

Board of Park Commissioners  
Meeting Minutes  
December 9, 2004

Present: Terry Holme, Acting Chair  
Angela Belbeck  
Jack Collins  
Debbie Jackson

Excused: Joanna Grist  
Kate Pflaumer

Staff: B.J. Brooks, Deputy Superintendent of Parks and Recreation  
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

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

## **Superintendent's Report**

Deputy Superintendent B.J. Brooks reported on the following:

Aquarium Director Announces Retirement: Bill Arntz met with his staff to share his decision to step down as Aquarium Director in January 2005, after a remarkable four and one-half years. The momentum of growth that the Aquarium has achieved during Bill's tenure will be maintained with John Braden, appointed as Acting Director.

State Likely to Fund Grants to Seattle Parks in 2005: Parks has lobbied for, and indications are good that we will receive, approximately \$45 million from the State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) in the coming year. Projects funded with this money include the Olympic Sculpture Park, Ercolini Park acquisition, and Lower Woodland Skate Park, as well as a portion of the South Lake Union Park project.

King County Funding Benefits Parks: King County appropriated \$250,000 from its general fund for the expansion of the Mount Baker Rowing and Sailing Center. With the support of the County Council, County Executive Ron Sims directed the use of discretionary funds in the 2005 budget. He indicated that due to the center's unique offerings and its regional draw, it made sense for the County to provide support. Together with a \$45,000 youth sports grant from the County, total King County support for the project is \$295,000.

Concerts on Pier Relocation: For 2005, Concerts on the Pier will relocate from the Seattle waterfront to a temporary venue of South Lake Union due to structural concerns with Pier 62 and 63. One Reel relies on the revenue from these concerts to support other major events in Seattle, including the Lake Union fireworks display and Bumbershoot. The financial benefit to the City is substantial.

Kroc Community Center Proposed: The City sent a letter to the Salvation Army requesting that Rainier Vista be considered for a new Ray and Jon Kroc Cops Community Center in Seattle. This is an opportunity for a \$30-50 million community center facility in an area of town that has over 1/3 of the City's children and a very diverse

population. Rainier Vista has moved on to the next round for consideration, and the City will be preparing a proposal to the Salvation Army with more specifics on how such a center could work in Rainier Vista.

Alki Bathhouse Dedication: On Saturday, December 11, Parks will join Mayor Nickels and the community to dedicate improvements to the Alki Bathhouse. The event will piggy-back with the Alki Beach Christmas Ships Social, sponsored by the Alki Community Center. The dedication marks the completion of a construction project that completely renovated this community building, creating artist studios and a multi-purpose community meeting area. The renovations were funded in large part by the Pro Parks Levy, with additional monies coming from the community through donations from Friends of Alki Bathhouse and the Alki Advisory Council, as well as from a Department of Neighborhoods Neighborhood Matching Fund award.

Magnuson Park Improvements: On Friday, December 3, more than 100 7th graders from Denny Middle School came to lend their volunteer hands to assist with native plant mitigation planting at the Magnuson Park Off-leash Area Shoreline Project. The next day, 53 volunteers associated with the Magnuson Off-leash Group lent their helping hands to complete the planting. This project is schedule to complete construction in early January.

Piper's Creek Salmon Celebration: The 2004 free annual salmon celebration at Carkeek Park, held November 26, was attended by 250 people and about 15 salmon. Visitors took a journey within a unique interactive living history program featuring a life-size model of a "real time machine."

### **Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience**

The Acting Chair, Terry Holme, 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. Two people signed up to testify.

J.D. Leza, Next Generation Consultants: He distributed a copy of the South Park Newsletter, which is a production of the Teen Outreach Program, South Park Community Technology Center, and South Park Teen Program. He also distributed a copy of a May 23, 2004, evaluation report, and a memo from himself to the Board regarding a request to develop and manage a teen-led effort to raise \$200-500,000 for teen program expansion. He is asking the Mayor, City Council, and Park Board to support the fundraising effort and he also objects to the elimination of the Teen Program Coordinator. He will meet with Councilmember David Della, then return to the Board with further information.

Monica Wort, Green Lake Teen Council Program: She voiced concerns that the Teen Program Coordinator position has been cut in the Department's budget and teens will no longer have that advocate.

Other teens in the audience were asked to sign their names and they all did so. Deputy Superintendent B.J. Brooks thanked the youth and will send their information to Operations Director Christopher Williams. Christopher's response to the youth will also be sent to the Board. Terry commented that the Board is not generally involved in the Department's programming decisions. Jack commented that the Board also has little input to the Department's budget decisions.

### **Briefing: Aquarium Pier 59 Renovation**

Erin Devoto, Parks Director of Planning and Development, and Rich Hennings, Parks Department project manager, came before the Board to give a briefing on the Aquarium Pier 59 Renovation. The Board also received a written briefing. Both are included in these minutes.

