

Department of Parks and Recreation

Seattle Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes
October 8, 2009

Web site: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/parkboard/>
(Includes agendas and minutes from 2001-present)

Also, view Seattle Channel tapes of meetings, June 12, 2008-most current, at
<http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/watchVideos.asp?program=Parks>

Board of Park Commissioners:

Present:

Neal Adams, Vice-chair
John Barber
Terry Holme
Diana Kincaid
Donna Kostka
Jackie Ramels, Chair

Excused:

Jourdan Keith

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

Tim Gallagher, Superintendent
Christopher Williams, Deputy Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Coordinator

Commissioner Ramels called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and reviewed the meeting agenda topics. **Commissioner Adams moved approval of the agenda as presented, the September 24 minutes, and the record of correspondence received by the Board since its September 24 meeting. Commissioner Holme seconded the motion. The vote was taken, with all in favor. Motion carried.**

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Gallagher reported on the following items. To learn more about Seattle Parks, see the website at <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/>.

Gun Rule in Parks and Facilities: At the Mayor's request, next week the Superintendent will sign a rule that prohibits the carrying or display of firearms in Seattle's parks and park facilities where children are likely to be present and where gun rule signage is posted. The rule is a condition of a person's right to be at these parks and park facilities. Directors, managers, security staff, and park rangers are being trained to administer the rule, which covers: playgrounds and children's play areas; athletic fields and sports courts; swimming and wading pools; spray parks (water play areas); teen life centers; community centers; environmental learning centers; small craft centers; performing arts centers; tennis centers; skateparks; golf courses; and swim beaches. A press release will be issued on October 14. The City anticipates a challenge by the Second Amendment Foundation in the form of someone showing up at one of the first facilities to be posted. The Superintendent noted that correspondence to the mayor's office overwhelmingly opposes the rule.

Commissioner Barber asked if the State Attorney General is aware of the rule. Deputy Superintendent Williams responded that the gun rule cannot pre-empt State law. The City is taking the stand that it is a property owner and as such can prohibit guns from its property. Responding to a question from Commissioner

Holme on staff training to enforce the rule, Deputy Superintendent Williams answered that staff members are having extensive training. Seattle Police Department is doing part of the training and will respond to any report from staff that the rule is challenged. Staff will have a script to follow in such instances. Commissioner Kincaid noted that recently police were called to Magnuson Park and did not know the layout of the park well enough. She urged that police become familiar with the park layouts in their precincts and Deputy Superintendent Williams agreed with this suggestion. To read the Mayor's press release on the gun rule, see <http://www.seattle.gov/mayor/newsdetail.asp?ID=10197&dept=40>.

Customer Service Training: This week the consulting firm LERN conducted a training session for Parks' recreation attendants and cashiers. Golden Gardens Bathhouse was the location for the two half-day sessions for community center coordinators, senior coordinators, and managers. The consultant reviewed trends in recreation, marketing, revenue generation, program knowledge, and customer service skills. Staff also identified challenges and made suggestions for removing obstacles in order to deliver better customer service. Participants were divided into teams, with the first team listing customer service problems and the next team developing the solutions.

The Department's Strategic Action Plan's Goal Team 2 has scheduled Parks Executive Team to meet with Starbucks in November. Starbucks' customer service trainers will share their insights on customer service delivery. The Superintendent noted that many people go into community centers and aren't acknowledged. Each visitor to the centers should be acknowledged and Parks is correcting that behavior. Responding to a question from Commissioner Adams whether all staff would have this training, the Superintendent replied that they will. Commissioner Ramels asked if there is a cost for this and the Superintendent answered that Starbucks is donating the training.

Capehart Housing Update: The Capehart homes located in Discovery Park are quickly being vacated and it is expected that Forest City, the managing firm for the Navy, will begin environmental remediation (asbestos and lead paint removal) of the homes in November, or possibly sooner. Once the homes are "cleaned" of hazardous materials, the buildings will then be demolished leaving the slabs. The property will be conveyed to the City in first quarter of 2010, and then Parks staff will remove the concrete slabs and restore the area as park property. Forest City is also testing the utility lines and replacing as needed, with assistance from Park staff members. For more information on the Capehart Housing, see http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/fortlawton/ft_lawton_properties/faq.htm#1.

