

Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2004

Present: Kate Pflaumer, Chair
Angela Belbeck
Jack Collins
Joanna Grist
Terry Holme

Excused: Debbie Jackson

Staff: Ken Bounds, Superintendent of Parks and Recreation
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

Chair Kate Pflaumer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. **Terry moved and Angela seconded that the minutes and the agenda, as presented, be approved. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.**

Superintendent's Report

Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds reported on the following:

Canada Geese Update: Department staff met with PAWS and the Humane Society to review 2004 moratorium results. Superintendent Bounds confirmed that a moratorium on Canada geese killing would continue next year, based on the ongoing efforts of volunteers to reduce impacts on parks and park users.

Pro Parks Acquisition on Longfellow Creek: The Department has signed an agreement to buy a 5,000-sq.-ft. parcel with about 50 feet of frontage on Longfellow Creek. The parcel is at the midpoint of a two-block reach of the creek that was recently upgraded by a joint project of Parks and Seattle Public Utilities. The project includes stream restoration, riparian habitat enhancement, and construction of the Longfellow Creek Legacy Trail, using existing Parks open space and undeveloped street right-of-ways. The acquisition is funded by the Pro Parks Levy and Conservation Futures Tax.

Discovery Park Chapel: The Landmarks Board voted unanimously to nominate the Discovery Park chapel as a landmark, with the designation meeting set for December 15. The Board wants to take another tour of the facility and grounds. The nomination is usually broader than the final designation, and includes the exterior, interior (chapel portion only), the memorial grove of trees to the east, and some land around the other sides.

Ocean Conservation 2005 Workshop: On November 8, the Aquarium hosted and participated in a sustainable seafood workshop co-sponsored by the Seafood Choices Alliance and presented by the Marine Fish Conservation Network – the nation's largest national coalition dedicated solely to promoting long-term sustainability of marine fisheries. Parks became a partner in this effort in 2003. The purpose of the event was to bring together members of the restaurant, retail, and fishing communities to brief them on upcoming marine conservation issues and outline opportunities for involvement next year.

Denny Awards Presented: Park volunteers attended a recent thank you reception at the Seattle Asian Art Museum. The annual award event recognizes the efforts made by our volunteers throughout the system. Special recognition was given to three citizens and one organization for extraordinary contributions in 2004.

Langston Hughes Invited to Present at National Youth-At-Risk Convention: Langston Hughes Performing Arts Center is invited to present a workshop at Georgia Southern University's National Youth-At-Risk Convention in Savannah, Georgia. The March 9, 2005, workshop will highlight best practices from the Center's All Teen Summer Musical Program. Langston's workshop was recognized as a conference standout and organizers were insistent they return. Now in its 16th year, the conference gathers hundreds of professional youth service workers from across the country to focus on best practices in the field of youth development.

Terry asked about the costs for this convention and how the expenses will be paid. Ken stated that the Department and youth will begin searching for funds.

Seattle Management Awards: Magnuson Park Director Eric Friedli won the 2004 Seattle Management Association (SMA) Leadership Award and Central East District Manager Royal Alley-Barnes has won the award for Management in the Field. The awards will be presented at a December 8 luncheon. This is eight years in a row that Parks staff members have won SMA awards.

Budget Update: City Council recently voted on the 2005-2006 budget. Good news is that Council restored \$152,336 in General Funds to the Late Night Program; provided resources from General Funds for the Pyramid project; passed the golf management agreement with Premier; rejected both the parking fee and the Conservatory Fee; and provided most of the revenue anticipated from those fees. Council members asked Parks to come back before City Council in January 2005 with the Occidental Park plan; deferred issuance of bonds for Piers 62/63, and removed the 2006 capital funds for City Hall and Freeway Parks. Council members also recommended that Parks be more rigorous in its donation system at the Conservatory to increase opportunities for visitors to donate at the door.

