

Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes
April 28, 2005

Board of Park Commissioners:

Present: Kate Pflaumer, Chair
Angela Belbeck
Jack Collins
Terry Holme
Debbie Jackson
Amit Ranade

Excused: Joanna Grist

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

Ken Bounds, Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Coordinator

Commission Chair Kate Pflaumer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed the Board's newest Commissioner, Amit Ranade. **Commissioner Holme moved and Commissioner Belbeck seconded that the minutes, as corrected, and the agenda, as presented, be approved. The vote was taken and the motion passed. Commissioner Ranade abstained.**

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Bounds reported on the following:

Earth Day: Approximately 150 events were held during April to celebrate Earth Day. The Superintendent attended the wheelchair jamboree @ Sealth High School and Southwest Community Center. He also visited the Fishing Derby at Greenlake Park. Kids 5-12 years old received a rod and reel and caught lots of trout.

Pro Parks O/S Levy Opportunity Fund: Monday night, the Pro Parks Levy Oversight Committee held a hearing at South Lake Union on the Opportunity Fund. The hearing had an excellent turnout, with 66 citizens attending.

Magnuson Park Council Action: City Council voted last week to approve the zoning exemption required for the athletic field lights for just four fields at Magnuson Park. This is a reduction from the total of seven lit fields they approved as part of the Master Plan in June 2004. The Council members who voted for the reduction all stated their continued commitment to seven lit fields but wanted to enforce a phased approach to the development.

The Superintendent thanked Commissioners Pflaumer and Holme for testifying before City Council.

Parks Acquires West Point Lighthouse: Parks received a letter from the Department of the Interior and the keys from the US Coast Guard for the Discovery Park lighthouse. Parks will work with its partners on programming for the lighthouse.

Boeing Donates to Specialized Programs: The Boeing Employees Recycling Program donated 20 new women's swimsuits to the Specialized Program. The Recycling Program also surprised everyone by presenting 20 new swim robes and two sweat jackets for coaches with embroidered logos, "Seattle Parks Sharks".

Special Olympians Excel: The Special Olympic King County & Southwest Region Aquatics Meet took place at King County/Weyerhaeuser Pool in Federal Way this past weekend. Twenty-three teams competed. Parks' Specialized Programs Team (Seattle Parks Sharks) had 24 swimmers and came home with 20 gold, 13 silver, and 9 bronze medals.

City Hall Park to be Renovated: This project will implement improvements to transform City Hall Park, located just south of the King County courthouse, into an attractive gateway to downtown Seattle. The City of Seattle 2005-2006 Capital Improvement Plan includes \$100,000 to initiate planning and schematic design of improvements to restore the park. The Mayor's budget proposal for 2006-2007 is expected to include \$400,000 for physical improvements. King County staff members are very interested in partnering with Parks to identify improvements. This project will be brought before the Board of Park Commissioners.

Loyal Heights Playfield: About 70 community members attended a second public meeting on April 26 to discuss Pro Parks Levy project to improve Loyal Heights Playfield. While some community members were enthusiastic about the proposal to upgrade the baseball/soccer/football playfield from grass to synthetic, many community members believed that the grass field was a more environmentally sustainable option. Parking and increased traffic also were a concern to the local community. The upgrade is a priority of the Joint Athletic Facilities Development Program (2002). The Levy provides \$2.3 million for playfield improvements that will be constructed in 2006. To respond to community discontent, Parks will form a Project Advisory Team (PAT) to advise the department on hours of field operation and community use of the playfield. The Board of Park Commissioners will hold a public hearing on July 14.

Commissioner Holme asked if there are any additional community meetings scheduled. If so, he will attend. There is one more — the date will be forwarded to Commissioner Holme.

