

**BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
MEETING MINUTES
August 14, 2003**

Present:

Bruce Bentley, Chair
Joanna Grist
Terry Holme
Sarah Neilson
Kate Pflaumer

Excused:

James Fearn

Staff:

Fritz Hedges, Acting Deputy Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

Chair Bruce Bentley called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. **Terry moved and Kate seconded that the agenda consent items be approved, including the August 14 agenda, July 24 minutes, and the acknowledgment of correspondence. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.**

Superintendent's Report

Acting Deputy Superintendent Fritz Hedges reported on the following:

Ravenna Creek Daylighting: Parks will host an Open House on August 19 so the community can take a walking tour of the Ravenna Creek Daylighting.

Outdoor Meals Program at City Hall Park: The outdoor meals program will relocate from the Public Safety Building to City Hall Park by August 30. Parks staff met with meal providers who assured them that the program will operate much the same after the transition.

Wading Pool Schedule: Wading pools located at playgrounds will close for the season on August 19. Due to budget cuts, this is a week earlier than usual. Two large wading pools at Sand Point Magnuson Park and Madrona will remain open until August 24. Five wading pools (Matthews, West Green Lake, Madison, Mt. Baker, and Seward) will remain open until September 1. There was increased attendance at nearly every site this summer. Pro Parks funds enabled the addition of weekend days to nine sites and longer weekday hours at five locations.

Summer Beaches: The seven life-guarded beaches have had 108,104 visitors to date, compared to 85,747 for the same period in 2002. Considering that two fewer beaches are operating this summer, this represents an increase in use of almost 40 percent.

Pro Parks Opportunities: An agreement has been signed to purchase property for a new neighborhood park in the Pinehurst community at the northeast corner of 19th Ave NE and NE 117th. The purchase of an 8,100-sq.-ft. parcel in the Thornton Creek watershed, located on the south side of NE 95th and west of NE 27th, was completed on July 31.

Yesler CC Demolition Under Way: Demolition is underway and nearby residents are excited at the prospect of construction.

Tilikum Place Renovations Complete: On August 5, Belltown residents gathered to celebrate the recently-completed renovations to this small neighborhood park. Improvements include new pavers, benches, planters, garbage containers, and hanging baskets.

All City Swim Meet: The summer swim league ended its season with an all-city swim meet on Saturday, August 2, at Madison Pool. The best and fastest swimmers from pools all over the city raced against each other.

Alki Music Festival: Last weekend the festival attracted more than 2,000 people per day. Many new performing artists and bands were showcased.

Laurelhurst Summer Concert Season: The Laurelhurst Summer Concert series concludes on August 14. These Thursday evening concerts have been extremely well received and have attracted 200 to 300 people per concert.

"Let's Go Fishing" Event: Stan Sayres Hydro Pits was the site of "The Great Fish In", with more than 40 youth from Yesler, Rainier, Garfield, and Seattle Emergency Housing participating. They enjoyed rides on both the Seattle Police Department Dive Team Zodiac Craft and the Harbor Patrol Boat. They fished, learning casting techniques and basic knot tying, and learned water safety tips.

42nd Annual Green Lake Summer Rowing Extravaganza: Nearly perfect weather made for a great day of rowing on Green Lake last weekend. A total of 58 races with approximately 950 competitors were run.

Greenwood Park Opening: The Commissioners are invited to the grand opening ceremony for the Greenwood Park project, at N 87th and Evanston N. This celebration will be held on Saturday, August 16, at 11:00 a.m., with Mayor Greg Nickels in attendance.

STEPS Program an Expanding Success Story: The 2003 Steps Toward Environmental Partnership (STEPS) program was a major success. STEPs is an environmental education training program that provides at-risk and economically disadvantaged teens, 15-to-17-years old, with environmental training and practical, hands-on work experience in local parks. This year's program served twice the number of youth as last year: 54 enrolled and 45 completed the six-week program. While the emphasis is on environmental education and stewardship, participants also learned basic life skills. Student participants earned a

stipend of \$6.90 per hour. Our partners this year were Community Center Advisory Councils, the Seattle Rotary, the Urban League of Seattle, Safeco, and other community and business organizations.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

Bruce explained that the general public comment portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had or are not scheduled for a public hearing. Testimony is limited to three minutes per speaker. No one signed up to give testimony.