City Center Task Force: This committee was recently formed to update the 2006 Renaissance Plan for downtown parks and next meets on October 21 at 7:30 a.m. Commissioners Ramels and Kincaid are both members. The Park Rangers attended the previous meeting and a good discussion followed. The Task Force is requesting representatives of the Human Rights Department and Seattle Police Department to attend the committee meetings.

Park Operating Hours: This week the Superintendent signed a revised policy and memo to the City Clerk implementing the updates to park operating hours that the Board acted on in July to change park operating hours. The policy was updated to implement the 6 a.m. to 10:00 pm exception to the standard 4:00 am to 11:30 p.m. hours. It also extends the time that a park's hours can be temporarily changed from 60 days to 270 days. Parks Department staff is still working with Seattle Police Department to delegate authority to close parks in emergencies. The Superintendent distributed a list of the operating hours. Many of these hours were changed 20 years ago, with no follow up since then.

Commissioner Barber commented that the parking lot at Leschi Park seems to be open longer hours and gangs use it to congregate. The Superintendent urged him to call Seattle Police when the park is closed. Parks is working with Police to determine how to close a park that has repeated problems.

Parks Levy Opportunity Fund: Michael Shiosaki, Seattle Parks' Planning and Development Deputy Director, is chairing the new levy Opportunity Fund. During this first round, there is \$7 million available, with February 1

the deadline for letter of intent applications to be submitted. The full application is due on April 1, with Parks staff answering questions and assisting applicants. There will be three-four public meetings throughout the City to encourage applications. For more information on the Levy Oversight Opportunity Fund and application dates, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/levy/opportunity.htm>.

Magnuson Park/NOAA Access Road: Parks and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) are nearing agreement on improving access at the north end of Magnuson Park. In addition, Building 27's is nearing a construction start date. For more information on Magnuson Park, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/Magnuson/>.

360 Evaluations: Parks upper management staff is participating in a 360 Evaluation system. For more information, see <http://humanresources.about.com/od/360feedback/a/360feedback.htm>.

2010 Budget: Parks budget staff did a great job preparing the Department's 2010 budget, which has gone to City Council. For more information on the City's 2010 budget, see <http://www.seattle.gov/council/default.htm>.

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 two minutes each and will be timed, and are asked to stand at the podium to speak. The Board's usual process is for 10 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 testified.

Jim Snell: Mr. Snell lives near Leschi Natural Area and testified to the Park Board approximately one month ago. Superintendent Gallagher approved a permit for tree trimming to enhance a park neighbor's view. He asked the Park Board to learn the facts and urge the Department to re-write its tree policy. Mr. Snell distributed two 8"x10" photos of the area, read a letter to the Park Board, and referred to written testimony from Cheryl Trivision asking the Department to revisit its tree trimming policy. .

Commissioner Ramels thanked Mr. Snell for his testimony. Noting that the Board had received e-mails from a number of people on this topic, she asked Mr. Snell how the public became aware of this issue. Mr. Snell responded that the Central District News ran a story about it.

Briefing/Public Hearing: Park Classification System Proposal

At its July 9 meeting, Michael Shiosaki, Deputy Director of Parks' Planning and Development Division, presented a preliminary briefing on this topic. To read the minutes, including the briefing paper and the Board's discussion, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/07-09-09.pdf>.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

As a follow up to the Park Board briefing on July 9, the Board of Park Commissioners will hold a public hearing on the proposed Parks Classification System at the October 8 Park Board meeting. On October 22 the Board will be asked to make a recommendation to the Parks Superintendent on a new Department policy and procedure regarding the Parks Classification System.

Project Background

Since the July 9 Park Board meeting, the proposed Park Classification System has been restructured into a policy document. In addition, some relatively minor revisions have been made to the document in response to comments from the Board and the public.

The proposed policy adopts the parks classification system including the park type definitions and Park staff responsibilities for implementing the policy.