Park Namings: Last week the Superintendent selected five names for local parks: Ballard Commons Park, Ursula Judkins Viewpoint, Northlake Park, York Park, and Nantes Park.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

The Chair explained that this portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had, or are not scheduled for, a public hearing. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and will be timed. The Board's usual process is for 15 minutes of testimony to be heard at this time, with additional testimony heard after the regular agenda and just before Board of Park Commissioner's business. Two people signed up to testify.

Matthew Lee Johnston: He testified as a representative of the Skatepark Advisory Committee (SPAC). He referred to the recent letter addressed to himself and the co-chair of the Skatepark Advisory Committee from the Board of Park Commissioners regarding the siting of the Lower Woodland skatepark. SPAC is a new committee and wants to help the Board create the best skate park. His committee believes that the Board's vote at its April 14 meeting hurts the process. It wasn't so much the decision the Board made; rather, it was that the decision was made while SPAC is still working hard to develop a skatepark criteria and matrix. They want to show these results to the Board. This hard work is being done by many people who care about Seattle and will continue regardless of the Board's unanimous decision to ignore SPAC's work. He described his own strong commitment to this process. The Commissioners' decision has impacted SPAC and made it feel like its effort is meaningless. Superintendent Bounds and Parks staff always refer to SPAC when skatepark issues come up with the public or in the press. Yet, the Commissioners' decision seems to indicate that SPAC is powerless to even make a recommendation that directly relates to building skateparks in Seattle. The concern is not so much the decision itself or the triangle site — it is the fact that SPAC is working on a recommendation and want the Commissioners to support them in the work they are doing.

Doug Jackson: He is President of the Friends of Olmsted Parks (FOPP) and is a landscape architect. The FOPP Board unanimously supports the adoption of the Historic Resources Plan and urges the Board's approval. It has been 102 years ago that the Olmsted Brothers designed parks in Seattle. The fact that the Olmsted Brothers' designs are still being talked about highlights their legacy. Seattle has a great legacy of Olmsted and WPA projects which the Historic Resources Plan addresses.

SPAC Discussion: Commissioner Collins commented that he made the April 14 motion referred to by Mr. Johnston. The motion was in regard to a letter from Ms. Kate Martin urging a new location be selected for the Lower Woodland skatepark. The minutes from the April 14 meeting don't reflect the intent of his motion. Before he made the motion, Susan Golub, Parks Strategic Advisor working on skateparks, mentioned that SPAC was reviewing alternative sites for the skatepark in Lower Woodland. It was his intent with the motion that SPAC decide whether or not to accept Ms. Martin's recommendation or go with the one that was on the table. His unspoken intent was that he didn't want to see a lot of public support for Ms. Martin's idea which could create a larger controversy before SPAC than already exists. He did not intend to subvert the work of SPAC. Commissioner Holme commented that it was also mentioned that for every new site that is considered, a lengthy public process is required. Mr. Johnston commented that one of their issues is that there wasn't much public process used to select the site at Lower Woodland and SPAC wants more diligence used.

The Chair commented that the difficulty with any amenities going into parks is that it impacts the rest of the city and affects other users of the park. Backtracking on the location decision now would require a large public process to hear testimony from the area surrounding the alternative site. The Board felt sufficient process had gone into the site selection process; however, it could be wrong and a public hearing could be scheduled. This would delay the building of the skatepark. Mr. Johnston thanked the Chair and repeated that the issue is not the site — rather, it is that SPAC wants the Board to at least seek a recommendation from the committee that is being touted as working on a recommendation. Otherwise, the purpose of SPAC should be revisited.

The Chair stated that the Board did not understand that SPAC's recommendations include site selections, rather she believed that SPAC was working on the design after the Department selected the site. That having been said, if a public hearing is needed, the Board will schedule one.