I-5 Open Space Briefing/Public Hearing

David Goldberg, Parks Department project manager, came before the Board to give a briefing on the I-5 Open Space project. The Board also received a written briefing. A public hearing was held immediately following the verbal briefing.

Written Briefing

INTRODUCTION

The Pro Parks Levy states, "**Develop area under I-5 into a neighborhood open space. Consider an off-leash area, stairs to make pedestrian connections, and other amenities.**" The Eastlake Neighborhood Plan recommended:

- Treating storm-water run-off.
- Planting suitable trees and other vegetation.
- Installing lighting and call boxes.
- Incorporating public art.
- Creating sport climbing.
- Making pedestrian and bicycle connections from Fairview Ave through the area under I-5 to the steps leading up to Capitol Hill via Blaine and Howe Streets.

Parks and Recreation is also considering the area for an off-leash area (OLA) and a strong constituency is interested in mountain biking trails. The Office of Arts & Cultural Affairs identified the site as a location for a significant public art project.

Budget: \$1.8 million. Construction budget is estimated to be \$1.1 million.

Location: The I-5 Open Space is in Eastlake on approximately 7.5 acres located below I-5 (WSDOT property). It is between Lakeview Blvd. and Franklin Ave. and Howe and Garfield Streets. Parks is negotiating a lease with WSDOT.

Schedule:

Planning:2002-3

Design:2003

Construction:2004

Completion: 2004

Community Involvement: Community-involvement includes nearly monthly progress meetings and three public workshops during the planning and schematic design phases. Additional meetings will occur during final design.

POLICY ISSUES

- ***Mix of Uses to Activate Space*** - While the majority of community members support the mix of uses, some are opposed to the OLA and mountain biking uses.
- ***Off-Leash Areas*** - The site is hilly and much of the more level areas are close to residents.
- ***Pedestrian and Bicycle Access*** - Creating an accessible route through the site is challenging and expensive due to steep grades.
- ***Mountain Biking Trails*** - Mountain biking trail could occur throughout the site since the unprogrammed areas may not be well used.
- ***Budget Priorities*** - Implementing the plan as shown could take more than is available in the construction budget.
- ***WSDOT Needs*** - WSDOT will need access to the site and will need to undertake significant construction at some future date. The lease proposal would have WSDOT gain ownership of the Parks improvements over time. The improvements would then be turned back to Parks in the future as mitigation of planned highway improvements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- ***Design Approach*** - Respond to the unusual site. Retain existing vegetation and minimize landscaping to areas that receive sun and rain. Use construction materials that provide texture and visual interest. (See attached Design Goals and Concept Images)
- ***Mix of Uses*** - Staff recommends that the mix of walking paths and stairs, the OLA and mountain biking will activate a difficult site. The plan responds to neighbors' concerns by locating walking paths, stairs and sitting areas near residences and the OLA and mountain biking trails further away. (See attached Site Plan)
- ***Pedestrian and Bicycle Access*** - While expensive, staff recommends including the paths and stairs to build on the well-used Howe and Blaine St. stairs. These elements provide access to the different activities and allow people to experience the character of the site (topography, views). The plan also identifies a path to complete a section of the Urban Trail system shown in the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- ***Off-Leash Areas*** - Staff recommends a 1.2 acre area that occupies the more level areas of the southern portions of the site.
- ***Mountain Biking Trails*** - Staff supports inclusion of mountain biking trail in areas that are not suitable for off-leash areas or adjacent to residential areas.
- ***Budget*** - Staff recommends building a project that includes all elements and will not require additional phases of construction. This means leveraging volunteer resources, focusing construction on improvements key to the site, and choosing

less expensive materials. Mountain bikers will bring substantial volunteer effort to develop those improvements and COLA will steward the OLA. The construction budget will pay for trails and stairs, OLA infrastructure, parking and a small amount of landscaping.