Park Classifications - The following park types are proposed:

- Triangles/Circles/Squares
- Pocket Park
- Downtown Park
- Neighborhood Park
- Community Park
- Recreation Area
- Natural Area/Greenbelt
- Boulevards/Green Streets/Trails
- Special-Use Park

Strategic Action Plan

The need for a Park Classification system is specifically called out as an action strategy in the Strategic Action Plan, Goal 1. The plan states, "Create and adopt a consistent land classification system that defines appropriate uses to identify the capacity of each land resource

- Classify all Seattle parks and open space land
- Communicate these categories effectively and consistently, defining what the land classification system means in terms of intensity of use, kinds of use, and potential future development."

Public Involvement Process

This system has been developed with input from staff members throughout the Department. A public hearing will be held as part of the October 8 Park Board meeting to receive public comments on the policy.

Environmental Sustainability

As new parks are developed or changes to existing parks are proposed, use of the park classification system may allow for better alignment of a park site that has specific environmental attributes with appropriate development and programming options.

Budget

No budget impacts are anticipated.

Schedule

The system will be put to use over time as new parks are planned and changes are proposed to programming of existing parks.

Additional Information

For more information, please contact me via phone at 206.684.0750 or by e-mail at michael.shiosaki@seattle.gov

Your City, Seattle



Department Policy & Procedure

Subject: Park Classification System	Number 060-P	
	Effective November 1, 2009	
	Supersedes	
Approved:	Department:	Page 1 of

1.0 PURPOSE STATEMENT

Seattle Parks and Recreation recognizes the unique nature of each property it owns and is responsible for. The size of each property, its setting within the surrounding neighborhood, the amenities it provides to park visitors, its accessibility to the public, its soil, hydrology, vegetation, and habitat combine to make each property a unique asset. Understanding the uniqueness of each property, there is also a recognized benefit to categorizing park owned properties based on their similarities across a number of characteristics. The purpose of this policy and procedure is to establish a method for classifying the parks in Seattle Parks and Recreation. The classifications are driven by park use, purpose and size. This classification system serves the following purposes:

- These classifications will provide a general guideline for future development options. The combination of descriptors for each park type represents what has generally been successful on a certain sized plot of land located in a certain type of physical environment. These guidelines can help to set community expectations for a given site.
- These classifications may serve as a basis for policies around appropriate programming in different park types.
- These classifications may inform functional planting design standards and other design standards.

This classification scheme is not intended to serve as an inventory of individual assets (e.g. total acres of natural area or total number of athletic fields) because different combinations of the same assets appear in each park type. In addition, for each park type, the list of desired or optional assets or programming opportunities is not intended to be inclusive of all potential assets or programs.

2.0 ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED

2.1 Department of Parks and Recreation

3.0 POLICY

Seattle Parks and Recreation adopts the following park classifications as defined in Section 4.0 :

1. Triangles/Circles/Squares
2. Pocket Park
3. Downtown Park
4. Neighborhood Park
5. Community Park
6. Recreation Area
7. Natural Area/Greenbelt
8. Boulevards/Green Streets/Trails
9. Special-Use Park

4.0 DEFINITIONS

4.1	TRIANGLES/CIRCLES/SQUARES	These small sites are typically composed of traffic islands or leftover pieces of land. They are often dedicated to Parks in the original plat rather than purchased for use.
Physical		
Size	Generally under 10,000 square feet (0.25 acres)	
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages, Urban Center Villages, Downtown Generally constructed on unused land between roads	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open	No	

Space requirement	
Built environment	
Percent developed	100%
Assets (desired)	None
Assets (optional)	Benches Lighting for safety Public Art
Parking	Street, none
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	No
Environmental Benefits	Possible green stormwater infrastructure
Programs	
Programming (desired)	None
Programming (optional)	None
Geographic range of users	People in the immediate vicinity (pedestrians, cyclists, drivers)

4.2 POCKET PARK

These are typically smaller developed sites that have been acquired to serve the immediate neighborhood as a small multi-purpose park. These parks are generally not large enough for significant programming or activity. They may incorporate utility infrastructure or a viewpoint.