The Superintendent stated that Mr. Johnston's recitation was accurate. What he would add is that Parks went through a process with the Board of Park Commissioners and identified skate park location policy criteria and involved a number of people in that process. This happened before SPAC was formed. Parks identified the site at Lower Woodland and had some public process, but it wasn't as extensive as some public processes have been. At that point in time, elected officials were willing to allocate funds to build a skatepark. Parks had a location in Lower Woodland that was relatively uncontroversial and was acceptable at the time to the skateboard community. Parks has proceeded to develop the skatepark at that site and IAC funds have been secured. It is not a foregone conclusion that the IAC funds can be switched to another site. Rather than spending time looking for an alternate site in Lower Woodland, SPAC can give valuable assistance by helping find sites in other parts of the city for skateparks. West Seattle has been an especially difficult area to find locations. Parks has the site at Lower Woodland and the money — let's now build the skatepark in Lower Woodland and continue searching for additional sites.

Scott Shinn is also a SPAC member and stated that the selected site is close to single family residences and will affect the neighborhood. The Superintendent commented that if the site in Lower Woodland is not acceptable, the process can stop and deal with any consequences. Commissioner Collins stated that it was clear to the Board that if another site is considered, a new controversy would arise. Mr. Johnson agreed to this and repeated that his issue is not about whether the triangle is the correct spot — it is about whether SPAC has a role in this process. Commissioner Collins believes the Board had three choices when it received the letter: (1) ignore it; (2) support the letter and force a process on both Parks and SPAC, or (3) support the decision that was already made. The Chair repeated that it is important

that SPAC understand that the site selection process happened before SPAC was formed. The Superintendent stated that if the site selection at Lower Woodland were being made now, SPAC would be involved.

The Chair thanked the SPAC representatives for testifying to the Board and asked that this information be taken back to SPAC.

Briefing: Historic Resources Plan

Kathleen Conner, Parks Major Projects Planner, and Kevin Stoops, Major Projects and Planning Manager, gave an update briefing on the Historic Resources Plan. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

The requested Park Board action is a recommendation to Superintendent Bounds to adopt the Parks Historic Resources Plan and the list of the highest recommended sites, buildings and objects to preserve. The Board was initially briefed on December 9, 2004, and a motion was made to bring the Plan back to them to consider recommending its adoption to Superintendent Bounds.

Project Description and Background

The 1993 Parks Complan and, more recently, the Seattle Parks Plan 2000 noted the need to identify and designate historic resources within the Seattle park system, with a particular focus on the Olmsted legacy and the WPA (Works Progress Administration) efforts. The catalyst to prepare the Parks Historic Resources Plan occurred with the planning for the 2003 Olmsted Centennial year activities. Parks had been using a piecemeal and reactive approach to historic preservation. The intent was to develop a plan to provide not only information, but also focused guidance, in our preservation work. Parks hired MAKERS architecture and urban design, along with team members Cathy Wickwire, and Susan Black Associates to prepare the document.

The Parks Historic Resources Plan has achieved the initial intent in that it is both a resource and strategic plan for management of Parks historic resources. 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.

Public Involvement Process

An ad hoc committee of preservation experts and interested persons met three times with City staff to formulate the direction of the plan and to review drafts of it. Parks staff briefed the Friends of Seattle’s Olmsted Parks (FSOP), the Chair of the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board and City Historic Preservation staff on the Plan. Later this spring we plan to brief the full Landmarks Preservation Board and Historic Seattle. The Plan has been on the Parks web page since November 2004.

Issues

- As funding becomes available, Parks can research historical buildings and landscapes and prepare nominations to ensure preservation of key resources. Seeking grants and other funding will be necessary to fully implement the plan.
- In the past, buildings were the only things nominated for Landmark status, but that is changing. The Landmarks Board now considers some landscapes as Landmarks. 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 Landmarks in the future. 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 park systems. Nearly everything we do to a park facility, from maintenance to major renovation, affects the overall park 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 is vital.

Budget

The Parks Historic Resources Plan is a long-range plan with no funding for implementation or dates attached to the implementation activities; therefore, implementation will occur as funds become available. We will continue to nominate buildings and landscapes when appropriate as part of a project, but that funding comes from individual capital project budgets. Each nomination costs approximately \$3,000 in consultant fees plus additional in-house staff costs.

