

Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes
May 11, 2006

Board of Park Commissioners:

Present:

Angela Belbeck
Jack Collins
Terry Holme, Acting Chair
Debbie Jackson
Kate Pflaumer, Chair
Jackie Ramels
Amit Ranade

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

Ken Bounds, Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Coordinator

This meeting was held at the South Lake Union Armory. Commission Chair Pflaumer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. **Commissioner Ranade moved approval of the Acknowledgment of Correspondence, the May 11 agenda as presented, and the April 27 minutes as corrected. It was seconded. The vote was taken and motion carried.**

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Bounds reported on the following:

George Long: George H. Long, Jr., Parks' Senior Special Events Scheduler, died unexpectedly on April 28. George was Parks' representative for Seattle special events for 30 years and worked with Virginia Swanson on the Special Events Committee for 25 of those years. He was a much-loved institution to a broad spectrum of the City's events community and will be sorely missed. Parks will hold a celebration of his life at the South Lake Union Armory at 3 p.m. on Sunday, May 21.

Loyal Heights Hearing Examiner Decision: In a decision rendered yesterday, the Hearing Examiner ruled to affirm the Loyal Heights Determination of Non-Significance (DNS.) Conditions included one-hour intervals between weekend games. Citizens have until the end of May to appeal the decision, then the Department will proceed with the project.

Garfield Community Center Technology Learning Center: The Community Center has 15 new computers. Garfield has developed a partnership with Seattle Central Community College and together they are offering English as a Second Language and technology classes.

Service Learning: Seattle Prep had their annual Ivy Out work party on Wednesday, April 26. In partnership with EarthCorps, the Arboretum, Japanese Garden, and other community members, about 650 Seattle Prep High School students worked at seven locations and donated almost 2,000 volunteer hours.

Morgan Junction/Former Seattle Monorail Project (SMP) Property: The SMP will sell the .4-acre property at 6401 California Avenue SW to a private buyer, Beveridge Investments LLC, which will re-sell 9,000 square feet of the property to Seattle Parks. The Pro Parks Levy had targeted the former Morgan Junction City Light substation for a park, but City Light has decided not to sell the property.

Diana, Fur Seal, Euthanized: Local newspapers covered the latest news about Diana, the Aquarium's oldest fur seal being euthanized on May 4. Despite numerous health challenges over the years, including blindness, Diana survived to be one of the oldest fur seals in captivity at age 25 — a testament to the outstanding care she received at the Aquarium.

Magnuson Park Building Development: The Seattle Parks' Enterprise Division received a single proposal in response to its request for proposals for redevelopment of the old fire station (Building 18) at Magnuson Park. The Cascade Bicycle Club is proposing to create The Northwest Center for Cycling. Parks staff members are reviewing the proposal and have asked the National Development Council to review the financial aspects of the proposal as it has done with the proposals for indoor recreation.

Golf Director Receives Award: On May 8, Andy Soden, Seattle Parks' Golf Director, received the Western Washington Golf Course Superintendent's Associations (WWGCSA) Superintendent of the Year Award for 2006 at the associations' annual Fivesome Tournament and Banquet held at Broadmoor Golf Club. Andy was recognized for his past and present contributions to the local WWGCSA, the Northwest Turfgrass Association, the Golf Course Superintendent's Association of America and golf industry as a whole. His successful contribution to the City's Parks and Recreation Department's effort to help restore the golf courses in Seattle to self-sustaining financial health and excellent condition is a recent success story in golf in the Pacific Northwest.

West Point Light Station in Discovery Park Open to Public: The light house has been open on four Saturdays during spring 2006, with approximately 200 people visiting the lighthouse on each of these days. The property continues to be open on various Saturdays and Sundays throughout the summer. There are special events planned for August during "The Great Washington State Lighthouse Hunt" a celebration of 150 years of lighthouses in Washington State.

Upcoming Events

Ravenna Creek dedication: On Sunday, May 14, the City, King County, and Ravenna Creek Alliance will hold a dedication celebration of the completed Ravenna Creek Daylighting project in Ravenna Park. Superintendent Ken Bounds will represent the City.

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.

One person, Joel Tufel, signed up and testified. His testimony was in regards to the public hearing issue and is reflected in that portion of the minutes.

Briefing/Public Hearing: Public Involvement Policy Review

Seattle Parks' Communication Manager, Dewey Potter, briefed the Commissioners on the Seattle Parks' Public Involvement Policy Review. The briefing was immediately followed by a public hearing. The Commissioners received both a written and verbal briefing.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

At this meeting, the Board will hear a staff briefing and hold a public hearing to hear suggestions for improving the current Public Involvement Policy.