Physical	
Size	Generally between 2,500 sq. ft. and 10,000 sq. ft. (0.25 acres) – this refers primarily to the usable area of the park
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages Generally surrounded by residences, small commercial, non-arterial streets
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	No, unless it exceeds 0.25 acres
Built environment	
Percent developed	70-100%
Assets (desired)	Benches Improved paths Plaza or grassy area for informal activity (no sports field)
Assets (optional)	Designed Landscape Lighting for safety (rare) Picnic table Play area Public art Viewpoint
Parking	Street
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	None
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants
Programs	
Programming (desired)	None
Programming (optional)	Small community gatherings
Geographic range of users	Immediate neighborhood – less than ¼ mile in distance

4.3 DOWNTOWN PARK

These are typically smaller developed sites located in Seattle’s Center City and other neighborhood centers. These areas provide a landscaped respite from busy downtown streets and often offer places to sit and space for performers and vendors. The 2006 Seattle Downtown Parks & Public Spaces Task Force report identifies 24 downtown parks in three categories: 1) downtown destination parks, which are “signature parks of interest to the broad

community”; 2) downtown neighborhood parks, where “neighborhood involvement in activities and programming...is most appropriate;” and 3) small public spaces or beauty spots, which are “small islands within the urban environment that present opportunities to enhance the city’s character and identity, and the public’s enjoyment of downtown, but are not large enough for substantial park facilities.”

Physical	
Size	Between 0.1 and 5 acres
Setting	The 2006 Downtown Parks & Public Spaces Task Force Report defines “downtown” as the area bounded by South Lake Union Park to the north, the International District to the south and Interstate 5 to the east. This document currently reflects those boundaries, although in the future the area defined “downtown” may shift as the city changes Generally surrounded by commercial buildings
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Only those over 10,000 square feet
Built environment	
Percent developed	100%
Assets (desired)	Benches Improved paths Designed landscapes Lighting for safety
Assets (optional)	Picnic tables Play area Public art Stage
Parking	Street, none
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	None
Environmental Benefits	Possible green stormwater infrastructure, native plants
Programs	
Programming (desired)	None
Programming (optional)	Buskers, food vendors (carts), small concerts, special events
Geographic range of users	Immediate business community, downtown visitors and residents, tourists

4.4 NEIGHBORHOOD PARK

Neighborhood parks are larger than pocket parks and serve the surrounding neighborhood for multiple uses. Typical park development may include play areas, small fields, benches, picnic tables, and improved paths.

Physical	
Size	Between 0.25 and 9 acres
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages Generally surrounded by residences, small businesses, small or arterial streets
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Yes
Built environment	

Percent developed	30-100%	
Assets (desired)	Benches Designed landscape Improved paths	Level grassy area for informal activity Picnic tables Play area
Assets (optional)	Basketball court Boat launch Comfort station Garden Lighting for safety Picnic shelter or small shelter house	Public art Sports fields (up to one) Stage Tennis courts Wading pool Viewpoint Off-leash Area
Parking	Generally just street parking; may have off-street parking	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	May have natural area, creek, lake	
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat (if natural area), CO2 reduction	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	None	
Programming (optional)	Light scheduling for athletic teams, community gatherings, small concerts	
Geographic range of users	Surrounding neighborhood – between ¼ and ½ mile	
4.5 COMMUNITY PARK	A community park meets the recreational needs of several neighborhoods and may also preserve unique landscapes and open spaces. These parks serve multiple uses and provide recreational facilities and accommodate group activities not provided in neighborhood parks. Community park sites should be accessible by arterial and/or collector streets.	
Physical		
Size	Between 5 and 60 acres	
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages Should be next to an arterial, institution, or natural area rather than surrounded by homes on all sides	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Yes	
Built environment		
Percent developed	25-100%	
Assets (desired)	Basketball court Benches Comfort station Designed landscape Improved paths Level grassy area for informal activity	Lighting for safety Picnic tables and shelters Play area Sports field(s)
Assets (optional)	Boat launch Community Center Concessions Community or	Pool Recreation complex (lighted sports fields with designated parking away from residences)