Schedule

Some implementation is underway. For example, in 2004 Parks submitted three Landmark nominations and all were designated Landmarks (Discovery Park Chapel, Laurelhurst Community Center, and Montlake Community Center). Another example is that staff is communicating both internally and externally with other departments and boards about the Plan.

Staff Recommendation

Staff is asking the Park Board to recommend adoption of the Historic Resources Plan. Staff also recommends that the Olmsted parks system framework, ten buildings, and the (Civilian Conservation Corps) CCC stove shelter at Carkeek Park be identified as the highest priority for research and possible Landmark nominations, although currently no funding is available to move forward with these nominations. The more detailed rationale for preserving each of them follows.

Comfort Stations and Shelterhouses

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

Colman Playfield Shelterhouse: This Mediterranean style building was built in 1937/38. The neighborhood, which 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 Playfield 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, is already designated. The Bathhouse Theater, built in 1927-28, 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.

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 a 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 Picnic 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 Picnic 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.

Additional Information

At the first briefing, the Board received a copy of the Historic Resources Plan. The Plan is also on the Parks website: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/projects/docs>. Kathleen Conner is the Project Manager for the Plan, and she can be reached at 615-1299 or Kathleen.conner@seattle.gov

Verbal Briefing/Board Questions & Answers

Mr. Stoops and Ms. Conner reviewed the written information the Commissioners received and displayed a large map and a list of proposed sites. Commissioner Jackson asked for the definition of an integrated park system, referred to by the presenters. Ms. Conner answered that it is a series of linked parks.

This plan focuses on parks that are 50 years or older. A current task is how to make the information that has already been gathered useful for both Parks staff and the public. Ms. Conner described the five periods in Seattle’s park development as pastoral, Olmsted Brothers, playground movement, federal relief (WPA), and suburban growth when many ballfields were built. Staff must now develop strategies to include new nominations and come up with guidelines for internal staff to use to integrate those new uses.

Ms. Conner described issues as: evolution, funding, landscapes to be landmarked, major maintenance, and coordination with other departments, i.e., Seattle Department of Transportation.

The Superintendent commented that Ms. Conner and Mr. Stoops have done a great job developing the Historic Resources Plan. The plan will be helpful to the Department during the Major Maintenance process. When Major Maintenance projects are being implemented, the Department works with Landmark Preservation’s standards. The Historic Resources Plan will help the Department be more proactive in determining how to address projects in landmarked buildings in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Ms. Conner next reviewed the list of proposed nominations (listed above.)

Questions & Answers

Commissioner Belbeck asked if a periodic update is slated for the Historic Resources Plan. Staff answered yes, in three to four years. The Chair asked if Landmark Preservation nominates the building. Ms. Conner and Mr. Stoops described the nomination process and stated that citizens can also nominate a building. Once a building is landmarked by Landmark Preservation, Parks must take any changes to the Board for review. Current policy is that work on any buildings over 50 years has to be sent to that Board for review.

The Superintendent commented that there are also controls and incentives. In the past, some buildings that were landmarked have later been demolished. The controls and incentives in this case may have been that there was a photographic history of the building.

Mr. Stoops commented that the plan represents a framework or source document, rather than a hard and fast list of historic properties. Commission Collins commented that the requested recommendation is for approval of a certain list of projects. He is concerned that the Superintendent may later change his mind on the list. He feels uncomfortable recommending a certain list in a certain order and feels more comfortable just recommending adoption of the plan as presented. Park staff agreed to this.

Commissioner Holme asked about the future role of Board of Park Commissioners on specific recommendations. After discussion it was agreed that any big additions/changes to the nomination list would come back to the Board.