Project Description and Background

Since 1999, Parks has operated under a Public Involvement Policy adopted through the city's rulemaking authority; it was developed through a public process over a nine-month period. After a year of use, Parks conducted a survey of everyone who had participated in a process in that year, and received positive results. Parks made minor revisions and updates to the policy in 2002; it is available online at http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/projects/public_involvement_policy.htm

Recent decisions by Parks, and by the City Council, have left some park neighbors unhappy. You have undertaken a survey of other cities (Vancouver, B.C., Portland, OR, Denver, Baltimore, and San Francisco) to learn their public involvement practices, and in response to a request from Mayor Greg Nickels, are conducting a review of the Public Involvement Policy which includes a public hearing on May 11.

The policy states at the beginning that it is intended for "proposals to acquire property, initiate funded capital projects, or make changes to a park or facility." The Board may want to talk about expanding the scope to include projects for which Parks does not yet have funding. Generally these are considered as an element of a plan that undergoes its own public process.

Public Involvement Process

The policy was developed over a nine-month period that began in the fall of 1998; Parks held three well-publicized community workshops facilitated by a consultant, one each in south, central, and north Seattle, to hear what the public thought should comprise our public engagement efforts. We used real cases of upcoming capital projects. More than 100 people total attended the open houses. Parks then crafted a first draft in response to those comments, and circulated it for review to all who had participated. The draft was revised in response to that circulation, and a final draft was presented to the Park Board for a public hearing. After the public hearing and some amendments, the Park Board recommended to the Superintendent the policy that was adopted in 1999.

The policy embraced a new approach: rather than design a public involvement plan based on the value or scope of the project, we based it on the potential impacts of the project. A summary of the development process is Attachment A.

Parks implemented the policy by going out to work groups, particularly grounds crews and planning and development staff, to provide training in what the policy and procedures entail, and by developing a worksheet to guide the public involvement plan for each project, Attachment B.

After a year Parks conducted an evaluation of the policy by surveying everyone who had participated in a public involvement plan. A summary of that evaluation is attachment C.

Issues

Some citizens recently expressed dissatisfaction with the results of Parks public processes on these projects and proposals:

Zoo Garage: The decision to fund and develop the parking garage was a 2005 budget decision supported unanimously by the City Council, and did not involve Parks. **ISSUE:** Opposing citizens claimed the City pulled a "switcheroo" since the preferred location had been at the south end of the zoo and the budget decision resulted in the location on the west side of the zoo. Council unanimously reiterated its decision in a May 2005 letter.

Loyal Heights Playfield: The 1997 and 2003 Joint Athletic Facilities Development Plans, which identified fields that could, with capital improvements, provide more capacity to meet growing demand, designated Loyal Heights as an appropriate field for synthetic turf, as it is already lighted and has adequate parking. It was included in the Pro Parks Levy project list; unfortunately, the levy language referred to improvements but did not specifically mention synthetic turf, although the funding specified in the Levy for the project was at a level to pay for conversion to synthetic. Fields that were intended to be improved with grass received considerably less Levy funding. **ISSUE**: The community feels that the decision preceded their involvement, do not like the proposal for synthetic turf, and feel that Parks held an empty process with no elements on which they could have an impact.

Occidental Park Project: There was a substantial public process (three community forums and 10 community breakfasts/coffees and the support of the Pioneer Square Community Association, the umbrella for business and residential interests in the neighborhood). **ISSUE**: People who fundamentally oppose the removal of any tree opposed the whole plan. The City Council held the 2006 funding back pending completion of the plan, and when it was presented to them they lifted the “budget proviso” and approved the budget and plan by an 8-0 vote (Steinbrueck excused).

Capehart Housing: In early 2004, the Navy announced that in response to a new federal law calling on the military to become more entrepreneurial about how they handle their real estate holdings, they would be developing housing on their property. In response to the community protest, the Mayor marshaled support from county, state, Congressional delegation and forged agreement to raise \$9m to buy the Capehart site (an element of the park master plan). The result is that the Capehart housing will be demolished at developer’s expense and the land will become part of the park, and the historic housing on other Navy-owned property inside the park will stay. **ISSUE**: The call to rally included the phrase “CONDOS in Disco Park.” We are unsure why people are accusing the city of this when the remaining Navy-owned property is theirs to develop under the current zoning designation.

Skatepark at Woodland Park: Parks secured Cumulative Reserve Funds for the project and applied to the State Inter-agency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) for more. In 2005 the Park Board approved locating the skatepark at Lower Woodland, adjacent to the hillside. **ISSUE**: Based on concerns from the skateboarding community about the location next to the hillside, staff moved the location within the park to a site closer to the parking lot along Green Lake Way. Neighbors protested to the Park Board that they had not been informed of the change in the preferred site. They prevailed.