#### *Written Briefing*

#### **Action Requested**

A Parks staff briefing on the structural renovation of the Seattle Aquarium on Pier 59 will be presented on December 9. No action is requested from the Park Board at this time.

### **Project intent**

The proposed 2005-2006 CIP budget includes funding to restore the structural integrity of the pier. The work involves the replacement of the old wood piles with new larger steel piles and new concrete aprons around the building. Steel trusses will be placed under the western portion and a complete replacement will be done to approximately the eastern one-fourth of the building. It is expected that Councilmanic bonds will be used to fund the project.

### **Project Background**

The 1997 Master Plan for the Aquarium and the Central Waterfront park properties called for replacement of the current Piers 62/63 with an entirely new Aquarium on that site. During the development of the final design, opposition arose from residents of new condominiums across Alaskan Way and from open space advocates favoring retention of Piers 62/63 as open space. At the same time, private funding for the large-scale development was not available due to the downturn in the regional economy and the uncertainty over replacement of the Alaskan Way Viaduct and seawall. Both Pier 59 and Piers 62/63 received minimal maintenance in expectation of their removal. The revised direction has been to retain the Aquarium function at Pier 59 to serve as the central core for Aquarium expansion at a later date.

A structural study in the fall of 2003 found that the piles supporting the pier had serious deterioration and recommended that it be renovated to provide for a 50-year life. At the same time a revitalized Seattle Aquarium Society (the Society) began forming a concept of what the new Aquarium would look like and what improvements they would fund. Parks has been coordinating with the Society in the development of the project design. The Aquarium has seen a dramatic increase in their revenues and expects the redevelopment will continue the trend.

The project will be constructed using a general contractor/construction manager (GC/CM) process which can be utilized for projects whose construction value is expected to be over \$10 million and that meet certain other criteria. Turner Construction has been selected to perform the GC/CM function. Turner will manage the project construction schedule and construction budget and will develop packages to bid out for subcontractors to perform the work.

### **Design**

A design of the pier has been developed and construction documents are currently being developed. Permits from the Army Corps, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, State Department of Ecology, and the City's Department of Planning and Development are all in progress. The first bid package for the purchase of the steel for the piles and the trusses is scheduled to be bid in February 2005.

The design is being coordinated with the efforts of the Society and its designer, Mithun. The Society is expected to begin construction to overlap with the completion of the Parks project in spring 2005. The Society has set a fund raising goal of \$13.7 million to construct a 140,000 gallon exhibit in the new eastern section of the building, along with interactive features, and will contract with concessionaires for the development of a restaurant and gift shop.

### **Public Process**

In November 2004, as part of the 2005 budget process the City Council held a mandatory (Resolution 30096) public hearing to take testimony regarding this project. In addition, the project will have limited public involvement as it is being undertaken as a major maintenance project to keep the facility operational. The Aquarium has public relations and marketing staff that will incorporate the redevelopment of the structure and the east end of the facility into the marketing program.

The decision to locate the expanded Aquarium incorporating a redeveloped Pier 59 resulted from the recommendations of a Citizens Advisory Committee in 2001. Pier 59 is a designated City Landmark, and alterations to designated features require a Certificate of Approval from the City's Landmarks Board. The design team has made several presentations to the Board and submitted a proposed Certificate of Approval in November.

### **Project Schedule**

Construction documents are expected to be completed in April 2005. Construction will begin with the removal of lead and asbestos, followed by the construction of new mechanical and electrical spaces and relocation of the electrical and mechanical systems in the area of the existing lobby. The start of pile driving is controlled by the State fish

“windows” that allow in-water construction work only between mid-July through mid-February. The pile work is scheduled to start in mid-July 2005, with completion of the remaining structural work in spring 2006.

### **Project Budget**

Project funding for planning, design, and construction is \$24 million. The current budget includes \$1.6 million for planning and design. The 2005 budget proposes to fund an additional \$22.4 million with councilmanic debt. Of the debt amount, \$2.4 million will be repaid with revenues generated by concessions.

### **Additional Information**

Rich Hennings, Seattle Parks Aquarium construction manager, 684-7262, or [richard.hennings@seattle.gov](mailto:richard.hennings@seattle.gov)

### ***Verbal Briefing***

Erin Devoto, Director of Project Development, and Rich Hennings, project manager, gave a verbal background on this project. A schedule of the proposed work and photos of the piers were displayed, with areas of deterioration pointed out.

Terry asked for clarification of where the project is located. Erin and Rich answered that Parks owns Piers 57 to 63. The Aquarium is located on piers 59 and 60, pier 61 was demolished some years ago, and piers 62/63 are where the “Summer Nights at the Piers” concerts have been held. Tonight’s briefing only concerns Pier 59.