Commissioner Belbeck moved that the Board of Park Commissioners recommend to the Superintendent to adopt the Historic Resources Plan as presented. Commissioner Jackson seconded. The vote was taken and motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Collins noted that, as preparation for his role on this Board, he visited the public library for a history of Seattle's Parks and Recreation Department and there wasn't one. He has read the Sherwood Files that are on-line at the Department's web site, but those stop long before the Forward Thrust era. He recommended that the Historic Resources Plan be distributed to schools, libraries, and other sites, as a wonderful reference. Commissioner Pflaumer agreed.

Commissioner Ranade referred to the list of priorities and asked if, for example, another shelter house was nominated, would one already on the list be eliminated. Mr. Stoops answered that staff have identified facilities during this stage to avoid having to make reactive, project-by-project decisions. The Superintendent stated that he expects other park facilities to be nominated and have controls and incentives placed on them. What he hopes is that this Plan will help in negotiations of those controls and incentives. It will help Parks put its resources where it is most important. The Superintendent commented that the Mayor and City Council controls where Parks spend its funds; Landmark Preservation cannot make Parks spend at certain site, but if the Department does work at a landmarked site, then Landmark Preservation can make the Department do certain things. This plan helps the Department decide where to spend funds.

The Chair requested that Parks staff brief the Board of Park Commissioners if significant changes are made to the plan or if the list is altered. Commissioner Collins commented that this discussion points out the difficulty that Parks encounters in having sensitivity to the past while having hands tied. This is a difficult issue at a physical site and even more difficult at a cultural site.

Commissioner Holme referred to costs in the budget paragraph. He believes that both upfront and future costs of maintaining these historical buildings must be included in the analysis and asked for an update on the historic chapel at Discovery Park. Mr. Stoops and Ms. Conners gave further details.

The Board thanked Mr. Stoops and Ms. Conner for the presentation.

Briefing: Enterprise Division

Eric Friedli, Seattle Parks Enterprise Division Director, briefed the Board on this new Seattle Parks Division. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

No formal decision or action is being requested of the Board. The Department is asking the Commissioners for their thoughts, insights, and guidance on the purpose and operations of the recently created Enterprise Division and the Department's approach to assessing revenue-generating ideas.

Project Description and Background

In conjunction with the 2005 budget, City Council approved a Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) recommending that the Department "develop a policy framework to guide exploration of ways to generate revenue, including entrepreneurial approaches." The Council stated its "intent to support the Superintendent's creation of a new Enterprise Division within Parks and Recreation to consolidate programs, services, and staffing for revenue generating activities."

Attached is the Departments response to the SLI, as sent to the City Council on March 25, 2005. The attachments include the Resource Development Policy Framework, a document that will guide Seattle Parks and Recreation in our efforts to expand the resources and increase revenues needed to achieve our mission. The attached policy framework describes:

- Key analytical questions to address when considering new revenue ideas;
- A review and assessment process that involves City staff, the Board of Park Commissioners, City Council and the community;
- Existing and potential new sources of earned income; and
- Existing policies and guidelines.

Public Involvement Process

No public process was necessary for the development of this material. Many of the individual ideas outlined in the Policy Framework will require public involvement. A public involvement process is described in the Resource Development Policy Framework.

Issues

The Department is sensitive to the potential negative reaction to generating revenue using park resources. The primary concerns of 'commercializing' our parks and making park programs and facilities too expensive for our citizens have been heard. The Policy Framework is a tool for the Department to formally evaluate revenue ideas in the context of existing policies and procedures and with an explicit view to the Department's mission. Each possible revenue idea will have particular issues that will be addressed as the idea is reviewed and developed.

Budget

The Departmental reorganization that created the Enterprise Division in January 2005 resulted in some administrative costs savings. One intent of the Enterprise Division is that the Department will be more intentional with our revenue generating activities which should result in increased revenues. No specific revenue targets have been set.

Schedule

The Department established the Enterprise Division in January 2005 and has begun using the Framework Policy to review possible revenue ideas. As those ideas are developed they will follow their own schedules for review.

Staff Recommendation

None necessary at this time.