Summer Nights: The decision to move the concert series from South Lake Union Park to Gas Works Park was one the Superintendent had to make to ensure the series would go forward. He was clear that there was no process, and about the reason. **ISSUE**: Some neighbors objected to the fact that they were not consulted. Parks convened a group of community leaders to work with Parks staff on measures to mitigate most of the potential impacts. The Friends of Gas Works Park filed a lawsuit against One Reel and the city, claiming we should have conducted an environmental review under SEPA. We are waiting for the outcome.

In two of these cases (Woodland Park skatepark and purchase of Capehart housing), the community prevailed; in two (zoo garage and Occidental Park), the City Council acted on final approval of the project. In one, there was no process (move of Summer Nights concerts), and in one (Loyal Heights Playfield) the Pro Parks Levy wording did not fully describe the project.

Possible Policy Changes

Parks staff have identified a number of minor changes in the procedures that would improve the quality of the public engagement process, such as:

- Bringing fewer staff people to public meetings. It has been Parks’ practice, in order to have subject matter experts available to answer any question that might arise, to bring several staff people to public meetings. We have heard that some members of the public find this wasteful and intimidating, and that we should bring fewer.

- At the (first) public meeting in a public process, go through with attendees:
 - The history of the project or proposal and whatever public input has led to the current point (e.g., a park master plan, a neighborhood plan, a citywide plan such as the Joint Athletic Facilities Master Plan).
 - The outreach efforts for the current meeting.
 - The project budget and how it may limit the scope of the project.
 - The timeline for the process, the points at which comment is invited, and the elements that are open to comment.
 - That there will be a decision at the end of the process, and that if there is disagreement among park neighbors or users, that some might be unhappy with that decision.
- In information prepared for subsequent public meetings, staff should include milestones and decisions made up to that point, so that the public is not caught off guard by decisions made at meetings they did not attend.
- Keep emphasizing that written or e-mailed comments bear the same weight as comments made in person at public meetings. People are busy and can't always take the time to attend.
- Try to make public meeting dates and times as convenient for the public as possible, and avoid evenings when other known community meetings are scheduled.
- Stay in close touch with the Department of Neighborhoods and use their up to date list of community organizations.
- Use the Internet to identify neighborhood groups.
- Craft a Public Involvement Plan for each Neighborhood Matching Fund project; we have learned that community support that leads to a fund award does not necessarily mean agreement within the broader community.
- Perform a new round of training for everyone involved at Parks: crew chiefs, park resources managers, recreation managers, and planners, project managers, and landscape architects in the Planning and Development Division.
- Consider hiring meeting facilitators for proposals that appear from the outset to be controversial, and for proposals over which controversy arises during the process.

Additional suggestions the Board discussed its April 13 retreat:

- Include clear direction on the circumstances that call for re-opening a process and including extra opportunities for public input, OR explain how the current decision was reached and move forward.
- Clearly document how decisions are made.
- Project managers should include, in their briefing papers, how many people came to each public meeting.
- Move the public involvement section to the beginning of each briefing paper.
- Clarify how Parks uses information from the public, and how it affects the decision.
- Distribute a general information flier at each Park Board meeting that provides an update on letters/e-mails/phone calls received on subjects under consideration or coming under Board consideration.
- If all projects are to follow a public involvement plan 100%, identify what are the weaknesses in staff's ability to follow a given public involvement plan.

Budget

The direct costs of public involvement are staff time and materials. Because Parks has been able to absorb these costs they have not been tracked project by project. Other costs are incurred if a project's timeline or scope changes because of unanticipated delays in the process. For the Loyal Heights Playfield project, the planner estimates the cost of the planning process, which comes from the project's \$2.3 million budget, at more than \$43,000.

Schedule

We anticipate recommendations from the Board sometime in June 2006.

Staff Recommendation

We have begun a list of suggestions for changes to the policy and procedures from both inside and outside Parks for the Board's consideration.

Additional Information

Dewey Potter, 684-7241, dewey.potter@seattle.gov

Joelle Ligon, 233-3979, Joelle.ligon@seattle.gov

http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/projects/public_involvement_policy.htm

Verbal Briefing

Ms. Potter reviewed the information in the written briefing, including recent projects that some in the community were unhappy about. The public involvement policy was a result of a project in 1998 that received a backlash from the community. The policy was developed in 1998 and implemented in 1999. Since then, Parks has operated under the policy. During the first few years of its implementation, there were fewer projects being completed. However, since 2001, with the Pro Parks Levy, 117 projects have been in process. In early spring of 2006, there was a number of events that some community members are not happy about. Some of the decisions that led to the unhappiness were not the Superintendent's decisions. She reviewed the projects referred to in the written briefing.