Until the repairs are completed, the Aquarium will close to the public if there are sustained winds of 50 mph or if there is a heavy snow load on the piers. The Imex Theater and the area near it will be demolished. The Aquarium will be closed for a few weeks during the construction.

Erin and Rich discussed the phases of the work. Rich displayed a structural X-section and described the work to be done to the east end of the pier. He then showed another structural X-section of the west side and a drawing that showed floor plans and operations. He also showed a drawing of the south elevation view and described the different elements located in this area. He then reviewed the project timeline and regulatory process.

### ***Board Questions and Answers***

Jack asked whether the City must pay compensation to the Imex Theater and Steamer’s Seafood for vacating their leases. Rich answered that the City will have to make some compensation. Debbie asked if the Theater and Steamer’s must also be closed if there are sustained winds of 50 mph or if there is a heavy snow load on the roof of their buildings and Rich answered yes. Angela asked how the public will know when the Aquarium is closed. Rich answered that the Aquarium has media staff and they will alert the public via the local media. Jack asked how visitors to Seattle, who may be planning to visit the Aquarium, would know prior to their visit of a construction-related closure. Rich answered that the construction closures would be fairly brief.

Angela asked if plans for 62/63 are currently off the table and Rich answered yes.

Terry asked if repair work to the nearby seawall will be accomplished through an interagency effort. Rich has met with the State agencies working on the seawall. He briefly discussed the relation of the Aquarium and the seawall and pointed out the location on one of the maps. There is a 9” separation between the two. Terry suggested that both be repaired at the same time. Rich stated that the seawall’s rip rap is currently being repaired; the extent of the needed repairs is not yet known.

The Board thanked Rich and Erin for the briefing.

### **Briefing: Historic Resources Plan**

Kathleen Conner, Major Projects Planner, and Kevin Stoops, Major Project & Planning Manager, came before the Board to give a briefing on the Department’s Historic Resources Plan. The Board received a written and verbal briefing. No action is requested of the Board at this time.

## *Written Briefing*

### **Introduction**

In 2003, Seattle Parks and Recreation proudly celebrated the Centennial anniversary of the Olmsted Brothers landscape heritage in Seattle. There was momentum to enhance the efforts that Parks has made over the years to preserve and protect its historic assets. That, combined with the fact that Parks frequently has been in front of Landmarks seeking approval for our Pro Parks, Community Center, and CIP projects that are in historic buildings. It was clear that there was a lot of information available through various sources, including the 1903 and 1908 Olmsted plans, the Sherwood files, the Survey of City-Owned Historic Buildings, and Complan 2000. The question was posed as to how best to direct Parks' efforts to take advantage of the momentum and existing data, and to more strategically manage our historic assets. The conclusion was to create a Parks Historic Resources Plan. Parks hired MAKERS, Architecture and Planning in July 2003 to prepare the Plan.

The Historic Resources Plan describes where we have been, catalogues our resources, describes the character of each major "era" in park development, and identifies steps to the future with specific strategies to implement the plan. The Plan focuses on our assets that are 50 years or more that would be eligible for Landmark designation; it does not include projects undertaken during the Forward Thrust or more recent years. The Historic Resources Plan is intended to be proactive so that Parks can be more deliberate in the steps it takes to further historic preservation in Seattle, rather than responding only to individual emergencies.

The following sections of this report excerpts parts of the Plan in order to describe the process and identify what our next steps will be to preserve and protect our most important historic resources.

### **Background**

#### **Seattle Parks History**

The first step in developing the Historic Resources Plan was to look at the history of Seattle Parks. The Seattle park system began in 1884 with the donation of what is now known as Denny Park. Three years later, in 1887, a Board of Commissioners was appointed by the City Council, to manage Seattle's parks. Soon after, Parks Superintendent E. O. Schwagerl developed the first Parks comprehensive plan in the early 1890s. The plan established a framework of a parks system by including green spaces at each corner of the city and a boulevard connecting Woodland Park, Ravenna Park, and the new University of Washington campus. Another major influence was the development of the Assistant City Engineer George F. Cotterill's map detailing Seattle's bicycle paths, which further emphasized the concept of a whole system of parks and boulevard connections to them.

In 1903, the City Council adopted "A Comprehensive System of Parks and Parkways," a plan prepared by the Olmsted Brothers. The City Council-adopted Plan implementation was comprised of 28 improved parks, 12 equipped playgrounds, 12 unimproved playgrounds, and 15 miles of scenic boulevards, or nearly 40% of Seattle's current park system at that time. A supplemental Olmsted Brothers plan followed in 1908 which emphasized recreation.