Additional Information

Please feel free to contact Eric Friedli, 684-8369 if you have additional questions or comments.

Verbal Briefing/Board Questions & Answers

Mr. Friedli reviewed the written briefing and attachments that were mailed to the Commissioners. He next described a pilot program undertaken by the Department early this year using parks property to advertise. However, this raises lots of issues of not advertising in parks. Staff decided to avoid extremes and test a small pilot. Adding banners to pool walls with ads was selected. This strategy has been used successfully at other municipal swim pools. It was determined that it was not inconsistent with Parks' mission. Staff mailed information to businesses they believed would be interested in advertising with the banners and followed up with phone calls. So far, no one has advertised with the banners. From that pilot program staff learned that (1) not marketable product (2) market too limited or marketed in wrong way, and (3) will now go back and talk to the businesses, analyze why the strategy didn't work, and possibly hire a marketing strategist. In the second part of the pilot staff will assess impacts of commercialization of parks property. To do this, staff will collect comments, survey guests, and tabulate the cost of managing the pilot.

The agenda attachments contained a range of ideas generated by staff. An oversight group was formed, Parks Resource Enhancement staff. If this group formulates a successful marketing idea, it will be brought to the Board of Park Commissioners for a public hearing.

Questions & Answers

Commissioner Jackson asked if staff have developed a system to go back to the public and determine ways to revise a good idea or bad idea. Mr. Friedli commented that they haven't and this is a good point. The Chair referred to the policy that allows the Sonics Basketball Team to have its name on some Parks' basketball courts. Mr. Friedli answered that this is allowed under the Department's sponsorship policy.

Commissioner Holme commented that field fees generate a lot of revenue for the Enterprise Division. Mr. Friedli agreed and commented that in the budget round for 2006-7, there will be a comprehensive review of fees and schedules. Commissioner Holme asked if efforts are being integrated with the Association Recreation Council. Mr. Friedli answered yes, that ARC Director Bill Keller is a member of the Resource Enhancement Committee.

Commissioner Belbeck asked if the golf courses are part of the Enterprise fund. Mr. Friedli answered that this has been discussed, but no formal decision has been made. Commissioner Belbeck referred to the flowchart of new ideas which indicates Council approval and asked if there are any ideas that can be implemented by Parks without Council approval. Mr. Friedli answered yes, that the banner project could be implemented without Council approval. The Superintendent stated that concession contracts are implemented without Council approval. Commissioner Belbeck commented that if the public dislikes the advertising, Parks will hear about it quickly. The Superintendent agreed with this and said the Department's sign code regulates what can be posted outside facilities.

Commissioner Collins commented that it is a challenge for the newer Commissioners to understand the various concessions contracts. Concessions are opportunities. At a recent 4-hour event he attended at Magnuson Park, all he could find in the way of food to purchase was a stale scone. The opportunity is there. Superintendent Bounds commented that a future briefing to the Board is concessions in Downtown Parks.

Commissioner Holme asked whether other Departments pay Parks when they rent Parks property. The Superintendent and Mr. Friedli both answered yes, that funds are transferred to Parks. Mr. Friedli then introduced Bob Hannis, the new Strategic Advisor in the Enterprise Division.

The Board thanked Mr. Friedli for the briefing.

Board of Park Commissioners' Business

None

New/Old Business

- ❖ Seattle Park Phone Guide: Commissioner Holme requested an updated version of the Department's Forget-Me-Not phone guide. Staff reported that a new version is being assembled and copies have been ordered for the Commissioners.
- ❖ Introductions: Tonight was Commissioner Ranade's first meeting as a Commissioner. All members introduced themselves and told a bit about their background and particular interests.
- ❖ Seward Park: Commissioner Holme mentioned an article he read in the South District Journal regarding Seward Park.
- ❖ Board Absences: Commissioner Grist has requested a leave of absence until further notice. Commissioner Jackson will be out of town at the May 12 meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

APPROVED: _____
Kate Pflaumer, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____