Upcoming Events

- **November 19** — Civic Light Opera will begin its production of *High Society* in the Magnuson Community Center Auditorium.
- **November 26** — Pioneer Square Community Association dedication of improvements in Pioneer Square Park and a holiday tree-lighting ceremony from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m.
- **November 26** — Tree lighting ceremony at Westlake Park and the opening of the winter holiday carousel.
- **December 11** — Alki Bathhouse Grand Opening at 8:00 pm. This event is being held in conjunction with the Alki Christmas Ships Social, which begins at 8:40 p.m. and will include live music, refreshments, Santa Claus, bonfire, and Christmas Ships viewing. The Christmas Social is from 8:40–10:20 p.m.
- **December 11** — Annual Green Lake Pathway of Lights will take place from 6:00-9:00 p.m. at Green Lake Park, 7201 E Green Lake Drive N.
- **December 2–26** — Langston Hughes Collaborates On Alternative Holiday Show. Seattle sketch comedy comedienne Lisa Koch and Peggy Platt celebrate 15 years of comedic partnership with "Smorgasporik: The Best of Ham for the Holidays." Now in its sixth year, this annual alternative holiday show is a collection of off beat sketches and hilarious characters. Warning: for mature audiences only.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

The Chair, Kate Pflaumer, explained that this portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had, or are not scheduled for, a public hearing before the Board. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and will be timed. The Board's regular process is for 15 minutes of testimony to be heard at this time, with additional testimony heard after the regular agenda and just before Park Board business. Kate recognized that a number of those who signed up to testify were concerned with the Seattle Prep/Montlake Playfield proposal listed on the agenda. 18 people signed up to testify, with 15 of those requesting to speak on the Montlake PF/Seattle Prep Proposal. Kate briefly addressed how best to accommodate everyone who wished to speak on this subject, and what the Board's next steps might be. The Board agreed that additional discussion on the Board's next step would be held after the briefing.

By the end of the testimony, seven citizens spoke on Montlake Playfield and three spoke on other subjects. Several decided not to testify when their name was called. A brief summary of the comments follows.

Steve Milam: He is a Montlake resident who lives near the playfield. He is a coach, user, and spectator at the field. He presented written comments to the Board and requests a thorough study of this proposal. He urged that the history of this project be looked at and that the proposal be better defined. He asked that development plans for Washington Park be included and stated that Montlake Community Council did not vote in favor of this proposal.

Patti Gorman: She has been a Montlake resident since 1975 and lives close to the playfield. She is concerned with the impact of this proposal. The street in front of the park is a one-way, short, and dead end street. Nearby homes would be impacted. There has been inadequate public input and miscommunication about this proposal and she requested a public hearing be held. She is concerned with the proposed uses for shot put and a batting cage. She understands that a codicil exists regarding a LID at this park and urged that this be investigated.

Nancy Van Leuvor: She made brief remarks from the audience and felt her concerns were addressed by the previous speakers.

Kathy Smith-Diduleo: She has lived one block from the park since 1977. Her concerns include traffic impacts and emergency vehicles' access and egress if this proposal comes about. There are walking trails near the park and having baseball played nearby is a safety concern. She stated that there were errors in the timing sequence referred to in the written briefing paper and meeting notices were inadequate.

Laura Gardner: She is President of Montlake Advisory Council. Earlier in the day she sent a fax to the Board from the Montlake Advisory Council and read portions of the fax aloud. She disputed portions of the information in the written briefing report and stated that the Advisory Council requested a copy of the June 18 technical report, which it never received. She requested that the Department follow its public involvement policy and stated that Parks' Operations Director, Christopher Williams, assured her today that this proposal will have a full public involvement process after the parameters are determined.

Roger Belanich: He is a Queen Anne resident who lives across from Betty Bowen/Marshall Viewpoint. He stated that he testified recently before the Board recently and tonight distributed additional history and information on this viewpoint. He is requesting that the viewpoints at this site be restored by the Parks Department.

