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***Board of Park Commissioners***

Present:

Antoinette Angulo   
Bob Edmiston

Barbara Wright

Jourdan Keith, Vice-chair

Brice Maryman

Yazmin Mehdi

Tom Tierney

Mazohra Thami

Excused:

Diana Kincaid

***Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff***

Christopher Williams, Superintendent

Rachel Acosta, Park Board Coordinator

Susan Golub, Strategic Advisor

This meeting was held at Seattle Park Headquarters, 100 Dexter Avenue North. Commissioner Keith calls the meeting to order at 6:30 pm. Commissioner Keith asks for approval of the Agenda, the November minutes and the Acknowledgment of Correspondence; Commissioner Edmiston moves to approve the consent items and Commissioner Maryman seconds. The consent items are approved.

To hear and view the full meeting, see <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=5591331>

Superintendent’s Report

Superintendent Williams gives the Park Board an overview of the changes in Parks and a summary of the high visibility issues.

* Park Legacy Plan – The park board will be ramping up their work on the Legacy Plan; Superintendent Williams’ hope is that the Park Board will inherit stewardship and accountability of the plan.
* There have been management changes at SPR:
  + Michele Finnegan will be the new Finance Director because Kevin Stoops is retiring (after 37 years!).
  + Kelly Guy is coming to us from Casey Family Foundation and Public Health and will be our new Recreation Director
  + Hazel Bhang comes from King County Parks and will be our new HR Director
* All three of these directors have a passion for staff – helping people thrive and succeed and Parks is lucky to have them.
* Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) at Seward Park – SPU has held 30 public meetings and went through a broad community process when deciding where to put the CSO tanks. Some of the neighbors are upset because they are anticipating the construction impacts. The neighbors would prefer it situated in the parking lot. Parks is looking at this through the lens of race and social justice in terms of how much it would affect the broader community versus balancing the needs of the people who live around the proposed site. Parks staff will be meeting with Ray Hoffman (SPU) and staff. Superintendent Williams clarifies that they will not be reopening the public process but simply reaffirming the process already done.
* Magnuson Park Controls and Incentives – Magnuson Park is a Historic district which means there are controls and incentives in place to maintain the historical integrity. The Magnuson Advisory Board are seeking more stringent controls and incentives and are looking to come to the Park Board. Commissioner Mehdi requests backup information regarding the Historic District designation.
* Smoking ban in parks – This issue has been around for many years; Parks will bring a ban to the Park Board in the near future.
* 14th Street Park – uses street right of way and takes some parking; the neighbors have been upset over the loss of parking spaces.
* Victor Steinbrueck Park – Parks, working in conjunction with the Pike Place Preservation Board, hopes to start design this year.
* Gas Works Park Play Area – Michael Shiosaki will come and brief the Park Board
* Seattle Asian Art Museum – Parks allotted $9million for renovation as part of a matching fund; the museum did not meet their fundraising requirements. Parks is working with their board to allow the city to sue the money for asset management planned projects – i.e. roofs, irrigation, taking care of what we already have.
* Building 11 and Building 30 – There are lease issues – Parks has hired real estate and marketing firm to establish a market rate study. Are we receiving enough money?

Oral Requests from the Audience

Carol Fisher – President of Lifelong Recreation Advisory Council, in 2010 29% pop was 50 or older. In 2010 there was a SLI that said there city would need to double their fund for the next 10 years to deal with the amount of seniors. Lifelong helps people maintain physical, mental and emotional health; she feels the Legacy Plan does not adequately support the seniors tsunami. [In the Investment Initiatives handout here] 2d is only a subset of seniors so does not represent long-term growth, 2a does not mention that seniors have long been underrepresented in the parks system. 1b does not take into consideration that all programs done in the parks system for seniors are done through Lifelong Recreation and not community center staff.

Sue Holloway, Lifelong Recreation board member, thanks SPR and says that Lifelong Recreation changed her life. She moved here to be closer to her grandchild and did not know anybody. Through Lifelong Recreation, she has met friends and become involved in the city.

Cheryl Klinker – Lake City Community Council member, implores Superintendent Williams to reach out to the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) about the new Seattle Housing Authority project on 33rd Avenue NE which is a land bank site. On south side of the park, there is a proposed congregate housing site with no setbacks which means there would be no space between the park and the buildings and there will be no public design meeting. Superintendent Williams will follow up with DPD.