Ms. Potter stated that Parks is listening carefully and is eager to hear good suggestions on ways to improve the policy. It is important to note that the policy applies to "funded projects." There is also a cost involved in the public involvement process. The Loyal Heights Playfield project manager has estimated that the PIP for that project cost \$43,000 of the \$2.3 million budget. That figure included costs up until the project came before the Park Board for a public hearing.

Public Hearing

The public hearing began. The Chair reminded speakers that they have up to three minutes to speak and will be timed. She asked that comments be suggestions that will help improve the Public Involvement Policy. Eight people signed up and testified. A very brief summary of their testimony is included below:

Joel Tufel: He has attended many community meetings and thought this meeting would be full, as there is much unhappiness in the community. He is here to help with ways to engage community organizations with bureaucracy. He brought two handouts – consciousness raising and citizens meeting inventory and provided copies of both. He believes many public meetings are totally wasteful and suggested Parks get professional guidance with its public meetings.

Diane Duthweiler: She is a Woodland Park Zoo neighbor and is opposed to the above ground parking garage. She is in the majority in her feelings about the garage. The Zoo's public process was clouded and secretive. She referred to the Zoo's annual plan and stated that Zoo staff made it very difficult for members of the public to access public comments made by other citizens. Don't call them public comments if they aren't available to the public.

Ken Shaw: He has worked for 11 years as a volunteer in the West Seattle area forests and salt water beaches. He believes the City is overlooking talents and skills of its volunteers. He believes he is an expert on restoring damaged City forest areas, from the vast amount of time he has spent helping to restore them and has felt left out of the decision process. Parks does a poor job in accepting information from the public. He suggested volunteers be used to gather additional information from those attending public meetings, and then help to share ideas, skills, and understanding of each other.

John Rozdilsky: He is the president of Friends of Gas Works Park and urged Parks not to lie. He stated that in August 2005 an e-mail was sent by One Reel to the Mayor's Office with thanks for offering Gas Works Park for the Summer Concert series. Community members only learned of the decision on December 23, 2005. This is a sham – don't lie and mislead. He clarified that the lawsuit was not undertaken by the Friends of Gas Works Park (FOGWP.) Instead, the community came to FOGWP and asked it to file the lawsuit, as it has a 501c3 standing.

The lawsuit is about a SEPA review. No survey was done on community support for the concerts. Public money should not be used for private gain. Lying does not build community.

Denise Derr: She thanked the Park Board, Ms. Potter, and the Superintendent. She participated in the formulation of the public involvement process six years ago and has seen no progress during that time — the policy is only public relations and not public involvement. Once a plan is made, the public is invited to attend. Projects should be brought to the public at the planning stage, as all issues arise from the public not being invited at the beginning. (1) Must engage the public and (2) Parks, notably the Superintendent, must be more accountable.

Sharon LeVine: She also participated in the 1998 process and has attended countless meetings since then. Some of her suggestions included the following: televise the public meetings, as the public thinks the process is secretive — not everyone can get out to meetings; the 6:00 pm meeting time of the Park Board is too early for working people and 7:00 pm works better; the acoustics in the Park Board room at 100 Dexter are terrible and the Commissioners should use a public address system; three minutes of testimony [in public hearings] is too short — allow community groups to group together and give longer testimony; record the meetings and transcribe them; planners should publish every comment made at a public meeting; planners should describe in detail how they resolved any contentious issues; and Parks should have a regular column in the newspaper, including a summary of each Park Board meeting.

Kris Fuller: She is a member of the Lower Woodland Neighborhood Association and read an extensive list of suggestions to improve the public involvement policy. She will send her full list of suggestions in writing to the Park Board.

Annie Davis: She lives near the Zoo and attended tonight to support a previous speaker. She saw the Zoo plan for an underground garage and stated that neighbors agreed to the plan. Neighbors then received a short notification that the garage will be built above ground and that the decision was a “done deal.” The City has too much process and should change so that it is getting public input and sharing that input with others.

The public hearing concluded.

The Commissioners will accept written testimony through Wednesday, May 24, and plan to discuss the policy and suggestions for improvements at the May 25 meeting.

Near the end of the meeting, under Park Board Business, Commissioner Pflaumer asked that the Board discuss at its May 25 meeting what the implications of including unfunded projects in the public involvement policy would be. Commissioners should e-mail any questions on the policy to Dewey Potter prior to that meeting.