Nancy Malmgren: She announced two upcoming events at the Carkeek Watershed: (1) The Salmon Return to Carkeek and (2) this coming weekend there is a gala art show at Carkeek. Tulle Piper's paintings have been restored and she invited everyone to Carkeek on Sunday to view them. She also distributed copies of a letter from her to the Department of Ecology on the Clean Water project. She asked Parks staff to review the letter and make any additions. The deadline is December 11.

Al Smith: He is a regular volunteer at Seward Park and was interested in tonight's Historic Resources presentation. However, after talking to Parks staff, he realized that tonight's Historic Resources briefing differs from his interest — which is a site to research historical Seattle park maintenance. He talked about the history of Seward Park in the 1920's and how decisions made at that time has impacted and influenced the look of the park today. He urged that the Board and Department consider some way to assemble these historical maintenance records so they are accessible.

Superintendent Bounds commented that Al is one of the three recent Denny Award winners, recognized as an outstanding volunteer.

As there were a number of audience members especially interested in the Seattle Prep/Montlake Playfield Improvement Proposal, the agenda was altered so this briefing could be heard before the Beach Fire Discussion/Recommendation.

Briefing: Seattle Prep/Montlake Playfield Improvement Proposal

Herbye White, Parks Department Director of Recreation, came before the Board to give a briefing on the Seattle Prep/Montlake Playfield Improvement Proposal. The Board also received a written briefing and engineer's report from Jim Ishihara to Herbye White, dated June 18, 2004. Both are included in these minutes.

Written Briefing

Seattle Parks and Recreation staff and Seattle Preparatory School (Seattle Prep) representatives will brief the Board on the proposed Montlake Playfield improvements so that Board members can convey their concerns and recommendations to the Superintendent for consideration.

PROPOSAL

Seattle Prep is proposing to improve the Montlake Playfield, which it has rented for its sports teams' practice for many years. The school plans to raise money for the improvements as part of a larger fundraising effort it recently initiated. The Seattle Prep proposal includes the following elements:

- Improve existing baseball field.
- Improve existing soccer field/track.
- Add a softball/little league baseball field.
- Add two tennis courts.
- Improve parking lot.

BACKGROUND

Recently Seattle Prep initiated a \$14 million major fundraising effort to make much-needed improvements to the school, including proposed improvements to Montlake Playfield costing approximately \$2.8 million (estimate prepared by D.A. Hogan and Associates Inc.).

This is Seattle Prep's first serious proposal for field improvements at Montlake Playfield. They want to provide safe and aesthetically pleasing park improvements for the community and develop a first-class practice facility for their team sports. There would be some additional impacts on traffic due to the reliability of the new synthetic surface; however, the additional impacts would be primarily from community groups other than Seattle Prep athletes, who would continue to walk between the school and playfield.

Superintendent Bounds and I met with representatives from Seattle Prep and the Mayor's Office in early June. After hearing their proposal, we agreed to involve the Montlake community to determine the community's interest and support for the proposal. At that meeting, Ken told Seattle Prep representatives that this effort could not interfere or impact the current planning for the ProParks-funded community center expansion, and Seattle Prep agreed to that condition.

CHRONOLOGY (all dates 2004)

- June 7—Parks and Recreation staff met with Seattle Prep in the Mayor's Office to hear its initial development proposal.

- August 19—Community leaders (9) and staff (6) met with Seattle Prep at 100 Dexter to review the proposal and answer any questions. Community leaders were asked to share that information with community members and also inform them that the Montlake Advisory Council would host a community-wide information sharing meeting in the next 30 days.
- September 8—The Montlake Community Club notified the community of this meeting at the Montlake Community Center. Community Club President Ken Schubert hosted the meeting. It was attended by approximately 80 people, including Seattle Prep representatives, Parks staff, and Montlake Advisory Council members.
- September 13—At the Montlake Advisory Council’s regular monthly meeting, members discussed the playfield improvements and voted to support the project in concept.

Note: The Advisory Council specifically asked: Are all the improvements identified in the plan necessary on such a small footprint? Will Seattle Prep address and satisfy the four concerns addressed in the Seattle Parks engineer’s initial evaluation dated June 18, 2004? What if any research has been done to determine if the proposed improvements would be impacted by the SR#520 highway improvements currently being discussed? The Council asked staff to meet with Seattle Prep and Parks technical staff to determine a realistic park improvement design model and report to them prior to further discussions.