Additional plans have been prepared throughout the years and funded by bonds and levies. Works Progress Administration (WPA), Civilian Conservation Corp (CCC) in the 1930s, joint park school planning, in the 1940s, Forward Thrust in the 1960s, parks and open space bonds in the 1980s, Community Center Levy in the 1990s, and Pro Parks in 2000 are among the major funding mechanisms that helped Seattle develop its parks system. The funding in the past century for acquisition and development demonstrates the deep commitment that the public has for its park system. As a result, there are currently over 6200 acres of parks, 400 parks and open spaces in Seattle.

#### **Recent Parks Plans and Studies**

In the past decade, there have been three studies done that influenced historic preservation in Seattle Parks. First, the *1993 Parks Complan*, part of the Citywide Comprehensive Plan, included policies on historic preservation and conservation and enhancement of the Olmsted system. Second, *Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan 2000, an update of the 1993 Plan*, broadened the scope of the policies related to the treatment of Historic parks resources, especially the Olmsted Brothers system. Third, the Department of Neighborhoods Historic Preservation Office prepared in May 2001 the *Survey of City-Owned Historic Resources* (Parks properties are in Volume II), by Cathy Wickwire. There were 109 Parks buildings surveyed and 43 were determined to possibly meet Landmarks criteria.

**Parks and Recreation Historic Landmarks**

The following 17 buildings and parks, shown on Table 1, are designated Seattle Landmarks. (Hat N’Boots is a designated Landmark that is located in Oxbow Park, but is not owned by Parks.) Since 2001, seven buildings were nominated; and six were designated as Landmarks. Those recently designated Landmarks are: Belltown Cottages, California Ave. Substation, Golden Gardens Bathhouse, Kinnear Park, Seward Park Inn, and Volunteer Park Conservatory.

Depending on the designation controls, changes to the building exterior, and sometimes the interior and/or the entire site, must be reviewed and approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

**Table 1  
PARKS AND RECREATION HISTORIC LANDMARKS (as of 10/04)**

Belltown Cottages	Lincoln Reservoir/Cal Anderson Park
California Avenue Substation	Parsons Garden
Gas Works Park	Pier 59
Golden Gardens Bathhouse	Queen Anne Boulevard
Hiawatha Playfields	Seattle Asian Art Museum
Kinnear Park	Seward Park Inn
Kubota Garden (core garden)	Tilikum (Chief Seattle Fountain)
Lake Washington Bicycle Path	Volunteer Park Conservatory
Langston Hughes Performing Arts Center	[Hat and Boots is in Oxbow Park, but is owned by the Community Council.]

In addition to the current Landmarks, Parks and Recreation has prepared nominations for three buildings: Laurelhurst Community Center, Montlake Community Center, and Discovery Park Chapel due to development proposals. It is possible that in the next few months these buildings will be designated as Landmarks. If so, a Controls and Incentives agreement (between Parks and Dept. of Neighborhoods) will be developed for each of them and future development will be guided by them. In addition, Seattle Public Utilities has investigated nomination of Volunteer Park due to potential changes to their reservoir in the park.

**Historic Districts**

Parks and Recreation also owns two historic districts and a building on National Register of Historic Places that require changes to be approved by the State. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 was enacted to preserve the nation’s historic and cultural resources. Section 106 of NHPA requires every federal agency to consider how its proposed project, program, or activity affects historic properties. Thus, when the federal property is transferred to the City, agreements are required to mitigate historic issues.

**Fort Lawton:** In 1988, the City designated the 40 acre Fort Lawton Landmarks District with boundaries similar to the federal Fort Lawton district that has been on the National Register of Historic Places since 1978, which includes the parade grounds and officer’s quarters. Local Landmarks Preservation Board approval is required when making changes within the district.

**Sand Point Historic District:** The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) must approve changes to the buildings, views, and specified elements within the district (located near the main entrance of Sand Point). Local Landmark Board approval is not needed for the Sand Point district.

**South Lake Union Armory:** The South Lake Union Section 106 agreement focused on the armory building. The exterior, the north and west entries, stairways in the west entry area, and drill hall, including the unique floor are among the features to be preserved. Similar to the Sand Point facilities, the SHPO reviews any changes to the significant features, and local Landmark Board approval is not needed for the South Lake Union Armory.

**West Point Light Station:** The property has not been transferred to the City of Seattle yet. Part of that process will involve a Section 106 assessment regarding its historic significance. It is more than likely that it will be found historically significant, which may require State review or it may have to be nominated for local Landmark status.