Ruth Williams – Thornton Creek watershed is thriving for the first time in a long time.

Max – feels that there should be 2 designations within the Seattle Parks system 1) parks – which connotes active users and 2) greenspace – which is natural areas. He feels that if Parks wants to change a greenspace to allow active use (mountain biking) then there should be another property that is traded for greenspace.

Chuck Dolan – Support natural areas and asks Parks to keep them natural.

Sharon LeVine – Parks traded 25 feet of land adjacent to the Queen Anne Bowl soccer field with Aegis; she realizes this is a very pricey piece of property but Aegis would like to turn the land into a 4-story apartment building. She implores Superintendent Williams and SPR to do something to acquire the land. She would also like the city-owned parking spots to be clearly marked.

Bicycle Use Pilot Project

Presented by Mark Mead, Doug Critchfield and David Graves

***Written Briefing***

**Requested Board Action**

Based on recent discussions, Parks staff is recommending that the proposed Bicycle Policy update be put on hold until such time as a pilot project can be implemented and evaluated. To that end, Parks staff is requesting the Boards’ support in moving Cheasty Greenspace forward as a pilot project site on which to implement and evaluate mountain bike trail(s).

**Background**

Parks staff has been before the Board twice, in October and November, to discuss the existing bicycle policy and the issue of potentially allowing mountain bike trails in appropriate areas of Parks’ greenbelts and natural areas. The Board has also heard public testimony both in favor of and opposed to mountain bike trails in our natural areas and greenbelts.

Given the concerns raised by the Board and the Board’s desire for an opportunity to evaluate mountain bike trails on the ground, as other surrounding jurisdictions have been doing for many years; a pilot project was suggested. The neighbors of Cheasty Greenspace have an existing proposal to build mountain bike trails at Cheasty. This proposal was presented as an Opportunity Fund project but was turned down due to conflicts with the existing bicycle policy. The Cheasty proposal is currently the only proposal for bike trails in natural areas. The proponents have community support and a proven track record in undertaking forest restoration and building hiking trails within a section of the Cheasty Greenspace. They are generating volunteer support sufficient to undertake the trail construction in their proposal.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends moving forward with the Cheasty trail proposal as a pilot project to enable staff to evaluate mountain bike trail construction and subsequent operation in a natural area. The proposal would be subject to Parks standard internal review and public process before any construction takes place.

**Proposal**

Staff from Parks’ Natural Resources Unit (NRU) which includes our existing trail crew would take the lead in reviewing the Cheasty Trails pilot. NRU staff would coordinate their review with Parks Planning & Development Division (PDD) staff. PDD staff could lead the public process. NRU staff has extensive information on the forest health and soils at Cheasty and will present this information to the Board on January 9th. (A pdf of this presentation is attached hereto.) This information provides the trail development criteria by which staff would evaluate the actual trail location, construction methods, and maintenance standards and associated forest restoration opportunities. The following lays out the process for evaluating the pilot at Cheasty, with the following assumption: The public process and subsequent trail construction would be completed and the trail(s) would be open for riding by June 2015. If public process and trail construction is completed sooner, the following time frames would adjust accordingly.

The evaluation period should be 12 months to monitor the trail through the four seasons. Trail monitoring would occur once a quarter – Parks staff would walk the trail(s) in June 2015 (or once completed) to establish the baseline condition and then again in September 2015, December 2015, March 2016, and June 2016 to observe the trail conditions.

Staff evaluation of the trails would include:

• General trail condition

• Estimated trail usage.

• Increased parking issues or impacts.

• Noting areas of trail erosion and/or standing water, with recommended fixes

• Noting areas of trail damage, with recommended fixes

• Evidence of bicycles not staying within the constructed trail corridor

• General vegetation health within the immediate trail corridor

• Areas of damaged and or dying vegetation within the trail corridor

• Any signs of wildlife (note that a lack of wildlife present during a visit does not mean that there is no wildlife in the area, only that they are not present at that time)

o Note: Seasonal changes in wildlife use and life cycles may impact this measure.

• Maintenance activities undertaken during the preceding quarter include trail maintenance and vegetation management activities and volunteer hours. Records to be acquired from Green Seattle Partnership CEDAR system.