- October 6—Jim Ishihara, Parks engineer, and Ted Holden, senior landscape architect, met with Seattle Prep representatives and refined the plan’s scope with the following suggestions:
 1. Seattle Prep should address all concerns identified by the Parks engineer’s report dated June 18 (attached).
 2. As context for addressing the permitting and land use issues, Seattle Prep and the City should work together to develop a park master planning strategy that would include all existing and proposed improvements. In particular, the strategy should include the shoreline enhancements as proposed in the preliminary design such as shifting the existing soccer field/track away from the shoreline, and the installation of a retainer to protect both the shoreline and the proposed improvements. This effort should also consider the shoreline environmental enhancements proposed by the community in a recent Neighborhood Matching Fund application.
 3. The proposed softball/little league baseball to be added should have no permanent fencing and the relatively immature trees should be relocated or replaced on site.
 4. The existing baseball field would not be used to accommodate 90-foot base pads, but instead add a batting cage similar to Lower Woodland #1 and other locations throughout the park system.
 5. Should the project go forward with the proposed installation of synthetic turf on the soccer field, track and baseball infield, the environmental benefits will result in better drainage, less water usage and limit the use of fertilizer to the outfield portion of the baseball field.
- Week of October 25—Staff informed Montlake Advisory Council of the October 6 meeting results. Also, staff attended the regular monthly Montlake Advisory Council meeting November 1 to inform them of the technical staff review results that led to the reduction of the elements in Seattle Prep’s original plan; staff offered to answer any questions or concerns, and invited Advisory Council members to attend the November 18 Board of Park Commissioners meeting. On November 2, staff met with planning and development staff to review the two proposed Montlake Community Center footprints to evaluate the relationship of the Seattle Prep design. It was determined that the women’s softball/little league baseball field would have an impact on the community center planning process. However, staff members believe that there may potential for a design that would incorporate a reconfigured parking lot and two additional tennis courts.

- Staff have drafted a schedule for the project based on our past experience with ballfield improvements and the associated permitting processes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Eliminate the tennis courts and softball field from the proposal pending the final footprint for the Montlake Community Center addition. If space becomes available for these improvements, Seattle Prep should revise and resubmit the proposal.
- Phase 1 improvements should include the baseball field, soccer field, and track. If space becomes available and adequate funding is in place for the additional improvements, highest priority should be given to the softball/little league baseball field, the tennis courts, and the parking lot.
- No additional block of hours should be scheduled. However, as a result of the new synthetic surface, more of the hours in all user groups' scheduled blocks will be useable.

###

Engineer's report from Jim Ishihara to Herbye White, June 18, 2004

The Planning, Engineering and Design Sections have reviewed the proposal presented at the June 11, 2004 meeting and have the following comments that should be considered in the planning phase for this project.

1. The schedule should include activities associated with need to obtain an Army Corps of Engineer review and probable permit. As a minimum, 5 months should be allocated for this activity and could go beyond that time depending upon the issues that need to be addressed and resolved.
2. Under its current land use designation, SMC 23.60.936 prohibits open space uses other than shoreline recreation (SMC 23.60.638). Existing ball fields are a nonconforming use, which can be maintained, but the code does not allow for the proposed project that was outlined in this plan. In other words, this project may not get approval due to the current land designation at this shoreline. The MUP permitting process can be expected to be much longer than what is shown on the proposed schedule if it is approved.
3. The proposed project does not appear to consider the SPU 1998 geo-technical report recommendations related to the northeast corner of the site (copy attached). Over the years, the northeast portion of the existing field/track has settled 5 to 6 feet in depth due to the unconfined organic layers below the field surface along the edge of the lake. This portion of the site will continue to settle into the future unless physically constrained by some sort of retaining structure. The SPU report recommended moving the existing field westward approximately 150 feet to a point that experienced less settlement in order to avoid expensive retaining structures. There would be a considerable cost associated with retaining the northeast corner of the site in order to prevent eventual loss of proposed improvements.
4. Park Standard for drain lines is 3034 PVC which is more expensive but more durable than the proposed ADS drain pipe. The design needs to comply with Parks standards.
5. It is assumed that these proposed improvements will be fully funded by the donors and meet Park Standards for similar facilities. Normally, for these types of donations, PDD staff time for coordination, public process, reviews, and inspections are normally funded by the project; this cost element is not identified on the project estimate. The cost for this element could be in the 3 to 6 percent of construction cost amount range.