## **National Register of Historic Places**

There are four Parks facilities on the National Register of Historic Places. These facilities do not need Seattle Landmarks approvals, unless they are also a local Landmark. The facilities are as follows:

- Fort Lawton (district)
- Iron Pergola (Pioneer Square)
- Seattle, Chief of the Suquamish (Tilikum Place statue only)
- Volunteer Park (entire park)

## **Why Develop an Historic Resources Plan?**

As noted in the Introduction, the momentum stemming from the Olmsted Centennial year, combined with a flurry of Community Center Levy, Pro Parks, and CIP projects that affect historic resources resulted in interest to develop a Plan. Parks had been using a piecemeal and reactive approach to preservation, nomination buildings only when required to do so. The idea is that a plan would provide information and guidance to be proactive in choosing which resources to nominate. Often times, the decision was made to nominate during the project, which caused project delays. Furthermore, there is a regulatory agreement that requires Parks to seek Landmark Status if a building is 50 years old, or identified as possibly meeting Landmarks criteria in the Survey of City-Owned Historic Resources.

## **Plan Development**

### **Preservation Planning**

During the development of the Historic Resources Plan, Parks used as a guide the following preservation planning principles from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning:

- Important historic properties cannot be replaced if they are destroyed.
- If planning for the preservation of historic properties is to have positive effects, it must begin before the identification of all significant properties has been completed.
- Preservation planning includes public participation. The planning process should provide a forum for open discussion of preservation issues.

These principles are used by preservation experts, and by following them, there is more weight given to the research, conclusions, and recommendations in the study.

### **The Historic Resources Plan**

Parks hired MAKERS Architecture and Planning to prepare the Historic Resources Plan. We also put together an ad hoc committee to provide input and help formulate recommendations. This committee consisted of historic preservation experts such as City and County preservation staff, Olmsted experts, and representatives from other historic groups in Seattle.

The Historic Resources Plan identifies and characterizes historically significant resources and organizes them into periods of influences on our parks system, including Olmsted Brothers and Federal Relief. Characteristics of these periods are described with an eye toward future preservation efforts. Here are the eras that are discussed:

- Early Seattle, 1884-1903
- Olmsted Brothers, 1903-1941
- Playground Movement, 1907-1920
- Federal Relief, 1935-1943
- Suburban Growth, 1945-1964

In each of these eras, physical characteristics were discussed to help inform parks staff and the public about the essence of the overall character of our facilities. The intention is to preserve the character of a site, rather than replicating the original park. Specifically, the following character-defining features, adapted from the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* were identified. Site plans and sketches accompany each section.

For buildings and Structures:

- Typical types and uses
- Location and siting
- Style
- Materials and construction

For Landscapes (parks, playgrounds, boulevards, and parkways)

- Spatial organization
- Natural systems and features
- Views and vistas
- Circulation
- Buildings and structures
- Constructed water features
- Vegetation.

The significance of each group was evaluated according to the following criteria:

- Association with an important individual
- Exemplification of distinctive design quality, style, or method
- Association with a significant social or economic period in history, or a particular event.

Finally, in addition to the catalogue of our history through the mid-1960s, the Plan also discusses current policies and management practices and makes strategic recommendations for future preservation efforts.

### **Issues**

- As funding becomes available, Parks can research historical buildings and landscapes and prepare nominations to ensure preservation of key buildings and landscapes, such as Olmsted Brothers. (See “Recommendation” below for specific recommendations.)
- In the past, buildings were the only things nominated for landmark status, but that is changing. The Landmarks Board has considered some objects and landscapes. Cheasty Boulevard, for example, was recently designated because it is part of the larger Olmsted parks and boulevard system. Other segments of the system may be designated in the future as Landmarks. Parks will want to weigh carefully the necessity for obtaining Landmark designations for other non-Olmsted landscapes.
- Seattle has an integrated parks system: with three basic levels: park elements, parks, and Parks systems. Nearly everything we do to a park facility, from maintenance to major renovation, affects the overall parks system.
- Communicating our historic resources with other departments to ensure that public works projects do not compromise elements of historic resources is important to obtaining interdepartmental cooperation in maintaining historic resources.
- Education is a key component to the strategy. Educating staff and the public about our intentions and plans to protect and preserve our historic resources, without replicating the original) is vital.
- Seeking grants and other funding will be necessary to implement the plan.

### **Recommendations for Future Action**

1. Review and adopt the Historic Resources Plan that includes the following nine strategies:
  1. Communicate Parks and Recreation’s historic resource policies and practices with other city departments and interest groups.
  2. Conduct a preliminary inventory of historic and cultural resources.
  3. Undertake designation of clearly eligible resources.
  4. Establish guidelines for the treatment of Parks and Recreation historic resources.
  5. Establish criteria and explore options for establishing multiple resources designations for appropriate categories of Parks and Recreation historic resources.
  6. Establish multiple resource designations for appropriate resource categories, such as Olmsted Brothers Plan parks and WPA buildings.