Update Briefing/Discussion/Recommendation: Draft Viewpoint Designation Policy

David Graves, Seattle Parks’ project planner, presented updated information on this new policy. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing. The Board previously heard briefings and held discussions on this policy at its January 26 and February 9, 2006, meetings. Minutes of those meetings are available at:

<http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2006/01-26-06.pdf> and

<http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2006/02-09-06.pdf>, Tonight the Board is asked to make a recommendation on the revised policy.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

The central issue is that while the Parks’ Policy and Procedures Manual contains procedures for naming a new park, there are no procedures or decisional criteria to assist Parks staff and community members in designating a park as a viewpoint. Currently a park could be named as a viewpoint, such as Ursula Judkins Viewpoint, without any analysis as to the cost of creating the viewpoint and the long term operation and maintenance costs. Attached hereto are draft Viewpoint Naming Criteria for the Board’s review, discussion and recommendation.

Project Description and Background

Seattle Parks and Recreation owns and manages a number of parks which are named as viewpoints or overlooks, that contain developed viewpoints or view areas, or which merely afford views of prominent natural and man-made features. Views and viewpoints receive unique status under the City of Seattle's regulatory framework. However, we as a Department don't have a consistent policy and procedure for the designation of new viewpoints. Existing viewpoints such as Betty Bowen Viewpoint at Marshall Park have also suffered from a lack of vegetation management over the past several decades. Due to a lack of such maintenance, recapturing the view is much more expensive in time, resources, and capital outlay than ordinary ongoing maintenance.

During the course of 2005 and 2006, I visited approximately 60 parks to assess the quality and character of the views. I also convened a mini focus group in 2005 to learn what people expected when a park or portion of a park was designated as a viewpoint. In general, we agreed to a working definition of a viewpoint, as follows:

People expect to see something that they can't see from their back yard. A viewpoint is an endpoint or destination; when you get there you expect to see something scenic or interesting. The view doesn't have to be Mount Rainier, Lake Washington, Puget Sound or the Olympics, but it does have to be commanding in some sense.

I have worked extensively with Horticulture staff, including the Senior Urban Forester, Mark Mead, and Horticulture Manager, Duane Penttila, in crafting the attached criteria. These criteria also incorporate previous guidance provided by the Board of Park Commissioners and citizens.

Public Involvement Process

Preliminary analysis of viewpoints was presented to the Board of Park Commissioners on September 22, 2005 with an outline of decisional criteria as to how a new viewpoint could be designated. I have also met with the Magnolia Community Club, and their Executive Committee, to discuss these criteria as they have an interest in the Ursula Judkins Viewpoint. Finally, revised criteria were presented to the Board of Park Commissioners on January 26 and February 9, 2006, and your feedback has been incorporated.

Issue

Attached are the draft Viewpoint Naming Criteria and analysis. I have also attached a spreadsheet that shows how these criteria could have been applied to four new parks. Note that in accordance with the Naming Committee procedures, once a park name is bestowed, it is permanent.

The four parks reviewed in the spreadsheet are:

- Horiuchi Park
- Mt. Baker Ridge Viewpoint
- Ursula Judkins Viewpoint
- MacLean Park

Budget

Adoption of the draft Viewpoint Naming Criteria will give Parks staff tools by which to estimate the short term and long term costs associated with a potential viewpoint. Staff time to undertake the analysis will have budget impacts but they are anticipated to be small in comparison to the value of the information that will be provided to the community and decision makers regarding any new park and/or viewpoint.

Schedule

If these draft Naming Criteria are recommended for adoption, they would be incorporated into the Policy and Procedure Manual and applicable to new parks upon adoption.

Staff Recommendation

The Board should recommend the adoption of the proposed Viewpoint Naming Criteria and incorporation into the Policy and Procedure Manual.

Additional Information

If you any questions, contact David Graves at 684-7048 or e-mail to david.graves@seattle.gov.

Parks and Recreation Naming Committee

***Note: Text in double underline is new, all else is existing.**

1.0 PREAMBLE:

Seattle Parks and Recreation has had a naming policy since 1969 to guide the naming of parks and recreation properties and facilities. This update re-emphasizes the criteria to be used in considering parks and recreation facility names and the permanence of a name once it is conferred.