Verbal Briefing

Superintendent Bounds gave a brief introduction. Seattle Prep came to Parks in early 2004 with this proposal and, over the past few months, Parks has reviewed whether it can work. This proposal is not an eminent project that will skip any public review or permitting processes. Tonight's presentation is to brief the Board and get feedback on the proposal. Parks staff members have had conversations with the community and have asked Seattle Prep to scale back its original proposal. Ken introduced Parks Recreation Director Herbye White.

Herbye addressed several points made in earlier testimony. The Seattle Prep proposal was introduced to the Superintendent and to Herbye as a concept and abstract notion. His job was to next take the proposal before the community for its reaction. Herbye stated that 80-100 people attended the September 9 Montlake Community Club meeting. He thinks the Department has been successful in getting citizens to look at the proposal and come back with questions.

He believes the report is basically accurate and addressed several points in the testimony. He asked to correct a date in the briefing paper chronology: The “*August 19—Community leaders (9) and staff (6) met with Seattle Prep at 100 Dexter to review the proposal*” was incorrect. The correct date was July 19. In the middle of the process, the primary staff member working on the proposal left the Department. That, coupled with the way this process has occurred, has caused some confusion.

He explained why the technical report wasn’t distributed to the public and agreed that, at the September 9 meeting, the Advisory Council “agreed to proceed with discussions about the proposal”, and did not give the concept its approval. The discussions began in early summer and Advisory Councils don’t usually meet in summer. Herbye talked a bit further about the discussion timeline. The intent was to get the word out, but unfortunately this did not happen.

This park has been under his direct supervision for a number of years when prior improvement projects to the soccer field and track were made. The Department has consistently and successfully worked with Seattle Prep over the years, as the school has used the field as renters for many years. This is the first time Seattle Prep has made a proposal to improve the playfield, which has extremely poor soil. Having a major resource make the improvements would be similar to the contractual arrangement the Department has with Seattle Pacific University.

Board Questions and Answers

Joanna asked what happens next in the public process steps. Herbye answered that the next step is Seattle Prep’s responsibility. There has been a departure from Seattle Prep’s original proposal and the school must now determine if it wants to pursue further discussions. Jack stated that he believes the Board should have a public hearing if there is more to hear from Seattle Prep. Herbye answered that the regular public involvement process hasn’t yet begun, as this is a proposal and not yet a project.

Ken and Herbye stressed that this is a proposal brought forth by Seattle Prep and not a project. Parks staff had issues with portions of the proposal, especially the shoreline area, and asked Seattle Prep to scale back the proposal. Parks staff went out to the community to begin the conversations about the proposal and heard some interest in pursuing the idea. Staff did not hear a definite “no” from the community. If Seattle Prep scales back the proposal and comes back to Parks, then both the public involvement and permitting processes would begin. This would be a long process, with Seattle Prep’s attorneys involved.

Terry asked if the proposed ballfield size would take it out of high school baseball game size. Herbye answered that it is not prudent to play full size (or 90’) regular games on the field. The Seattle Prep improvements would be for a practice field only. Terry referred to Jim Ishihara’s June 8 technical report and asked if the entire park is included in the current land use designation “under its current land use designation, SMC 23.60.936 prohibits open space uses other than shoreline recreation (SMC 23.60.638).” Ken answered that 200’ is so designated. Herbye stated that as the proposal would be for both new uses and a change in uses, it is unknown if permitting approval is possible. This is a difficult issue. Angela asked if the 200’ buffer would encompass the entire park and Herbye answered no. Angela asked what components are there now and what would be added and Herbye pointed these out on a large map. He also distributed a copy to the Board. There would be some new uses in this 200’ buffer.