	specialty garden Lifeguarded beach Lighting for specific facility use Natural Area Off-leash area Public art	Skatepark Stage Tennis courts Wading pool Viewpoint
Parking	Off-street parking	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	May have natural area, creek, lake	
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat (if natural area), CO2 reduction	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	Community gatherings	
Programming (optional)	Scheduled for athletic teams, small concerts, naturalist activities, food vendors (cart)	
Geographic range of users	Several surrounding neighborhoods – between 1/2 and 3 miles; citywide if park contains a recreation complex	
4.6 RECREATION AREA	Recreation areas supplement neighborhood and community parks, serving broader citywide recreation needs. Each of these parks contains various assets, often for active recreation, and is programmed accordingly. Many also have designated natural areas. Restroom facilities and off-street parking are generally provided for users.	
Physical		
Size	Between 20 and 500 acres	
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages Accessible via public transit and urban trail system and arterial streets Usually next to an arterial, commercial building, other institution, greenspace, or waterfront, rather than surrounded by residences on all sides	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Yes	
Built environment		
Percent developed	20-100%	
Assets (desired)	Benches Comfort station Designed landscape Improved paths Level grassy area for informal activity	Lighting for safety Picnic tables and shelters Play area Stage
Assets (optional)	Administration Building Basketball court Boat launch Community Center Concessions	Recreation complex (lighted sports fields with designated parking away from residences) Sports field(s) Skatepark Tennis court

	Lifeguarded beach Lighting for specific facility use Off-leash area Natural area Pool	Unique garden areas or conservatory Wading pool Viewpoint
Parking	Multiple off-street parking lots to allow for access to different parts of the park	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	Yes – forest, lake, creek, riparian area	
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat, riparian corridor (possible), CO2 reduction	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	Community gatherings	
Programming (optional)	Scheduled for athletic teams, concerts, special sporting events, large special events, nature programs, fairs	
Geographic range of users	Citywide, regional, tourists	

4.7 NATURAL AREA/ GREENBELT

Natural Areas are park sites established for the protection and stewardship of habitat and other natural systems support functions. Some natural areas are accessible for low-impact use. Minimal infrastructure may include access and signage, where it will not adversely impact habitat or natural systems functions. Larger natural areas may have small sections developed to serve a community park function. Large Natural Area/Greenbelts may be divided into subareas based on vegetation, habitat, restoration status, wildlife area designation, recreation use area, etc. in order to better differentiate resource needs and use priorities.

Physical		
Size	Any	
Setting	Where tracts of undeveloped land are available. Natural areas may include, but are not limited to, forest, meadows, riparian areas, beaches, tidelands and wetlands. Non-accessible natural areas are generally found on steep slopes or in riparian zones or wetlands. Natural areas often serve as a buffer between incompatible land uses. See 1993 Greenspaces Policy (Resolution 28653) for details about natural areas.	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Only parks with usable open space over 10,000 square feet	
Built environment		
Percent developed	Limited to infrastructure for support services	
Assets (desired)	None (Parks Design Standard 02900-01 "Site Restoration of Natural Areas" shall apply)	
Assets (optional)	Comfort station (in more heavily used natural areas such as	Play area Signage Trails (internal and connecting with external urban trails)

	Carkeek and Discovery Park) Environmental Learning Center Picnic tables	Viewpoint
Parking	Street parking, off-street parking for natural areas with more amenities	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	Yes	
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, habitat, riparian corridor (if there is a creek or shoreline), erosion control	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	Environmental education	
Programming (optional)	Plant restoration service projects, research	
Geographic range of users	Citywide, regional, tourists	

4.8 BOULEVARDS/GREEN STREETS/TRAILS

Boulevards, green streets and trails are linear parks that typically serve as an aesthetically-pleasing transportation corridor. A boulevard is legally designated in SMC 15.02.046, defined as an extension or expansion of a dedicated street which continues to serve as a right-of-way in addition to being park land. Many of Seattle's boulevards are part of the Olmsted plan. Boulevards and green streets often provide safe pedestrian routes as well as recreation opportunities.