7. Designate individual parks and/or elements within the multiple resource designations as opportunities arise.
  8. Ensure that internal design review processes for improvements to parks consider historically significant resources.
  9. Continue to train staff regarding historic resources and allocated resources for adequate maintenance.
2. Determine which projects should be on Parks' highest priority nomination list. Of the 93 buildings surveyed, there are 38 Landmark-eligible buildings. Ten of those buildings (the cabins at Camp Long are counted as one building), plus the CCC stove shelter at Carkeek Park, and the Olmsted system are recommended as the highest priority for research and possible nominations. See Table 2, Recommended Highest Priority Nominations Summary for the list of facilities. The more detailed rationale for preserving each of them follows.

***Volunteer Park Shelterhouse:*** This Craftsman-style shelterhouse was built in 1910. It is the only Olmsted-designed building that remains in our Parks inventory. Also, it is important because it was built in an Olmsted-designed park.

### **Comfort Stations and Shelterhouses**

***Colman PF Shelterhouse:*** This Mediterranean style building was built in 1937/38. The neighborhood was primarily Italian at that time, pushed for a park and for a building in the area. This is the only shelterhouse built in this style in the Parks system.

***Washington Park PF Shelterhouse:*** There are 19 comfort station and shelterhouses eligible for nomination. The most prevalent style is Tudor Revival (58% of the total eligible structures) and this one represents the best of them. Built in 1930, it hasn't been altered significantly, and it is in a prominent location, which makes it ideal for preservation.

### **Bathhouses**

***Green Lake Park Bathhouse Theater:*** There are four eligible bathhouses with two architectural styles: Colonial Revival and Classical Revival. Golden Gardens Bathhouse, a Colonial Revival building, was already designated. The Bathhouse Theater is the only Classical Revival example left in the system. The building is also in relatively good shape, and it is in a highly visible location in an Olmsted-designed park. It was built in 1927/28.

### **Other Buildings**

***Camp Long Cabins (10) and Camp Long Office/Clubhouse:*** These buildings are WPA/Rustic style. The cabins were built in 1938 and the clubhouse was built in 1941. They are relatively unaltered from the original designs, particularly the clubhouse. They are associated with the federal works programs, the development of Camp Long (and the West Seattle Golf area), and are unique style. Eleanor Roosevelt attended the dedication of the clubhouse in 1941. It is possible that this could be a "multiple property" nomination or be grouped for a mini-district to include all the buildings.

***Carkeek Park Stone Shelter:*** This 1935 WPA Rustic Style stone shelter was built by the Civilian Conservation Corps in Carkeek Park. The design is unique and it is the only stone shelter we have in our system. It is a remnant of the CCC camp that was established in Carkeek Park in the 1930s.

***Denny Blaine Lake Park Shelter:*** This shelter was built in 1901 in the Craftsman style. The building was originally constructed to house the office of the Denny-Blaine Land Company, which had just platted a large area near Lake Washington. It was built on the streetcar route and also served as a waiting room for the streetcar, and later, buses. Denny and Blaine built it so it could be converted later for a waiting and picnic shelter after it was no longer necessary to use as a real estate office. The building retains good physical integrity. It has been attributed to Ellsworth Storey, an influential architect at the time, who did residential buildings and the lookout tower and stone buildings at Moran State Park on Orcas Island.

***Seward Park Fish Hatchery Pump House:*** This WPA/Rustic style building was constructed in 1936-37. It was also built by the WPA to provide lake water for the operation of the adjacent fish hatchery at Seward Park.

**Other**

***Olmsted System:*** There is a system of parks, playgrounds, boulevards and parkways identified by Olmsted Brothers in their plans for Seattle. Cheasty Boulevard has already been designated as a Landmark, setting the stage for future designations. The initial work would involve research and identifying the framework of the system. The next phase would be designation of individual elements, as funding becomes available.

3. Fund more research, prepare nominations, train staff, and to undertake the next phase of reporting on Forward Thrust buildings, among other later Parks development. Partnerships with Parks foundation, the public, and other grant sources will help us continue and expand our preservation efforts.