Jack suggested that this discussion be tabled until a project is brought back before the Board for a public hearing and the Board agreed.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

Kate allowed two additional speakers at this point.

Craig Van Riper: He is concerned with two principals: (1) the proposal by an endowed private entity to take public lands for its own needs; and (2) a possible private partnership between Parks and Seattle Prep. He believes Parks must manage with its current funds or get a levy passed. He disagreed with several staff comments made during the briefing.

Judy Coryell: She is a 30-year Montlake resident and is committed to the Montlake neighborhood. Most of the neighborhood kids attend public schools. It bothers her that Parks is considering limiting public resources to benefit kids already getting a private education. This is robbing the community of one of its assets and the issue should be brought before the community.

Discussion/Recommendation: Beach Fires

At its October 14 meeting, Adam Cole, Environmental Stewardship Coordinator, came before the Board to give a briefing on a proposal to ban beach fires at both Alki Beach and Golden Garden Parks, immediately followed by a public hearing. (http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2004/10-14-04_minutes.pdf)

Tonight the Board is being asked to discuss the proposal and vote on a recommendation to the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation.

Board Questions & Answers

Kate stated that tonight the Board is continuing the public process to keep the public informed. The Board has received hundreds of e-mails on this proposal.

Ken commented that since the October 14 briefing, Adam surveyed 23 other jurisdictions and cities, from San Diego to Richmond, BC, on their beach fire policy. Adam verbally detailed results of this survey. All those he surveyed have similar concerns as Seattle. Some are satisfied with their beach fire management, others aren't. Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego are not considering cutting back on beach fires. Some nearby entities plan to ban the fires or have banned them in the last few years. Terry asked if any of the ones that allow fires have a fee structure for beach fires. Adam did not believe any charged for the fires. However, some fires are allowed in parks that charge admission fees or have metered parking lots. Some have a reservation system and some others can be utilized in conjunction with reserving a picnic shelter.

Jack suggested that the Board discuss the two parks, Alki and Golden Gardens, discuss separately. The Board agreed with this.

Alki Beach

Jack stated that, at the October 14 public hearing, three speakers from Alki spoke in favor of beach fires. His understanding is that after stricter enforcement began in 2003, the illegal fire situation at Alki is under control. According to correspondence sent to the Board, beach fires are an historical family event in Alki; volunteers want to help monitor the fires; better signage is needed; beach fire users want the rules to be enforced; and they want appropriate fuels available for purchase. He suggested that the Alki Community Council be very engaged in helping to enforce the rules and that Seattle Police Department enforce the laws about alcohol in parks and on streets.

Kate stated she is impressed that the stricter enforcement and education instigated in 2003 resulted in a 70% reduction in illegal fires. Ken agreed that Park staff's monitoring efforts has paid off; however, there are concerns as to whether staff can sustain this level of enforcement.

Angela urged that the City come down hard on enforcement. Joanna suggested that fires be kept as is — in the rings — and evaluate how things are going in one-year.

Terry was impressed by the libertarian bent of some e-mails and, for the record, he especially enjoyed the West Seattle Sons of Beaches' communications. He supports keeping the existing system at Alki, but doesn't want to take away opportunities from another area. The objective should be to maintain recreation opportunities.

Golden Gardens

Terry believes the Golden Garden site poses a different problem, as it is in a secluded area. Alcohol use at Golden Gardens is a concern, as well as the graphic photos of beach fire remains sent by one citizen. He thinks beach fire fees are impractical and need more discussion. He recommends that the beach fires be allowed at Golden Gardens, but Parks should continue its enforcement and education efforts. Put Golden Gardens on probation as part of the education process. Local beach fire advocates want to be involved and help.