Physical		
Size	Any	
Setting	Single Family Residential, Residential Urban Villages, Hub Urban Villages Along an arterial road In places with attractive views	
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	Those with usable open space over 10,000 square feet	
Built environment		
Percent developed	25-100%	
Assets (desired)	Designed landscape Improved Path	Regular street lighting
Assets (optional)	Benches Decorative lighting Flat grassy area for informal activity	Play area Public gathering place Viewpoint
Parking	Street parking, off-street parking	
Natural Environment		
Natural Area	May have shoreline, riparian area	
Environmental Benefits	Green stormwater infrastructure, native plants, riparian area, CO2 reduction	
Programs		
Programming (desired)	None	
Programming (optional)	None	

Geographic range of users	Citywide, all travelers using the street
4.9 SPECIAL-USE PARKS	<p>This category refers to stand-alone parks that are designed to serve one particular use. Examples of parks that fit into this category include stand-alone golf courses, marinas, boat ramps, and community or specialty gardens. These parks may serve a second or third use (e.g. picnic tables at a marina or walking paths at a golf course), but the primary use is prioritized with regard to design, maintenance and funding decisions.</p> <p>For each special-use park type, the descriptors will differ depending on industry standards and best practices for the intended activity. For each type of special-use park, a more detailed list of descriptors should be developed by a design expert in that particular field.</p>
Physical	
Size	Whatever size is necessary for the intended use
Setting	Depends on intended use
Contributes to planning area Usable Open Space requirement	In some cases
Built environment	
Percent developed	70-100%
Assets (desired)	Depends on intended use
Assets (optional)	Depends on intended use
Parking	Depends on intended use
Natural Environment	
Natural Area	None
Environmental benefits	golf courses contribute to CO2 reduction, native plants, habitat, and green stormwater infrastructure; environmental benefits of other special-use parks depends on development
Community	
Programming (desired)	Depends on intended use
Programming (optional)	Depends on intended use
Geographic range of users	Citywide

5.0 RESPONSIBILITY

- 5.1 The Planning & Development Division (PDD) will be responsible for reviewing the Parks Classification System as a guideline as park development plans are reviewed for proposed improvements or changes in use.
- 5.2 The Parks Division will be responsible for reviewing the Parks Classification System as new maintenance procedures at a park site are considered.
- 5.3 As policies related to park programming options in different park types are considered, it will be the responsibility of the Recreation Division to review the Parks Classification System for policy guidance.

6.0 PROCEDURE Not applicable

7.0 REFERENCES Not applicable

Verbal Briefing/Discussion

Mr. Shiosaki introduced himself and reviewed the information in the written briefing paper. Prior to this meeting, the Board received the latest version of the policy, with any additional changes highlighted.

Commissioner Kostka suggested a minor addition on page 8. Commissioner Barber believes this is a very thoughtful policy. Commissioners Adams and Barber referred to the letter from Seattle Audubon about the classification policy, specifically on the “recreation” classification that is proposed for 9 of the large parks, including Magnuson, Lincoln, Golden Gardens, Alki, and other. People sometimes forget that recreation is more than sportsfields and includes walking and many other recreational uses. Commissioner Ramels urged the Department to do a thorough job of educating the public on the meaning of the classifications. She added that having multiple classifications for one park seems contradictory. Mr. Shiosaki responded that the new park classification sets an overall tone for a particular park. Commissioner Holme reflected that this new policy is tentative and asked when it will be adopted by the Department. He anticipates the public asking many questions at that time and he will want further review of the policy. Mr. Shiosaki answered that when the policy is adopted, it becomes policy. Commissioner Kincaid asked if Parks has taken this policy out to the community and is concerned that the Park Board has received little public testimony. Commissioner Ramels asked if the Department followed its public involvement policy. Mr. Shiosaki responded that it will take this to the public as it is being implemented.

Commissioner Barber referred to the purpose statement on page one and asked that it include language that this policy is not to be used as a way to determine zoning.

Commissioner Kostka is concerned that neighborhoods are unaware of this new policy and will be unhappy with their local park’s classifications. Mr. Shiosaki responded that the classification will not result in a change to the parks. Commissioner Kostka suggested the classification of larger parks, such as Magnuson and Lincoln, be “multi-community.” She also suggested that the term “sanctuary” be added in the natural area section of the policy. She will forward any additional suggestions to Mr. Shiosaki.

Public Hearing

The chair reminded the audience that each person has up to two minutes to testify and will be timed. No one testified. The public hearing concluded.

The Board will discuss the policy at its October 22 meeting and plans to vote on a recommendation to the Superintendent. Commissioners thanked Mr. Shiosaki for the update.

