribution guidelines and an inventory of the areas where the goals are met or not.

Seattle's Comp Plan provides population and distribution-based goals for open space in Seattle's neighborhoods. The goals address open space at the citywide level and provide additional goals for areas identified as urban villages. The Plan also outlines open space criteria that identify categories of open space, specifically Breathing Room Open Space and Usable Open Space. The Departments Plan 2000 offers more detailed definitions of these types of open space.

The report has three objectives. It provides a review of the existing open space guidelines; it identifies where gaps in the city's open space network exist, and it notes how the city is responding to these gaps.

Breathing Room Open Space is defined as combined acreage of all dedicated open spaces (parks, greenspaces, trails and boulevards) but not including tidelands and shorelands. Offsets include school grounds, green streets, boulevard, trail, recreational facilities, etc. They can provide open space for passive or active recreation or enjoyment and sometimes fill gaps in Breathing Room and Usable Open Space for residents who use the playground at their local school, stroll along a tree-covered boulevard or exercise indoors at a community center. Usable Open Space is defined as relatively level and open, easily accessible, primarily green open space available for drop-in use. Urban Village open space is additionally defined as "publicly owned or dedicated open space that is easily accessible and intended to serve the immediate urban village. This encompasses various types of open space for passive enjoyment as well as activity and includes green areas and hard-surfaced urban plazas, street parks, and pocket parks. Greenspaces are defined as areas designated for preservation because of their natural or ecological qualities and their potential to contribute to an interconnected open space system.

The desirable open space goal for Breathing Room Open Space is 1 acre per 100 residents. An acceptable goal would be 1/3 acre per 100 residents (citywide). The Usable Open Space goal is 1/4 - 1/2 acre within 1/4 to 1/2 mile of every resident (areas outside Urban Villages). Usable Open Space goal in primarily single-family residential areas is 1/2 acre within 1/2 mile of households. Urban Village Open Space goals (population based) is one acre of Village Open Space per 1,000 households for urban center, hub and residential urban villages; for the downtown core one acre of Village Open Space per 10,000 jobs. The Urban Village Open Space Distribution Goals for urban center villages is all locations in the village within approximately 1/8 mile of Village Open Space; same for hub urban villages. For residential urban villages, (moderate and high density areas) all locations within 1/8 mile of a Village Open Space that is between 1/4 and 1 acre in size or within 1/4 mile of a Village Open Space that is greater than 1 acre. For low-density areas, all locations within 1/4 mile of any qualifying Village Open Space. The qualifying criteria for urban village open space: Urban Center Villages – dedicated open spaces of at least 10,000 s.f. in size, publicly accessible, and usable for recreation and social activities. At least one usable

open space of at least 1 acre in size (Village Commons) with growth target of more than 2,500 households. Hub Urban Villages: same as for Urban Center Villages. At least one usable open space of at least one acre in size. For Residential Urban Villages, same as for Urban Center and Hub – at least one usable open space of at least 1 acre in size where overall residential density is 10 households per gross acre or more.

Kate displayed maps that graphically measured how the goals and criteria for Breathing Room and Usable Open space are or are not met. While developing the report, population data from both the 1990 Census and population estimates developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council for 1999 were reviewed. There was little change in the maps produced with these different data sources. The use of census tract boundaries as units of measurements is sometimes problematic. Census tracts provide only a quantitative representation of the relationships within their boundaries, which may or may not accurately reflect the nature of relationships on the ground.

Kate reviewed what is and is not counted as open space. She reviewed the open space gaps in the Northwest, Northeast, West, East, Southwest and Southeast Sectors. Kate also reviewed the Future Breathing Room and Usable Open Space projects that will alleviate gaps. She highlighted citywide Pro Parks Levy Projects that will fill gaps. The report also details where gaps will remain.

James Fearn thinks open space criteria should refer to density not acreage. He dislikes the idea of spending money for open space in areas that have personal open space such as estate areas. Susan Golub noted there may not be opportunities to meet standards for open space in the urban village areas. Promises were made during the neighborhood planning processes. Kathleen Warren asked if anything surprised staff after completing the assessment. Kevin Stoops stated all the urban villages came up as deficient. Kathleen inquired if there was still a perception that the south end of the city does not get as much as other parts of the city. Kevin stated many greenbelts and other green space have been acquired in the south end of the city. James Fearn stated Opportunity Fund money was allocated for the south end of the city as that is where land is available and affordable.

Patricia McInturff commended the planning staff for the work that went into this report and the data will be very valuable to the new Levy Oversight Committee.

Seward Park Fish Hatchery Site ReUse Study Briefing

Kevin Stoops, Manager of Parks Planning and Program Development, presented the background of the Seward Park fish hatchery. The fishponds were constructed in the 1930's as a WPA project and the facility was operated by the State Game Department until 1985. The University of Washington graduate students used the site for fish experiments. Kevin reviewed the layout of the site.

Four alternatives were proposed. The recommended plan was prepared by J. A. Brennan Associates in association with Makers and URS Greiner Woodward Clyde. Alternative IV is the recommended plan. The total cost for this alternative is \$1,128,241. The project could be approached in phases. This alternative entails renovation of the site for use as a educational day camp while undertaking vegetative restoration efforts. It is envisioned that school and scouting groups and general park visitors will use the site. Access is to be restricted with limited vehicular access. This facility will focus on environmental education centered around the park forest and aquatic habitats (possibly for raising Pacific Tree Frogs), utilizing existing ponds, lake front, park site amenities, and forest and edge planting re-vegetation.

Existing buildings will be improved or remodeled to better accommodate intended uses. Many of the existing hatchery ponds will be removed to accommodate re-vegetative restoration efforts. Four of the ponds and the pump station will be remodeled to support aquatic/environmental education functions. Kevin reviewed the remodel and repair recommendations. The pump station is estimated at \$350,000. Without the pump, the scenic waterfall cannot operate.

New Facilities to support the day camp and environmental education activities will be provided. It is anticipated up to 40 campers including chaperones, will be using the site at its peak use. The site may also be visited by general park users during these times (pedestrian access only). Picnic, passive recreation and outdoor classroom facilities will be provided. Parking is planned for not more than 6 cars for staff and teachers. Parking for the two caretakers will be retained adjacent to the existing caretaker houses.

In this alternative portions of the site will be restored to a natural state much like it may have been prior to the hatchery's construction. Native plant species will be used to revegetate and reforest disturbed areas of the site to blend with surrounding areas typical of a mature forest in this area. Long term planting parties could occur.

Public meetings have been held and mixed comments were received. Some people would like the hatchery in operation again, others want the park restored the way it had been and others felt it was a good idea to have good uses in the park. The Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks are on the mailing list regarding this project. There is no money funded to complete the project at this time. The Audubon Society may be able to contribute some funding. Some of the work may be done by Park staff such as the reroofing of the caretaker houses. It may be possible to have a portable water system instead of redoing the pump station. There may be neighborhood grant sources for funding the pond removal.

The Park Board unanimously passed a motion to recommend to the Superintendent that it proceed with Alternative IV for the Seward Park Fish Hatchery Site Re-Use.

The Park Board was invited to join a tour of the park on March 15 at 10 a.m. Naturalist Christina Gallegos. (604-7513), also invited the Board to attend on-going Seward Park nature walks.

New/Old Business/Future Agenda: No discussion

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

APPROVED: _____ DATE: _____
Bruce Bentley, Chair