• Records from Parks PLANT system to evaluate impacts on Parks staff.

• Increases or decreases in trash and or encampments in area

• Development of unplanned trails.

Staff evaluations would be written with attached photo documentation. At the end of the evaluation period, staff will make a determination/recommendation as to whether or not to amend the bicycle policy as originally proposed to allow the potential for trails in other greenbelts/natural areas within the City.

At this time staff has not developed criteria for where to locate a mountain bike trail within the parks system, as there is only one proposal on the table for the pilot – Cheasty. If the pilot is successful, staff will develop locational criteria to be used for siting any additional trails. It is likely that not all greenbelts or natural areas would be appropriate locations for the siting of a mountain bike trail. For example, many greenbelts and natural areas are small and/or dominated by natural features such as Thornton Creek that would preclude the siting of a trail.

**Public Involvement Process**

Parks staff will facilitate a public process to review the Cheasty Trails Pilot consistent with our Public Involvement Policy.

**Issues**

The central issue remains acknowledging mountain bikes as a legitimate recreational use and accommodating that use in a way that balances public access, recreation, environmental stewardship and restoration. People treasure the green associated with Parks’ Greenbelts and Natural Areas even though some areas are home to invasive species and illegal and illicit activities. Encouraging positive recreational activities and fostering stewardship and restoration activities can have a beneficial impact, both socially and ecologically.

**Environmental Sustainability**

Any new trail would have to be sustainable; volunteers would be expected to undertake restoration efforts as well as trail construction to help further the work of the Green Seattle Partnership.

**Budget**

This pilot project has budget implications as it will require staff resources to review the proposal, oversee any construction, manage the public process and evaluate the long term impacts of any constructed trail. A specific budget amount has not been calculated nor has a funding source been identified.

**Schedule**

Parks staff could begin working on the Cheasty Trails pilot upon direction from the Superintendent.

Additional Information

For more information, you can contact David Graves at david.graves@seattle.gov.

***Discussion***

Parks staff presented a slideshow and asked the Park Board to recommend to abstain from voting on the Bicycle Use Policy and to recommend a pilot project at Cheasty greenbelt. A Vegetation Management Plan was performed by Seattle Parks and Recreation staff in 2003. Cheasty greenbelt has problems. Parks staff use treeiage as a scale to measure the health of a forest and the amount of work needed; the scale ranges from best (1) to worst (9). The majority of the Cheasty Greenspace is a 6, which means the forest is ripe with invasive species and not in good shape. There are many non-native maples in the park due to plantings along the boulevard. The trees are choked by ivy, which needs removal. There remains a lack of native plant diversity. Furthermore, there are homeless encampments, garbage and yard waste, and social trails all throughout the greenspace. All of these factors contribute to prohibiting Cheasty from being a home for wildlife and a refuge for Seattle residents.

Parks staff review of the soil found the soil loamy and well drained, and the organic content is low. Most of the slopes are moderate enough to accommodate mountain biking trails. Staff did not see any evidence of slide activity on the slopes.

Mark Mead explains the major concerns from those opposed to the mountain biking trail have to do with the destruction of wildlife habitat, changes in users of the park and erosion. Some of the concerns would be alleviated by creating mountain biking trails that are less steep and avoiding the critical natural areas, such as wetlands. Furthermore, Green Seattle Partnership (GSP) would work with the Cheasty volunteers to ensure the trails are maintained and the greenspace protected.

The Cheasty mountain bike trail pilot project would be closely monitored for all potential issues such as, parking, erosion and the impact to wildlife.

Commissioner Mehdi wants to see some data about the wildlife that currently live in the Cheasty Greenspace. Mark Mead responds that they are working with The Audubon Society to track and study bird habitats, however, it is very difficult to quantify the wildlife population. He emphasizes that a healthier forest will promote wildlife habitation. David Graves concurs with Mark that providing a baseline of wildlife is costly and very difficult to do and that the best indication of a healthy wildlife population is good food sources (ie. a healthy forest). Commissioner Edmiston asks if there will be eco-counters and Mark responds that Parks staff will perform spot checks to count users of the trails. Commissioner Maryman says he sees two communities that feel equally passionate on opposing ends of the Cheasty Greenspace/mountain bike park project; he feels this project could prove mutually beneficial. He suggests having signage that talks about the importance of the urban forests to educate the mountain bikers and foster an understanding and excitement about the natural world. However, Commissioner Maryman thinks the 1 year observation period is insufficient to properly observe the forest restoration and/or impacts to the forest and community by the mountain bike trail, and should be extended to 3 years.