OPTIONS

Although there has been some concern about an OLA and mountain biking trails, strong constituencies have grown for these elements. Advocate organizations for these uses will help improve and steward the site. Therefore, the concept plan options explored alternative ways to accommodate the suggested uses. Parks reviewed two alternative Concept Plans at a public workshop on April 15. Alternative 1 mixed the following elements in the site.

- Unstructured open space and landscaped areas
- 1+/- Acre OLA
- 1.5 Acres available for mountain biking trails
- Pedestrian/bicycle connections
- Parking
- Public Art
- Sport Climbing facility

Alternative 2 segregated the uses into different areas. The workshop attendees, the Design Commission and Parks ProView endorsed Alternative 1. The consultant has refined Alternative 1 to create the site plan.

Verbal Briefing

David Goldberg, Parks Department project manager, came before the Board to give a briefing on the proposed I-5 park project. At its August 28 meeting, the Board is asked to discuss and make a recommendation to the Superintendent on the project. David introduced Lorraine Pike, designer for this project. He discussed the process to date for this project, Lorraine gave a summary of the design elements, and David discussed the policy issues that have come from both the community and the project team and its recommendations.

This project is funded for \$1.8 million from the Pro Parks Levy and the language for this project (as for many Pro Parks Levy projects) is broad: develop the property under I-5 into a neighborhood open space, consider developing an off-leash area, stairs to make pedestrian access, and other amenities. The Eastlake Neighborhood Plan also suggests a number of other elements: pedestrian and bicycle connections; trees and vegetation, treating stormwater runoff, increasing safety by installing lighting and call boxes, incorporating public art, and looking at sports climbing. Approximately two years ago, a kickoff meeting to describe the project was held. From feedback received at this meeting, a mountain biking trail was added to the list. The Department has received numerous e-mails and other correspondence, with some favoring an off-leash area and/or mountain biking trails and approximately the same amount opposed to these uses. The design team has continued efforts to design a project to meet everyone's needs.

David described the location and its boundaries. It is located under Interstate 5, is steep, and gets little rain. The property belongs to Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and must be leased. This project will be beneficial for both WSDOT and the community.

David next described the public involvement process. Three public workshops were held with good involvement. Monthly progress meetings have been held and David thanked those citizens who went through the entire process. A planning meeting was held on August 7 and the team received lots of comments from those in attendance. There will be continued opportunities for public comments and involvement as the project moves from schematic to design phase.

Using a large colored drawing, Lorraine pointed to and described the proposed design in detail. Three broad categories were used to define design goals: (1) users; (2) character of the park, and (3) access. Part of her job is to design zones and accessibility. She described possible artwork for the project.

Kate asked a question about the steps and also asked how an artist is chosen for a project. David said that this is one of the projects selected through the City's 1% for Arts program. Terry asked about the location of parking. Lorraine and David said there are 15 spaces on the west side at Lakeview and two-hour parking is located on Franklin. They described the parking areas and pointed out ADA parking sites. Terry commented that he recently walked the site and believes the project is fantastic and he is enthusiastic about the development of this site.

Participants in the process answered a survey and David used this information to determine common themes. Trying to fit all the suggested uses onto this site is challenging. The site has been divided into passive and non-passive uses. David described the mixture of active uses and talked about the workshops that were held. Mostly positive comments were received regarding a mixed use of this park, however, some were opposed to mountain bike trails and off-leash areas. Common themes include:

1. Off-leash area: City Council has guidelines for off-leash areas, which read that the OLA must be in a flat and non-residential area. Parks Department would have preferred to have a three acre OLA, but there is not enough space. The proposed smaller area is available; however, drainage/irrigation must be installed. The surface can be of gravel and must be irrigated.
2. Pedestrian and bicycle access: takes lots of design and lots of money to include both a pathway and stairs.
3. Mountain bike trails: will bring a new use to Seattle's park system. Interested biking groups will assist with building the trails.
4. WSDOT ownership of the land: needs ongoing access to some of the areas. They must do some seismic work in some areas within the next 10-15 years and when this work is scheduled, it will impact the park's usage. The design is planned so that the areas most affected by the seismic will use materials (gravel, soil) that won't need jackhammering or other extensive work to access.