2.0 ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED:

- 2.1 Seattle Parks and Recreation
- 2.2 Seattle Board of Park Commissioners
- 2.3 Seattle City Council committee that considers parks and recreation issues

3.0 REFERENCES:

- 3.1 Seattle Municipal Code 18.08.010 and 18.08.020, Park Naming Procedures.
- 3.2 Seattle Parks and Recreation Naming Committee Policy adopted December 4, 1969, and amended February 4, 1971, May 16, 1974, October 30, 1974, June 6, 1985, and January 21, 2003.
- 3.3 Seattle Parks and Recreation Corporate Sponsorship Policy, #060-P 2.13.1 and P 1.4.2
- 3.4 Seattle Parks and Recreation Gift Acceptance and Donor Recognition Policy, #060-P 1.4.1

4.0 POLICY:

- 4.1 It is the policy of Seattle Parks and Recreation to name *newly acquired or developed* or as-yet unnamed parks and recreation facilities, after following the procedures outlined here.

5.0 DEFINITIONS:

- 5.1 Seattle Parks and Recreation Naming Committee – created by Ordinance 99911, consists of the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, the Chair of the Board of Park Commissioners, and the Chair of the city Council committee that considers parks and recreation issues, or their designated representatives.
- 5.2 Board of Park Commissioners – a citizen board created by the city Charter to advise the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, the Mayor, City Council and other city departments with respect to park and recreation matters.
- 5.3 Parks and Recreation Facilities – all properties and facilities in the park and recreation system of the City under ownership, management and/or control of Seattle Parks and Recreation.

6.0 RESPONSIBILITY:

- 6.1 The Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, with the advice of the board of Park Commissioners, is authorized to designate the names of parks and recreation facilities from names submitted for consideration the Seattle Parks and Recreation Naming Committee, of which he is a member.
- 6.2 The Seattle Parks and Recreation Naming Committee is authorized to establish a criteria and procedures to be followed in selecting names to be submitted to the Superintendent.

7.0 PROCEDURES:

- 7.1 The Seattle Parks and Recreation Naming Committee will meet as necessary and may elect its own Chair. The Superintendent of Parks and Recreation will provide staff support.

- 7.2 The Naming Committee will use the media and appropriate signage to solicit suggestions for names from organizations and individuals. The Committee will acknowledge and record for consideration all suggestions, solicited or not.
- 7.3 After considering the names and applying the criteria set forth in 7.5 below, the Committee will recommend names to the Superintendent, and provide the historical or other supportive information as appropriate to justify the recommendations.
- 7.4 The Superintendent, with the advice of the Board of Park Commissioners, has final authority to designate names for parks and recreation facilities. Upon designating a name for a park or recreation facility, the Superintendent will, within ten days, notify the Mayor and the Chair of the city Council committee dealing with parks and recreation matters, and will file the name designation with the office of the City Clerk, at which time the name will become official.
- 7.5 CRITERIA:
- 7.5.1 To avoid duplication, confusing similarity, or inappropriateness, the Committee, in considering name suggestions, will review existing park and facility names in the park system.
- 7.5.2 In naming a park or facility, the Committee will consider geographical location, historical or cultural significance, distinctive natural or geological features, and the wishes of the community in which it is located.
- 7.5.3 In naming community centers and other facilities, the committee will give considerable weight to the names that reflect the geographic location that gives identity to the community.
- 7.5.4 Parks and recreation facilities may be named for a person subject to the following conditions: the person must have been deceased for a minimum of *three* years, and the person must have made a significant positive contribution to parks, recreation, or culture in the community where the facility is located. The City will bear the cost of the plaque or monument indicating the name of the individual for whom the facility is named.
- 7.5.5 The Superintendent of Parks and Recreation may accept or reject the Naming Committee’s recommendation.
- 7.5.6 As a general rule, portions of a park or recreation facility will not have a name other than that of the entire facility. The Committee may consider exceptions in cases where, as a revenue or fundraising opportunity, a nomination is submitted to name a room within a community center after a corporate sponsor or in cases where an area within a park is distinctive enough, in the view of the Committee, to merit its own name.
- 7.5.7 Because temporary “working” designations tend to be retained, the Superintendent will carry out the naming process for a new park facility as early as possible after its acquisition or development. Facilities will bear number designations until the naming process results in adoption of a name.
- 7.5.8 A name, once bestowed, is permanent.

7.6 VIEWPOINTS

- 7.6.1 If the new park name is to include “viewpoint”, “overlook” or other such designation, the following analysis, with a staff recommendation, shall be forwarded to the Naming Committee for their consideration prior to any final decision.
- 7.6.1.1 Description of the view and the object of the view, e.g. Mt. Rainier, Space Needle; either existing or potential after vegetation removal. Note that the description of the view should include the horizontal and vertical viewshed and the location *on the site* where the view is taken from;
- 7.6.1.2 Existing site amenities (if any); is or would the site be predominantly a neighborhood destination or could it serve a broader population;
- 7.6.1.3 Surrounding amenities, e.g., proximity to a neighborhood business district, on-street parking, nearby Metro bus access;
- 7.6.1.4 Is the existing or potential view the central focus of the park or one of the amenities;