Commissioner Keith, referring to Commissioner Mehdi's request for a wildlife survey, comments that she lives near the East Duwamish greenbelt and there were many species – coyotes, owls –living in the Greenbelt before the restoration was done.

Currently there are no real trails in Cheasty Greenspace, but there are about 1.25 miles of social trails; social trails are trails made by people using the same paths to get from place to place within the greenbelt.

Commissioner Tierney moves for a recommendation for staff to forego the policy update and start the pilot project. Commissioner Edmiston seconds. Commissioner Maryman suggests an amendment to add making the pilot project 3 years and Commissioner Mehdi seconds the friendly amendment. The commissioners vote unanimously to move forward with the pilot project and forego changes to the Bicycle Use policy until the pilot project has been successfully completed. Commissioner Tierney specifies that this does not bar future mountain bike pilot projects that may arise. David Graves articulates that an update to the Bicycle Use Policy is still allowed.

Legacy Plan

Susan Golub, Strategic Advisor for Seattle Parks and Recreation presents on the Legacy Plan and the work of the Parks Legacy Plan Citizen’s Advisory Committee (PLCAC). She announces the public meetings that will be coming up in January:

* **Thursday, January 23**, International District/Chinatown Community Center, 719 8th Ave. S, at 6 p.m.
* **Saturday, January 25**, High Point Community Center, 6920 34th Ave. SW, 1 p.m. (free childcare will be provided)
* **Thursday, January 30**, Bitter Lake Community Center, 13035 Linden Ave. N, at 7 p.m.

The Committee is still in the process of producing a work plan for 2014 but the first meeting will most likely be a discussion around the big picture stuff and the second meeting will discuss operational issues.

Susan distributed a report that included all of the investment initiatives. The report summarizes and lists out all of the priorities for the department based on the findings of the Committee and the testimony heard and received from Seattle residents. The report does not include the size or type of recommended funding mechanism. In March, the final report will come out; this will contain input from the public meetings held in January and input from the Board of Park Commissioners. The City Council will vote by May 5 in order to get this on the August ballot. As previously stated, Susan would like recommendation from the Park Board to ascertain whether the Commissioners feel the PLCAC have represented the goals and vision of SPR and the public. Parks staff have already received valuable feedback from the Commissioners which lead to include Trends in Land Management, and snapshots for Off-Leash Areas and P-Patch.

The Legacy Plan document is comprehensive; everything SPR does is included in this 1 document. In the Fall, SPR and the Board of Park Commissioners will need to start developing an implementation plan. This plan will include the following:

* Department accountability
* Performance management
* Performance measurement for the ballot measure and SPR

Susan requests the Commissioners re-read the plan and get comments to her by the end of January. She asks them to critique the plan but no copy editing. Susan will come back to the Park Board in February.

Commissioner Mehdi points out that the plan will help the department make decisions in times of scarcity. Superintendent Williams adds that the plan is a living document and will help drive how SPR uses their resources.

Commissioner Angulo acknowledges all the work SPR and the PLCAC have put into this document. Susan adds that all SPR staff should find themselves in the plan.

For more information about the Investment Initiatives and the updates to the Legacy Plan, please follow this link: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/legacy/committee.htm>

**Oversight for new ballot measure**Presented by Susan Golub, Strategic Advisor for Seattle Parks and Recreation

***Written Briefing***

**Requested Board Action**

Seattle Parks and Recreation (Parks) is evaluating options for oversight of the new ballot measure anticipated for a public vote in August 2014. Parks requests a recommendation from the Board of Park Commissioners (Board) as to the best option for oversight.

**Background**

As directed by City Council Resolution 31454 (May 2013), a citizens’ committee is evaluating the need for and content of a new Parks funding measure. The new funding measure, whether a renewal of the current parks levy or the creation of a metropolitan parks district (MPD), will include citizen oversight, following the predominant practice in the City. For Parks, citizen oversight of ballot measures has provided a valuable connection to the public throughout implementation of projects and programs and is a welcome as well as necessary component of achieving success.