Quarterly Briefing: Parks Planning and Development Division

Kevin Stoops, Director, Seattle Parks’ Planning and Development Division, presented a quarterly briefing on the work of his division. Prior to this meeting, Commissioners received a written report, included below.

Written Briefing

Acquisitions

- First Hill Park (PPL) sites appraised
- Duwamish Head Greenbelt (Admiral site) open space-closed
- Duwamish Head Greenbelt (Fairmount site)-in negotiation
- MeKwaMooks Natural Area open space-closed
- Thornton Creek Park #6 open space addition-closing
- Fautleroy Park addition (donation)-closing
- Capitol Hill Park site offer

- Other levy funded acquisitions

In Planning:

- Neighborhood Planning for Southeast Seattle
- Lake Union Trail projects
- Martha Washington Shoreline Habitat (KCD)
- Beach Nourishment along Lake Washington Boulevard
- Ballard (7th Elect Church site) design program
- International Children's Park Renovation (NMF)
- Pinehurst PG Shelterhouse (NMF)
- Greenwood Park expansion (NMF)
- Play Area Renovation design programs, e.g., Beacon Hill, Fairmount, etc.
- Spray Pool design programs for Georgetown, Northacres, Highland Park

In Design

- Myrtle Reservoir
 - "Bellevue Substation" Park (John and Summit)
 - Volunteer Park Seattle Asian Art Museum
 - Madison Pool plaster liner (hold)
 - Volunteer Park Conservatory east wing renovation (hold)
 - Volunteer Park support greenhouse renovation (hold)
 - Delridge Playfield skatepark
 - Basketball court lighting-Rainier Playfield
 - Discovery Park-Fort Lawton Utilities (by others)
 - Delridge Playfield field conversion*
 - Genesee Playfield field conversion*
 - Jefferson Park "Beacon Mountain"
 - Camp Long Lodge renovation
 - Langston Hughes Performing Arts Center seismic renovation
 - Rainier Beach Community Center and Pool
- *denotes in-house design

In Construction

- Lake Union Park Phase 2
- Ballard Corner Park
- Capitol Hill Park (16th and Howell)
- Jefferson Park-Beacon Reservoir
- Jefferson Park tennis courts
- Jefferson Park play area
- Magnuson Park Wetlands
- Magnuson Park Athletic Fields
- Magnuson Park Comfort Station (bathhouse)
- Cascade People Center (HVAC, roof and other work)
- Irrigation Upgrades: EC Hughes, Salmon Bay, Lincoln, Volunteer Parks
- Freeway Park Canyon and Cascade Fountains
- Hiawatha Playfield field conversion
- Ballfield Lighting-Rainier Playfield
- Small Ballfield Work at West Queen Anne #3
- Colman Playground Shelterhouse renovations
- Leschi Moorage Improvements
- Dahl Playfield Skatepark
- Play Area Safety Improvements (Rainier Beach, W Queen Anne)

- Queen Anne CC Seismic Upgrade (FEMA)
 - Oxbow Park Hat and Boots Restoration
 - Discovery Park North Roadway removal*
 - Discovery Park Lighthouse
 - Magnuson Park 65th Street entrance
 - Chinook Beach forest restoration
 - Queen Anne Boulevard Improvements*
 - Atlantic Street Play Area*
 - Brighton PF Play Area*
 - Bhy Kracke Park Play Area*
 - John C. Little Play Area*
 - Bayview Playground Play Area*
 - Lower Woodland #2 field conversion*
 - Lower Woodland #7 field conversion*
 - Northgate Urban Center (Hubbard Homestead) Park
- *denotes in-house design

Completion

- Golf Master Plan
 - Lake Union Trail Master Plan
 - Japanese Garden Entry Structure
 - Morgan Junction Park
 - Green Lake "shade garden"*
 - Langston Hughes Performing Arts Center exterior renovations
 - Green Lake Parking Lot*
 - Miller Playfield field conversion*
 - Tennis Court Resurfacing (Rainier Beach, Delridge)
 - Montlake Playfield shoreline (NMF)
 - Denny Park ING donation*
 - Powell Barnett Playground Picnic Area (NMF)
- *denotes in-house design