5. Budget: \$1.1 million and seven acres doesn't go far. The different elements are being built so they can be as self-sustaining as possible.

All these issues are challenging and have received lots of public input. Some community members want much more green space. David read his and staff's recommendations, which are to respond to this unusual environment (dry, dusty, under the freeway) rather than force inappropriate uses of the area (i.e., try to develop into a green space.)

David described the budget, per current planning estimates:

- pathways, landscaping and stairs use 60% of the budget
- OLA uses 20%
- mountain biking uses 6-10%

David gave additional details on the parking. He is working with WSDOT to change some all-day parking to two-hour limits. The parking at Lincoln Reservoir was changed in this way and it has been a successful modification.

Questions and Answers:

The Board asked questions on the following:

Do the existing vegetation and trees currently receive their water from rain? David answered yes.

Will mountain bikers hold competitive events here? David answered no, although they do plan to have training events.

Is a portable toilet proposed? David said he would work with Seattle Public Utilities on this.

Is any money transferred during the lease agreement with WSDOT? David answered that WSDOT requires a "market lease". The value they receive is in future mitigation.

Is the large parking lot near the south end available for parking? David answered that it is owned by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. It is both gated and attended and probably not available.

Is this an especially small mountain bike area? David answered that it is a small area and will be planned primarily as a technically challenging pathway.

What is proposed for the white area on the map? David answered that currently wild clematis and ivy grow there and the plan is to leave the area as it is.

What materials will be used on the mountain bike path? David answered that the one-way trails will consist of crushed rock and look like a well-maintained forest road.

Is it anticipated that the off-leash area will become a regional off-leash area and create parking problems? David answered that this is a concern from both residents and from some off-leash area users.

At the Boards' request, Lorraine and David further described the "zone of gathering."

Some granite may be used in this area and boulders that are already on site may be partially submerged and used as sitting areas. The area has several excellent viewpoints.

Is there a projected number of park users for this site?. David answered that the park should be well used, as there is a high density of nearby residents; however, it is difficult to estimate the number of possible users.

Is lighting included in the budget? David answered that the Parks Department policy is to not light open spaces. Lights attract homeless encampments. However, lighting may be considered later if the active users want lighting.

The Board asked for a larger version of the site map and David agreed to send a copy to each Board member.

Public Testimony

The following people signed up to give public testimony on the I-5 Open Space project:

Peter Ansell: He has been pleasantly surprised with this plan and believes the City needs more active-use park areas.

Jack Tompkinson: He is a member of Back Country Trails Club, is the leader of the coalition, and appreciates this opportunity. He thanked David, Lorraine, and the constituents who have worked on this project, which can succeed. He listed and thanked various organizations and individuals who are supporters of the mountain bike trail.

Karen Moe: She believes one of the Park Departments' strength is using unusual spaces and non-traditional design for parks. She is a mountain biker and described benefits of the activity. There are currently no mountain bike trails in Seattle - she drives 45 minutes to the nearest one.

Frank Gonzalez: He is an Eastlake resident and said 100 units of apartments are being built soon near the site. He distributed a handout to the Board. Frank discussed the Eastlake Neighborhood Plan and special interest areas. He complimented David Goldberg on the survey, which had 110 responses. He said there was just as much opposition to the off-leash area as there was support. Eastlake Community Council letter expresses concern. He wants more green area in the park and for the park to have more family-oriented uses.

Sandra Simmons: She is an Eastlake resident and supports the design. The area currently is a big empty space with dirt and urban campers.

Robert Rudine: He is the Chair of Olmsted Park organization, which pushed the Pro Parks Levy. Choosing this site reflects the real vision of the City. OPO wants to meet the goals of the Eastlake Neighborhood Plan. Robert suggested possible names for the new park: "Collonade Park" or "Lifting the Sky Park" and he told the story behind the legend of "Lifting the Sky". He believes the artist, John Rulof, will bring great sensibility to this park.

Mire Levy: She believes this is a wonderful idea and thanked the City and the Parks Department. She represents the mountain biking community and believes this project is a good opportunity to involve kids. She plans to bring her daughter to the trail-building work parties.