Joanna believes enforcement must be all or nothing at Golden Gardens and supports a ban on beach fires. She supports recreation for families, but in a clean and healthy way. Shoreline in a city is a rare and special thing and should be protected.

The natural area is located in the area north of the bathhouse. Ken suggested that a stiff fine be imposed for any fires out of the legal area and that the natural area be completely off limits to beach fires. Most of the illegal fires at Golden Gardens are in this natural area. Kate stated that warning signs to this effect must be big and clear. Golden Gardens does not have the residential community resources that Alki does to help monitor the fires and must have staff resources for enforcement and education. Joanna suggested that fines for fires in the natural area be more costly. Ken discussed the current municipal code; currently the penalty is only a park code violation and fine. Parks staff can look at drafting legislation to have a more effective enforcement tool. Adam stated that under the current policy, Seattle Police officers have to see the person light the fire; the code could be re-written to fine those who also maintain the fire.

General discussion

Jack believes that education, staff and volunteer enforcement, and clean and appropriate fuels are necessary to deter the negative aspects of beach fires. The beach fires are not a priority for Seattle Police, but they are a priority for Parks. Joanna believes that it can be intimidating for volunteers to approach those at an illegal fire. Angela stated that if the Department issues permits for fires, it could potentially lose its recreation liability coverage. Ken agreed that any change in wording must be carefully structured. Joanna stated that if fires are allowed and fuels are sold on-site, it is difficult to understand how education will help deter the illegal fires. Ken answered that in 2003, Pro Parks staff began monitoring the beaches, distributing brochures, and turning away those with illegal fuels. The number of illegal fires dropped, due to the combination of their presence and education efforts. Joanna asked if the Department has the staff to continue this effort and Ken answered that it has been funded by the Pro Parks Levy, so far. The Department is concerned that it can maintain the needed staffing level.

The Board continued its discussion for a short while longer. Adam reviewed the three options presented at the October 14 meeting: **#1 Ending public beach fires (except under Special Event permitted status); #2 Prohibit fires October 2 – May 30, allow June 1 – October 1 by reservation and fee only; or #3 Allow beach fire recreation to continue "as is" (or status quo.)**

Jack moved that **fires at Alki Beach be allowed as they currently are - in appropriate fire pits, with use of fire pits enforced, with education, and with particular reliance on the community.** Angela seconded. Joanna added a friendly amendment "and banned October 1- May 31." The friendly amendment had no second. The vote was taken on the original motion, with 3 votes in favor (Terry, Jack, and Angela) and 1 opposed (Joanna). Kate, as chair, does not vote unless there is a tie. Motion carried.

Terry moved to **continue the current policy at Golden Gardens with added effort to increase enforcement, education, and signage. Beach fires will be placed on a one-year probation in this park, after which the Parks Department will present an assessment to the Park Board, and the Board will make a recommendation to the Superintendent.** Angela seconded. Joanna made a friendly amendment that fires would "be prohibited from October 2-May 31." The friendly amendment had no second. The vote was taken on the original motion, with 3 votes in favor (Terry, Jack, and Angela) and 1 opposed (Joanna). Kate, as chair, does not vote unless there is a tie. Motion carried.

These recommendations now go to the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation for consideration. Kate stated that the general consensus is to continue to try to make beach fires work. Terry suggested the Board give its support for City Council to change the municipal code.

Briefing: Sand Point Historic Campus Strategic Development Plan

Tabled — to be rescheduled in the near future.

Magnuson Park Director Eric Friedli distributed a large packet of information to the Board members. Jack requested a tour of the campus be arranged for Board members. Eric agreed to arrange this tour, after which the briefing will be rescheduled for a future meeting.

Briefing: Historic Resources Plan

Tabled — to be rescheduled in the near future.

Park Board Business

None

New/Old Business

- The Board’s retreat is scheduled for one of two dates the first week of February.
- There was a discussion of the Department’s public involvement policy and ways to better notify the public of the process.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

APPROVED: _____ DATE _____

Terry Holme, Acting Chair