The City has employed a number of means to provide citizen oversight of ballot measures. Table 1 shows the make-up of some current City citizen oversight committees. Committee make-up ranges from a standing board (library levy) to a committee which includes the Mayor and a City Councilmember (Families and Education Levy).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1: City Ballot Measure Oversight Committees** | | |
| **Ballot Measure** | **Citizen Oversight Provided By** | **Membership** |
| 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy | Parks and Green Spaces Levy Oversight Committee | 16 members: 8 appointed by the Mayor and 8 appointed by the City Council; 3-year terms |
| 2012 Library Levy | Library Board | 5 members: all appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council; 5-year terms |
| 2011 Families and Education Levy | Families and Ed. Levy Oversight Committee | 12 members: the Mayor, one City Council member, one School Board member, the School Superintendent, plus 8 citizens |
| 2006 Bridging the Gap Transportation Levy | Bridging the Gap Oversight Committee | 15 members: 5 appointed by the Mayor, 5 appointed by the City Council, plus one representative from each of three advisory boards: Bicycle, Pedestrian Freight Mobility; plus one City Council member and the City Budget Director |
| **Ballot Measure** | **Citizen Oversight Provided By** | **Membership** |
| 2009 Housing Levy | Housing Levy Oversight Committee | 13 members: one City employee appointed by the Mayor, one City employee appointed by the City Council, 6 non-government employees appointed by the Mayor and 5 non-governmental employees appointed by the City Council |
| 2011 Transportation Benefit District | None |  |

**Anticipated Duties**

The responsibilities of the oversight committee for a Parks funding measure would likely include:

1. Annual budget review/recommendation
2. Assessment of performance measures
3. Reporting to the Mayor and Council on implementation issues/concerns
4. Leading Challenge/Opportunity fund allocation processes

**Options to Consider for Parks**

As shown in Table 1, the City employs a variety of ways to include citizen oversight for funding measures. Parks is offering 3 options for the Board to consider:

1. Park Board providing oversight – the Library model;
2. A separate oversight committee – Parks’ current model; and
3. A hybrid which would have the Board or a committee of the Board supplemented with additional members from the public.
4. Park Board Oversight

Board oversight fits with the Superintendent’s vision of the Board taking on stewardship of the new funding mechanism which, as the Superintendent has described, would include an expanded role in department accountability, communication and reporting to the public, Mayor and City Council. The Board could take on oversight duties at the second meeting of the month, as needed. Current levy oversight has not always required monthly meetings, and may be needed less with a Board already aware of and involved with Parks issues. Board oversight is the model used for the library levy.

**Advantages**:

* + - * The upcoming ballot measure is significantly more complex than past parks levies in that, as currently being considered, it would include a complex mix of maintenance projects, programs and partnerships. This would be a departure from the past two parks levies which were primarily (2000 Pro Parks) and solely (2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy) comprised of capital projects. The Board has a city-wide, comprehensive view of Parks and extensive background/knowledge of the parks system that would be beneficial in overseeing a complex funding measure.
* With the new ballot measure expected to fund projects and programs in every aspect of Parks, having the Board provide oversight avoids potential conflicts over authority: which issues are the purview of the Board to oversee and which belong with a separate oversight committee.

**Disadvantages**:

* With the expected expansion of the Board’s workload into the areas of department accountability, communication, and reporting, adding oversight of the ballot measure increases the workload and may significantly tax our volunteers.
* Keeping oversight within the 9-member Board does not involve a broader group of citizens, as has occurred with the previous two parks levy oversight committees.

1. A Separate Oversight Committee

A separate committee is the predominant method used for oversight of City ballot measures and is consistent with Parks’ previous levy oversight.

**Advantages**:

* A separate committee involves a broader range of the public than with Board oversight.

**Disadvantages**:

* The complexity of the proposed ballot measure requires significantly more understanding of Parks than previous capital-focused measures. This does not mean that a levy-focused citizens’ committee couldn’t get up to speed, just that it will be more difficult.
* With every aspect of Parks touched by the ballot measure, it may be confusing to distinguish what issues should be addressed by the Park Board and what should be addressed by the oversight committee.

1. Park Board Committee with Added Members

Either the full Board or a subcommittee of the Board could be supplemented with citizens to form the ballot measure oversight committee.