Art Tuffel: He is a member of the mountain biking association, and is excited about this opportunity. He has vast experience in building mountain bike trails, which are usually wet trails. This will be a dry trail as it is under the freeway. The trails will be designed for slow speeds and technical biking and will all run one way. Consequently, bicyclists, joggers, or pedestrians may use the trails.

Chris Mapes: She lives 10 minutes away and will use the park regularly. She is pleased with the off-leash area. She commended David and Lorraine for their work on this project.

Alley Rutzel: She also lives 10 minutes away and will be a regular user of the park. She commended the designers and planners on the project and likes the unexpected location, the bike trail, and the off-leash area. The more a park is used for positive uses, the less undesirable uses it attracts. The covered spaces protect the users from rain and other elements.

Sharon Levine: She commended David and Lorraine for the fair, well advertised, well publicized, and open process for this project. Only a handful of nearby residents are in opposition to the plan. There is a need for an off-leash area in this densely-populated area. The I-5 project is being funded by Pro Parks Levy, which requested a large off-leash site in the area. This is a small site, but is a groundbreaking site. She hopes there is an off-leash area near her home when she retires.

Chris Leman: He helped write the Eastlake Neighborhood Plan, helped collect 200 signatures, and worked on the Pro Parks Levy. Not many in Eastlake oppose the bike trail or an off-leash area. These were his ideas. The issue here is balance, and this design is not balanced. 5.8 of 7.0 acres will have no irrigation, as most of the irrigation will go to flush the off-leash area. The area is greener now than it will be after the project is complete. The Board must insist that the off-leash area be reduced in size. There will be no grass for toddlers to lie on and look up at the sky. The community is not getting what it deserves with the proposed project. The Comprehensive Plan must be included in the design. The design presented today is different than what was presented at the last community meeting.

Jerry Malmo: He lives on Capitol Hill and is a Citizens for Off-leash Area (COLA) member. He worked with the design commission since the beginning of this project. The project is a good compromise in including the off-leash area. Comprehensive Plan 2000 calls for one off-leash area in each sector. This projects' off-leash area would meet the minimum requirements. Many Capitol Hill residents with dogs can walk to this site. If residents want a park with green spaces, Volunteer Park is only two blocks away. He thanked David and Lorraine for their work.

The public hearing concluded.

Terry asked about the surface material to be used for the off-leash area and the type of fencing. David answered that the fencing will be chain-link and the surface material will

be gravel or "hogs feed."

Bruce asked what type of irrigation system will be installed in the off-leash area. David said that it will be a fixed irrigation system. Irrigation needed for the planned new vegetation at entrance; the existing vegetation will not be irrigated.

The Board plans to discuss this project at its August 28 meeting and make a recommendation to the Superintendent. David and Lorraine were thanked for their presentation.

Skateboard Policy Discussion/Recommendation

At its July 28 meeting, the Park Board heard a briefing from Susan Golub, Parks Department Strategic Advisor, on the Department's proposed skateboard policy. A public hearing followed. At tonight's meeting, Susan presented a report that responds to the comments heard at the public hearing and to comments and questions from the Board of Park Commissioners. Alternatives to amend the policy are provided. The Board is being asked tonight to make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation.

The following changes to the policy presented at the July 28 meeting were voted on by the Board individually as follows:

1. Comment: The siting criteria are too vague, especially regarding impacts to neighbors (Section 6.0)

Alternative 1: Adopt the Joint Athletic Facilities Development Program (JAFDP) siting language which reads: "Sites should be selected where impacts to surrounding neighbors can be minimized and mitigation measures can be maximized."

Alternative 2: Adopt language that requires skateboard parks to be located a specific distance from residences: "Skateboard park sites should be located X feet away from residential uses."

Alternative 3: Keep the original language: "Skateboard park sites should consider adjacent uses and potential noise impacts."

Staff recommendation: Alternative 1

Terry voiced his strong concerns regarding siting where noise is least likely to impact neighbors or institutions. This is difficult to incorporate this into the language. He had e-mailed his thoughts to Susan Golub. Kate felt that including a certain # of feet in the language would be restrictive. Kate suggested re-writing the policy to begin with the sentence in Alternative #3, followed by the language in Alternative #1.