- 7.6.1.5 Proximity to other existing viewpoint(s); Is or will the view be unique or duplicative;
- 7.6.1.6 What improvements are needed, e.g. on-site parking, ADA access pathway;
- 7.6.1.7 Extent of vegetation removal needed to open and/or maintain the view, now and/or in the future; Potential impact(s) to existing urban forest of vegetation removal; Any proposed vegetation removal must be consistent with the Department's Tree Management, Maintenance, Pruning and/or Removal Policy;
- 7.6.1.8 Is the vegetation to be removed on Parks property, other public property, or private property; what are the potential impacts associated with the vegetation removal, such slope stability.
- 7.6.1.9 Description of surrounding existing and potential land uses and zoning which could impact views;
- 7.6.1.10 Estimated cost of vegetation removal;
- 7.6.1.11 Estimated annual maintenance costs; and,
- 7.6.1.12 Estimated needed improvement costs.
- 7.6.2 The above analysis shall be performed in cooperation with Parks staff including but not limited to the Senior Urban Forester, Senior Planner and the District Manager and/or Crew Chief. The analysis shall form the basis of the staff recommendation to the Naming Committee and shall include a discussion of the value of the project to the Department and to the City balanced against any potential loss of urban forest and include the short-term and long-term costs, of the development.

Verbal Briefing/Discussion/Recommendation

Mr. Graves displayed three large photos of views/possible views from the four listed parks and reviewed information in the written briefing paper.

The Commissioners had a lengthy discussion on how this policy would impact the efforts of the Parks' Naming Committee and how to ensure the policy is clear and understandable to citizens who propose new park names. Discussion/suggestions included:

- Parks staff will develop a clear checklist of criteria for the public/Naming Committee to meet when suggesting a park/area of a park to be named a viewpoint. This will be step 2 of the designation process.
- Keep the viewpoint designation separate from the process used by the Naming Committee (Commissioner Jackson is a member of this Committee and urged that the policy be clear and not confuse the Committee or citizens who suggest names for new parks.)
- Parks staff will do a viewpoint designation analysis of a site before the community's suggestion to name it a viewpoint is sent to the Naming Committee.
- The Naming Committee submits new park names to the Superintendent, but does not make the final decision on the name.
- If a park is designated a viewpoint, a future viewpoint must be assured (i.e., don't name an area a viewpoint if a tall building could be erected on adjoining/nearby property and permanently block the view.)
- Keep in mind that a viewpoint designation by the Parks Department has a different meaning than a State Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) designated viewpoint.
- Once the policy is final, Parks staff will brief the Naming Committee and answer questions.
- Include language in the Naming Policy to refer to the Viewpoint Designation Policy if a site is proposed as a viewpoint. Adopt the criteria in the appropriate part of the Department's Policies and Procedures.
- If a park is to be named a viewpoint, it would be brought before the Park Board before the name becomes permanent. The Board would ask such questions as who in the community was involved in designating this site as a viewpoint.

Mr. Graves will revise the draft policy language to include the Commissioners' suggestion and present an updated briefing in the near future. Commissioners will then vote on the policy after additional review.

Update Briefing: Proposal for a New Parks and Recreation Plan to Replace Seattle Parks and Recreation Plan 2000

Kevin Stoops, Seattle Parks' project manager, briefed the Board on this project. The Board received both a written and verbal briefing. Both are included in the minutes.

Written Briefing

Seattle Parks and Recreation proposes to prepare a new, comprehensive parks and recreation plan during 2007. Such a request is in response to a City Council Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) during the 2006 budget process and is the subject of a budget proposal for 2007-08.

Plan Content

The new parks and recreation plan will involve assessment of existing parks, recreation facilities and open space and the recreational programs that are offered by the Department, a projection of future demands for such, and an outline of the means and timeline for making changes and improvements. The plan will update open space goals; distribution guidelines; and acquisition, development, resource management and recreational program policies that were outlined in the previous Parks and Recreation Plan 2000. The plan will incorporate ongoing asset management planning efforts, and will also outline a six year action program for major maintenance projects, other specific capital improvements, and other actions. This effort will be coordinated with the preparation of a strategic business plan related to parks maintenance and recreation programs that will be sustained after the conclusion of the 2000 Pro-Parks Levy period. It should be noted that the plan will also reflect the recent focus on park development, management and operation issues related to Center City parks.

Plan Process

Preparation of the plan will involve significant public outreach efforts throughout the City, with special attention devoted to efforts to reach immigrant and underserved communities. We will involve the Board of Park Commissioners in this public outreach as well as through traditional briefing and public hearing processes as the plan is developed.