**Table 2  
HIGHEST PRIORITY NOMINATIONS SUMMARY**

<b>CATEGORY INVENTORIED/ ELIGIBLE</b>	<b>STYLES for ELIGIBLE STRUCTURES</b>	<b>PRIORITY NOMINATION(S) AND WHY?</b>
<b>COMFORT STATIONS AND SHELTERHOUSES</b>  40 Inventoried  19 Eligible	<b>Eight Styles:</b> <b>Art Deco (1)</b> <b>Classic Revival (1)</b> <b>Craftsman (1)</b> <b>Mediterranean Revival (1)</b> <b>Mission Revival (1)</b> <b>Modern (2)</b> <b>Tudor Revival (11)</b> <b>WPA Rustic Style (1)</b>	<b>Volunteer Park Shelterhouse</b> [Only extant Olmsted-designed structure in Parks system and only Craftsman style comfort station.]
		<b>Colman PF Shelterhouse</b> [Only Mediterranean Shelterhouse. Also reflects the influence of the predominantly Italian neighborhood when constructed.]
		<b>Washington Park PF Shelterhouse</b> [The best example of our predominant Tudor Revival comfort stations and shelter houses.]
<b>BATHHOUSES</b>  8 Inventoried 4 Eligible	<b>Four Styles:</b> Colonial Revival (3) Classical Revival (1)	<b>Green Lake Park Bathhouse Theater</b> [The only Classical Revival style bathhouse and one of 4 classical revival buildings in the Parks system.]
<b>OTHER BUILDINGS</b>  45 Inventoried 14 Eligible	<b>Eight Styles:</b> 20 <sup>th</sup> Century; Vernacular/Modern; Art Deco; Craftsman; International; Minimal Traditional; Tudor Revival; Victorian; WPA Rustic Style	<b>Camp Long Cabins and Camp Long Office/Clubhouse</b> [These are WPA Rustic Style and relatively unaltered from the original. Associated with development of Camp Long, an urban camping experience. Eleanor Roosevelt attended the dedication in 1941.]
		<b>Carkeek Park Stove Shelter</b> [WPA Rustic style. Built by the Civilian Conservation Corps. The design is unique and it is the only stove shelter we have in our system. The CCC didn't build extensively in Parks.]
		<b>Denny Blaine Lake Park Shelter</b> [Unique building that is significant for its origin as a real estate office and as a waiting room for streetcars.]
		<b>Seward Park Fish Hatchery Pump House</b> [WPA/Rustic Style. It is unique to our system.]
<b>OTHER</b>		<b>Olmsted System</b> [Identify the "structural components" of the system: Parks, playgrounds, boulevards, and parkways.]

**Table 3  
PARK FACILITIES - REQUIRED TO NOMINATE AS LANDMARKS (IF ALTERED)**

<b>PARK/BUILDING NAME</b>	<b>REQUIRED TO NOMINATE</b>	<b>BACKGROUND DATA</b>
Beer Sheva CS	Yes	1940-WPA/Rustic Style; Recent site improvements.
Camp Long Cabins	Yes	1938-WPA/rustic Style; Recent site improvements.
Camp Long Office/clubhouse	Yes	1941- WPA/rustic Style; Recent site improvements.
Colman PF SH	Yes	1937/38-Spanish Colonial Revival/Mediterranean, built by WPA; Planning for renovation underway.
Denny Blaine Lake Park Shelter	Yes	1901/1924-Craftsman/Arts & Crafts
Green Lake CC	Yes	1928/29-Art Deco/Art Moderne; Olmsted-designed Park
Green Lake Park Bathhouse	Yes	1927/28-Classical Revival; Olmsted-designed park
Hiawatha CC	Yes	1911- Art Deco/Art Moderne; Olmsted PG; Recent site improvements
Highland Park PF SH	Yes	1938-Tudor Revival; Olmsted PG; Built by WPA; Possible Multiple Property nomination.
Jackson Park Clubhouse	Maybe	1930-Colonial Revival
Jefferson Park Clubhouse	Maybe	1935/36-Colonial Revival; built with financial assistance from Public Works Admin.; Olmsted-designed park.
Leschi Park CS	Yes	1929-Tudor Revival; Possible Multiple Property nomination with other SH's/CS's. Olmsted-influenced.
Lincoln Park/Colman Bathhouse	Yes	1940/41-Colonial Revival; Olmsted-influenced park.
Lincoln Park SH	Yes	1932-Tudor Revival; Olmsted; Possible Multiple Property nomination with other SH's/CS's. Olmsted-influenced.
Lower Woodland Park CS #5	Yes	1924-Tudor Revival; Craftsman/Arts & Crafts; Olmsted; CRF project to renovate in 2006. Olmsted-designed park.
Madison Park Bathhouse	Yes	1919/1929- Colonial Revival. Olmsted-influenced park.
Madrona Park BH	Maybe	1927/28- Classical Revival; Spectrum Dance. Olmsted-designed park.
Madrona PF SH	Yes	1938/39- Tudor Revival; WPA Construction
Magnolia Park CS	Yes	1927- Tudor Revival; Possible Multiple Property nomination with other SH's/CS's. Olmsted-recommended park.
Maple Leaf PF SH	Yes	1932- Tudor Revival; Possible Multiple Property nomination with other SH's/CS's.
Mt. Baker Park CS	Yes	1928- Tudor Revival. Olmsted-designed park.
Parks Hdqtrs. (100 Dexter)Admin.	Yes	1948/49- International Style. Denny Park is an Olmsted-influenced park.
Ravenna Park CS	Yes	1926- Mission Revival; Olmsted-influenced Park
Ravenna Park SH	Yes	1932- Tudor Revival; Olmsted-influenced Park; Possible Multiple Property nomination with other SH's/CS's.
Seward Park Art Studio	Maybe	1927/1940- Classical Revival; Olmsted-designed park.
Seward Park CS #1	Yes	1932- Tudor Revival; Olmsted-designed park; Possible joint nomination for both CS's in the park.
Seward Park CS#2	Yes	1932- Tudor Revival; Olmsted-designed park;