**Kate moved approval of Alternative 1, followed by Alternative 3, to read:
"Skateboard park sites should consider adjacent uses and potential noise impacts. Adopt the Joint Athletic Facilities Development Program (JAFDP) siting language which reads: Sites should be selected where impacts to surrounding neighbors can be minimized and mitigation measures can be maximized."**

Sarah seconded. There being no further discussion, the vote was taken and was passed unanimously.

2. Comment: Graffiti walls lead to spillover graffiti in the neighborhood. Graffiti walls are a good element for skateboard parks. Section (6.1.2)

Alternative 1: Eliminate the graffiti wall from the policy and replace with community-generated art.

Alternative 2: Eliminate the graffiti wall from the policy, with no replacement feature.

Alternative 3: Retain the graffiti wall as an ideal park element.

Staff recommendation: Alternative 1

Kate moved approval of Alternative 1. Terry seconded. There being no discussion, the vote was taken and was passed unanimously.

3. Comment: Disperse skateboard parks evenly throughout the City. (Section 6.1.3)

Alternative 1: Specify that the goal is to locate a skateboard park in each quadrant of the city. "The Department will seek to distribute facilities throughout the city, with the goal of providing at least one skateboard park in each quadrant of the city, and generally will not seek to develop skateboard parks as stand-alone facilities."

Alternative 2: Retain existing language which does not refer to equal distribution in each quadrant.

Staff recommendation: Alternative 1

Kate moved approval of Alternative 1. Joanna seconded.

Discussion: Terry did not want future planners to look at the language that reads "generally will not seek to develop skateboard parks as stand-alone facilities" as too restrictive. Kate wondered if skateboard will continue to be popular twenty years in the future, while Sarah envisions that it may be an even more popular sport. The Board discussed whether "each quadrant of the city" should be included in the policy.

There being no further discussion, the vote was taken and was passed unanimously.

4. Comment: A skateboard park design team should have lots of experience and include skaters. (Section 7.3)

Alternative 1: Adopt language requiring experience as part of a design team: "The Department will use consultants/designers as part of a skateboard park project team who have experience in the design of skateboard parks."

Alternative 2: Retain the original language which recommends, but does not require, experience. "The Department will seek to use consultants/designers who have experience in the design of skateboard parks."

Staff recommendation: Alternative 1

Terry moved approval of Alternative 1. Motion was seconded.

Discussion: Kate voiced concerns that the policy language should not paint the Parks Department into a corner. Terry felt that the best design is the best way to spend funds.

There being no further discussion, the vote was taken with three in favor (Terry, Joanna, and Sarah) and one opposed (Kate). Motion passed.

5. Comment: Consider BMX bike riding use at skateboard parks. (Section 8.5)

Alternative 1: Leave the door open to site-by-site consideration of BMX bike use, similar to what is recommended for in-line skating. "Use of skateboard parks by in-line skaters and BMX bikers will be permitted when the Department determines such uses can be safely accommodated. The Department may limit non-skateboarding use of the skateboard parks."

Alternative 2: Prohibit BMX bikes from using skateboard parks, and explore other options for accommodating this use in our parks. (Retain existing draft language.)

Staff recommendation: Alternative 1

Kate moved approval of Alternative 2. Terry seconded. There being no discussion, the vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Kate moved overall approval of the skateboard policy, as amended. Terry seconded. There being no further discussion, the vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Lincoln Park Vegetation Management Plan Briefing

Mark Mead, Manager of the Urban Forestry Program, came before the Park Board to give a briefing on the Lincoln Park Vegetation Management (VMP). The Board received both a written and verbal briefing. The written briefing, in its entirety, follows:

Written Briefing

Project History

This project was initiated in Spring 2001 under the direction of predecessor urban forester Jenny Benz. Two public meetings were held as part of plan development, in Spring 2001 and Spring 2002. Both were lightly attended, by audiences supportive of forest restoration. A small but steady Friends of Lincoln Park group has formed as a result and reinstated monthly work parties. Throughout its development, the VMP had generated little citizen feedback despite the park's size and popularity.