**Advantages**:

* This hybrid model retains the city-wide/system-wide perspective and knowledge base of the Board, and adds a broader community perspective.
* A subcommittee of the Board supplemented by non-Board members puts less pressure on Board members’ volunteer time.

**Disadvantages**:

* As compared with a separate committee, a hybrid would not have as many citizens involved in oversight.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommend moving forward with option 1, Park Board oversight, with the understanding that if Board workload and volunteer time commitment become too burdensome, the hybrid model will be implemented.

***Discussion***

SPR requests the Park Board steward the plan alongside the department by providing oversight for the new ballot measure. Susan reviews the levy oversight structure for other city departments; one can find that briefing paper [here](http://www.seattle.gov/parks/parkboard/default.asp). She emphasizes that if the Park Board took on this work, the Commissioners would be taking on a much larger role with the department, which means more work. Susan will talk with staff from the other departments to gain a better understanding of the advantages and pitfalls of each oversight structure.

At this point, the Commissioners compliment Susan for all of the amazing work she does; she is a quiet powerhouse. Superintendent Williams agrees and adds that she is awesome.

Commissioner Keith, who sits on the previous Levy Oversight Committee, comments she really enjoyed the energy brought in by the “outsiders” to the Levy Oversight Committee.

Commissioner Maryman does not fully support a separate committee for the Challenge Fund because the plan is so complex and all-encompassing that if the Park Board is acting as oversight they should be involved in all aspects of the process. Commissioner Mehdi mentions the Library Board acted as the major oversight but they had an Opportunity Fund Committee that reported to the Library Board.

Commissioner Tierney states the Park Board should express their willingness and excitement to embrace the levy oversight role in a letter to the PLCAC. Superintendent Williams agrees, stating that Parks staff did not introduce the idea to the PLCAC in large part because he feels the Park Board need to express interest. Commissioner Tierney feels that the Park Board should bless the plan but wonders what the timing should be on a recommendation and when it goes to City Council for their approval. Commissioner Mehdi adds that the designation of oversight should be spelled out in the legislation.

The Commissioners feel the Park Board’s involvement is important because the Commissioners have been immersed in SPR policy and steeped in knowledge regarding Parks issues for a long time and the Board is a balanced group with varied interests.

Old/New Business

January 14 at 3pm, the Board of Park Commissioners will participate in a RACE workshop facilitated by the Office of Civil Rights. Independently, the Commissioners went to the RACE exhibit at the Pacific Science Center and this workshop will help the Commissioners use this information to make better decisions for Seattle Parks and Recreation.

Commissioner Mehdi served on a panel for the Seattle Neighborhood Coalition and found there was a lot of mistrust regarding the Metropolitan Park District. She noticed that there was a lot of confusion and concern and a lack of clear information. She recommends the Park Board and SPR work diligently at answering people’s questions and assuaging fears if an MPD is chosen.

Commissioner Maryman mentions there has been a lawsuit filed against the Bicycle Master Plan. One can find more information about it here: <http://www.seattlebikeblog.com/2014/01/08/people-upset-about-westlake-bikeway-file-appeal-to-delay-entire-bike-master-plan-hire-missing-link-lawyer/>

ARC Subcommittee update – Commissioner Keith and Commissioner Angulo share this subcommittee but with Commissioner Keith’s term up in March there will need to be another Commissioner on the ARC subcommittee. ARC has been working to prepare their own Legacy Plan and collaborating with Seattle Parks Foundation for the polling on SPR’s Legacy Plan.

Commissioner Keith feels SPR should collectively address homelessness. Many of the people in encampments in Seattle parks are native people and she feels we should be the voice for those who do not feel they have one. Superintendent Williams says that in an urban park system a balance has to be maintained between value conservation with social issues. Seattle offers the highest level of human services. He recommends having the “Committee to End Homelessness in 10 years” come to a Park Board meeting. Perhaps a coalition could develop through which SPR could work with other departments to point people towards resources. The Commissioners wonder whether this is an area they should explore further.

**Commissioner Tierney moves the meeting adjourn; Commissioner Maryman seconds the motion and the motion carries. The meeting adjourns at 8:58 pm.**

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ DATE\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Diana Kincaid, Chair

Board of Park Commissioners