		Possible joint nomination for both CS's in the park.
Seward Park Fish Hatchery House	Yes	1936/37- Minimal Traditional; WPA constructed; Olmsted-designed park.
Seward Park Fish Hatch House and Garage	Yes	1936/37- Minimal Traditional; WPA constructed; Olmsted-designed park; Renovation project underway.
Seward Park Fish Hatchery Pump	Yes	1936/37- Minimal Traditional; WPA constructed; Olmsted-designed park.
View Ridge PF SH	Yes	1953- Modern
<b>PARK/BUILDING NAME</b>	<b>REQUIRED TO NOMINATE</b>	<b>BACKGROUND DATA</b>
Volunteer Park SH	Yes	1910- Craftsman/Arts & Crafts; Olmsted-designed park
Washington Park PF SH	Yes	1930-Tudor Revival; Olmsted-designed park
W. Seattle Stadium North Stands	Yes	1938-20 <sup>th</sup> Century Vernacular/Modern; Olmsted-recommended park.

### *Verbal Briefing*

Kevin and Kathleen reviewed the information presented in the documents. Parks has many historic buildings and other resources in its 120-year-old park system. The Department began the Historic Resources Plan effort in late 2003 and early 2004. Kathleen commented that tonight's briefing on the Aquarium, which is a potential historical site, is a good segway to the Historic Resources Plan. There are currently 17 designated landmarks located within the park system. When a site is designated as a landmark, certain controls come into being with that designation. If the buildings are worked on, the work done must meet those controls. Kathleen reviewed the current historic sites and said the West Point lighthouse, recently obtained by the Parks Department, will soon come under review. She discussed the process and stated that one goal of the plan is to be consistent with federal historic site guidelines.

### *Board Questions and Answers*

Jack commented that the Historic Resources document, prepared by Makers, is well written with wonderful graphics and is an outstanding tool. Excellent work! However, he urged that Parks be careful that it doesn't designate facilities as historic that might need future alterations as the Landmarks Preservation Board has a great deal of authority on properties that have been designated as historical landmarks.

Angela stated that she agrees with both Jack's comments and asked if, when a building is designated as historical, will the Department receive any funds from the federal government. Kathleen answered that it is possible; for instance, there is some relief on energy costs if there is a landmark designation.

Jack asked who adopts this Plan. Kathleen answered that the Board could vote on adoption of the Plan or it could be included in the Comprehensive Plan. Jack recommended that the Board approve the Plan as a way to bring it attention. Terry asked about the Comprehensive Plan timeline. Kevin answered that City staff will complete their updates in 2005 and the document will have public review during 2006. Jack believes the Board should act now.

**Jack moved that the Board be allowed to consider the Historic Resources Plan in the next three months. The motion was seconded by Angela.** Discussion followed: if the Board recommends to the Superintendent that the Plan be adopted, it would then go from the Superintendent to City Council for adoption. Jack recommended that this Plan become City policy and not just Park Department policy. There was a brief discussion on the Board's role in future nominations. **There being no further discussion, the vote was taken and was unanimously in favor.**

A brief discussion followed on other groups that are focused on area historic resources plans, including the Washington Park Arboretum, Friends of Olmsted Parks, Historic Seattle, and several community historical societies. This was followed by a short discussion on the designation process and what would happen if the Department later needed to alter/demolish a site designated as a landmark.

The Board thanked Kathleen and Kevin for the informative presentation and good job on this effort.

## Park Board Business

None

## New/Old Business

- Jack was in the RDA Building recently and saw a large map with Pro Parks projects and other parks projects highlighted. Erin will send Board members a large version and small version.
- The Board's retreat is scheduled for February 2. Several items were suggested for the agenda, some of which deal with the Board's operation and functions and some that deal with Parks Department functions:
  - Board related topics:
    - What are the Superintendent's, Mayor's, and City Council's expectations of the Board members?
    - Jack currently serves as the Park Board representative to the Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee. He would like a determination on how Board-committee members share information with each other.
  - Department related topics:
    - Additional and regular presentations on Cumulative Reserve Funded projects
    - Internal workings of the Department and information on the recent re-organization
  - Board members will send additional agenda suggestions to Sandy Brooks, via e-mail.Jack stated that his preference is to use the retreat discuss how the Board operates and functions, rather than how the Department operates and functions.
- Angela asked when the Central Waterfront Committee meets, as this is her assigned committee. The Board's Coordinator will follow up on this.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

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

Kate Pflaumer, Chair

DATE \_\_\_\_\_