The complete Draft document was distributed for public and staff comments in early January 2003. Parks Project Steering Committee reviewed and signed off on the plan May 19, 2003. The Lincoln Park Vegetation Management Plan is being brought to the Parks Board in recognition of Lincoln Park's importance and size, but without significant associated issues raised by citizens or internally. Final plan adoption by the Superintendent is pending Parks Board review. Limited implementation via community volunteers has been underway since mid-2001.

Project Description

This VMP (Vegetation Management Plan) addresses the need to safeguard habitat and native vegetation, as well as support diverse landscape characters and uses. Key management themes which recur among the delineated Management Areas are:

1. Hazard tree management, mitigation & prevention
2. Invasive plant removal
3. Reversing & minimizing soil compaction
4. Reducing habitat fragmentation by social trails
5. Improving vegetation quality in both native and developed landscapes

The document follows a similar format to that created for the Sand Point Magnuson Park VMP, and further develops a "template" approach. It is divided into ten sections:

1. Overview (site map, plan summary, "how to use" VMP)
2. Goals and Objectives
3. Plan Context (history, plans & policies, citizen concerns, park usage)
4. Assessment of Existing Resource (soils, slopes, vegetation, wildlife)
5. Findings (defining issues VMP seeks to address)
6. Vegetation Management Recommendations (for 7 Mgmt Areas)
7. Management and Maintenance Practices (BMP's, plants, techniques)
8. Implementation (approach, priorities, cost estimates, strategies)
9. Monitoring Plan
10. Appendices (public comment, existing vegetation, madrona management, references, photos, maps)

The full draft Lincoln VMP is posted to the web and available for review at:

<http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/parkspaces/LincolnPark/vmp.htm>

Executive Summary provides additional information.

Lincoln Park Vegetation Management Plan Executive Summary

Document Overview

This VMP follows a similar format to that created for the Sand Point Magnuson VMP, and further develops the "template" approach. It is divided into ten sections, as follows:

11. Overview (site map, plan summary, "how to use" VMP)
12. Goals and Objectives
13. Plan Context (history, plans & policies, citizen concerns, park usage)
14. Assessment of Existing Resource (soils, slopes, vegetation, wildlife)

15. Findings (defining issues VMP seeks to address)
16. Vegetation Management Recommendations (for 7 Mgmt Areas)
17. Management and Maintenance Practices (BMP's, plants, techniques)
18. Implementation (approach, priorities, cost estimates, strategies)
19. Monitoring Plan
20. Appendices (public comment, existing vegetation, madrona mgmt, references, photos, maps)

Key Issues & Recommendations

The VMP revolves around issues of safeguarding habitat and native vegetation, as well as the need to support diverse landscape characters and uses. Lincoln is many things to many people. Key management themes which recur among MA's are:

6. Hazard tree management, mitigation & prevention
7. Invasive plant removal
8. Reversing & minimizing soil compaction
9. Reducing habitat fragmentation by social trails
10. Improving vegetation quality in both native and developed landscapes

Public Involvement

Throughout project PIP, the VMP generated little citizen feedback despite the park's size and popularity: meeting attendance was 10 - 15, with two comments received on draft plan. A small but steady Friends of Lincoln Park group has formed and reinstated monthly work parties. Leader Ken Shaw (also of Friends of Schmitz) requested that VMP include a detailed park map showing all social trails, for purposes of planning & documenting work party locations. (Project did not have the resources to provide such extensive mapping.) He also objected to the concept of volunteers doing restoration monitoring, as too much paperwork & not enough action. Neighbor Sharon Baker promoted the idea of connecting Lincoln Park with undeveloped land to the north, of which her two parcels are now protected through Cascade Land Conservancy easement. General support for reforestation was expressed by many individuals.

Plan Summary (excerpt from VMP Chapter One)

Introduction

Lincoln Park is one of Seattle's largest and most popular parks. Its 135 acres of open space provide a broad range of landscape types and a rich variety of recreational opportunities. Significant interactions between users and park vegetation, as well as the inherent needs of plants and wildlife, drive this Vegetation Management Plan. Lincoln Park offers a unique opportunity to manage stands of native and non-native trees in forested and open settings, for future generations of Park users to enjoy.