Budget

Preparation of the plan will involve significant resources in terms of staff work and consultant resources. A tentative target budget of \$500,000 has been proposed to provide for additional staff dedicated to this effort, as well as to retain planning consultants and provide for public outreach and interpreter services.

Work Underway to Prepare for the Plan

At this time we are preparing for the plan effort by doing the following:

- The 2001 Gap Report is being updated to show changes in the geographic array of parks that have realized since 2001 with various Pro-Parks acquisitions, and to document where gaps in the provision of parks still exist.
- Demographic information is being collected and will be analyzed to document the characteristics of Seattle's various communities.
- The 2007-2012 Asset Management Plan is being prepared to indicate needed capital improvements to sustain the parks system.

Work to occur in 2007

If funding is approved for the preparation of the parks and recreation plan in 2007, we will undertake analysis of the provision of parks and open space and provision of recreational programs and conduct public involvement efforts to gauge the public's satisfaction with such as well as the need for new or improved facilities and new or improved operations and programs. Following such efforts, various technical reports will be prepared as well as a draft plan

that will be the subject of public review and comment. We would expect to brief the Park Board at several points in this process, and conclude with a summary briefing and public hearing before the Board late in the year. A Department recommended plan, incorporating the Board input, will be forwarded to the City Council by way of the Mayor's Office by year-end.

Next Steps

Attached is the Department's initial response to the City Council Statement of Legislative Intent related to the requested comprehensive parks and recreation plan to be prepared with a new Strategic Business Plan. The scope and schedule outlined in that response will be refined this month and budget proposals developed to support this effort. Our final proposal for the scope, schedule and staffing (and other resources) to mount this effort is due to the City Council on June 1.

For more information, call Kevin Stoops at (206) 684-7053 or e-mail at kevin.stoops@seattle.gov.

Verbal Briefing/Discussion

Mr. Stoops reviewed the information in the written briefing and the need to update the Department's plan.

Commissioner Collins asked if the Department is required by the State IAC that its current plan be approved to get IAC grants. Mr. Stoops agreed that this is a requirement and talked about stop gap measures. Commissioner Belbeck asked if, when the Gap report is prepared, whether it looks at the types of parks. Mr. Stoops answered that the Gap report is somewhat "blind", but it can identify areas where citizens have to travel a long distance to reach a park.

Commissioner Holme referred to testimony mentioned in the briefing and asked if the Department did some type of survey. Mr. Stoops answered that a survey was sent out to Advisory Councils asking for their primary purposes, goals, etc. The Department received responses with information on nearby areas and also from a broader perspective.

Commissioner Ramels asked about the references to recreation programming and where these programmed recreation sites are located. Mr. Stoops answered that these are community centers, environmental learning centers, tennis instruction centers, and rowing and sailing centers. Commissioner Ramels commented that all these activities are currently programmed through the Association Recreation Council (ARC) and asked if ARC is factored in. Mr. Stoops answered yes and commented that sometimes it is difficult to determine where programming ends and capital projects begin. If an agency provides programming, what type of facility must be provided to accommodate the programming? If a facility already exists, what type of programming will it accommodate? Commissioner Ramels referred to the reference to outreach to different communities, and cautioned staff to be clear with the community what the purpose of the outreach is and whether it is to inform or solicit their input.

Commissioner Ranade asked whether Parks is consulting with King County Parks and other departments and agencies to determine how each can help the other. Mr. Stoops answered yes and that Parks already has strong relationships with other departments (SDOT, DPD) and other park agencies.

Commissioner Collins referred to the Olmsted park goal of having a park within ½ mile of every citizen and asked how near Parks is to reaching that goal. Mr. Stoops answered that the goal is fairly close for single family households to be located within ½ mile of a park. The areas of exception are West Seattle and Northwest Seattle. Commissioner Collins referred to the City's Growth Management Plan and asked if Parks' plan is a self supported, independent plan or will be integrated into an overall City Plan. Mr. Stoops commented that Parks worked closely in 2000 with the City's Planning Department to develop the most recent Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Holme recommended that more emphasis be placed on maintenance in the planning process. Mr. Stoops answered that Parks will be looking closely at this.

The Board asked Mr. Stoops to return to a future meeting to give a briefing on the Gap Analysis. The Commissioners thanked Mr. Stoops for the briefing.

New/Old Business

- SR520 Widening Project: Commissioner Collins gave an update on the Stakeholder’s meeting, of which he is a member.
- NRPA Conference: Three of the Commissioners will attend the National Recreation and Parks Association Conference in Chicago next week.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

Kate Pflaumer, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____