Site Description

Lincoln Park is composed of approximately 64% forested natural area, 16% developed landscape area, 12% shoreline and 8% managed recreation space (playground, ballfields,

etc). The large, fairly level upland area includes open and forested portions, and is bordered to the west by a steep bluff that drops a dramatic 100 feet to the saltwater shoreline below. Vegetation ranges from turf to open lawn with trees, to intact and invaded native forest, madrona groves, weedy slide slopes, wetlands, beach grass, and ornamental landscape beds.

History

Lincoln Park was purchased by the city in 1922, for \$104,186. Although it was recommended for inclusion in the original 1903 Olmsted park system, the Olmsteds never were commissioned to complete a plan for Lincoln Park, nor a parkway linking it with Schmitz Preserve. The park landscape most likely evolved under the hand of various Parks gardeners, without benefit of an overall plan. As a result, an interesting mix of native and ornamental plant species commingle in the park today, but it lacks a clearly organized trail system. Bluff landslides are an important part of the park's past as well as an inevitable aspect of its future. Despite Lincoln Park's tremendous popularity, much of the park's native vegetation has been conserved over time, representing a significant legacy and key to its landscape character.

VMP Goals

The following overall goals were established for the vegetation management plan, based on citizen comments and detailed resource evaluation:

- Respect the unique landscaped character of the park
- Manage vegetation to support diverse and appropriate human uses
- Protect and enhance native vegetation
- Protect and enhance wildlife habitat

Public Process

As for all Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation projects, VMP development involves a prescribed Public Involvement Process (PIP). For the Lincoln Park plan, existing vegetation first was sampled in random plots, after which a public meeting was held to discuss initial findings and gather user concerns (April 2001). Citizen concerns are noted in Chapter 3 of the plan. At a second public meeting (May 2002), Urban Forestry staff presented key issues and a detailed overview of the draft VMP. This document then was posted to the Seattle Parks website and copies made available at local libraries for a three week review period.

Final plan adoption incorporating public comment follows internal departmental review and signoff. The adopted VMP will be posted to the Web; limited bound copies will be distributed to libraries and parties directly engaged in its implementation (both staff and volunteers).

Management Area Recommendations

For the purposes of vegetation management, Lincoln Park has been divided into seven distinct Management Areas. These have been defined based on analysis of existing resource characteristics, geographic features, and primary landscape uses. As delineated in Map F-6 (attached) these Management Areas include:

- Management Area A Shoreline
- Management Area B Bluff
- Management Area C Forest
- Management Area D Passive Use Greensward
- Management Area E Lawn / Ballfields
- Management Area F Active Use Greensward
- Management Area G Native/Ornamental Landscape

Several key management recommendations recur among the Management Areas:

- Monitor potential hazard trees and protect trees from use-related damage.
- Eliminate or reduce the presence of invasive plants.
- Enhance vegetation quality and character, both native and ornamental.
- Mitigate compacted soils and eliminate further soil compaction.
- Reduce social trails that fragment native vegetation.

Verbal Briefing/Questions & Answers

Mark gave a very short verbal briefing to the Board. Kate asked what is meant by the removal of invasive plants at Lincoln Park. Mark answered that invasive issues are pretty well controlled. Terry asked about the slide areas and Mark answered that the slope management procedures deal with the slide areas. Bruce thanked Mark for the presentation.

Park Board Business

- Sarah asked if the Park Board retreat date has been confirmed. The date has been set for Thursday, September 17, at 3:30 pm.
- Sarah asked to have a discussion on golf and its decline in Seattle. Fritz will ask the Park Department golf staff to come before the Board to give a briefing.
- The Board asked about the status of the Park Board Committee list. Fritz answered that work on this list is continuing and should be completed soon.
- The Board asked about the status of filling the vacant seat on the Park Board. Fritz answered that the Mayor's office continue to work on filling this position.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

APPROVED _____ DATE _____
Bruce Bentley, Chair