Other

- Virginia-Graham Baker Act swimming & wading pool compliance
- "Yellow Swings" installations
- Magnuson Park Electrical and "Green Power" with Seattle City Light

UPCOMING ISSUES FOR POSSIBLE BOARD REVIEW/CONSIDERATION

School-Park Property Issue Review and Recommendation

- Southshore School and Rainier Beach Community Center and Pool

Park Plan Review and Recommendation

- Maple Leaf and West Seattle Reservoirs Planning
- Washington Park Playfield and SPU Madison Valley Drainage

Policy Review and Recommendation

- Non Park Use and Park Encroachment Abatement

Status Reports/Briefings

- Central Waterfront and Alaskan Landing Master Plan
- SR 520 Issues at Montlake, McCurdy and Washington Parks
- Freeway Park Renovations
- Arboretum Projects: Pacific Connection, Japanese Garden Entry
- Magnuson Park Wetlands and Athletic Fields

Verbal Briefing/Board Discussion

Mr. Stoops introduced himself and noted that he last briefed the Board on the Planning and Development Division in April. He reviewed the written report and gave some additional information about a number of the items. For more information on Parks' projects and planning, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/projects/default.htm>.

Commissioner Adams

- thanked Mr. Stoops for the information and always looks forward to his briefings to the Park Board.

Commissioner Barber

- noted there are only 4-5 Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF) projects listed. Mr. Stoops replied there are additional NMF projects; however, the Department is only doing half the amount of NMF projects that it was four-to-five years ago.

Commissioner Holme

- referred to Genesee Playfield and noted that both fields were engineered at the same time. Because these are located on a former landfill, they are more complex to maintain than some other fields. Responding to a question on whether Parks will do this project in-house, Mr. Stoops answered that it will.
- referred to the Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) underground water retention project at Washington Park Playfield and recommended that the field lighting be improved as part of the project. Mr. Stoops answered that the SPU project will have a very small footprint, with the new tank located near Madison Street.
- asked that Parks staff schedule regular briefings to the Park Board on the Parks and Greenspaces Levy. Superintendent Gallagher agreed, with the first briefing to be presented in April 2010.
- recently drove by Miller Playfield and complimented the aesthetics of this park.

Commissioner Kostka

- asked if there have been lessons learned from the reservoir/park planning process. Mr. Stoops responded that adding a park over a large water retention tank is a very technical process. One issue has been the type of soil that can be added to the top of the concrete tanks, and Parks staff came up with a lightweight soil mixture that should work well. He added that the tanks also have hatches and access ports that staff must keep in mind during the park design. Mr. Shiosaki added that this project gives great new park space and the City didn't have to buy the land. He agreed that the soil mix has been a big challenge, as well as the slope of the lids. He added that Queen City Lawn Bowl at Jefferson Park has incredible views of the city and Parks is adding gorgeous landscaping.

Commissioner Ramels

- noted that the rebuild of Rainier Beach Community Center is not funded by a levy, thus making it the first community center to be built as a capital project. She asked how Parks determined that it was the next community center to be rebuilt, as there are several others on the wait list. Mr. Stoops responded that the School District decided to demolish Southshore Middle School and this provided Parks the opportunity to build a new community center. [Note: Commissioners heard a briefing on the new community center's schematic design at the November 12, 2009, meeting and had additional questions on how this decision was made.]
- asked what work has been completed at Cascade People's Center. Mr. Stoops responded that Parks replaced the roof and heating system, and are doing some other smaller projects. Mr. Shiosaki added that originally the People's Center proposed a \$41.3 million eco-building; however, it couldn't raise the needed funds
- asked for a status on Tom Wales Park. Mr. Stoops answered that the design is 99.5% complete and the deadline for bids is in December.

Commissioner Kincaid

- has heard from several people that they would like pickle ball lines added to Miller Playfield.
- referred to the Department's search for new park properties in the First Hill area. Mr. Stoops identified the area as south of Madison and north of Yesler, and Parks is especially looking at parking lots. The property in this area is very expensive.
- asked if the \$2.5 million needed for Volunteer Park Conservatory is long-term spending. Mr. Stoops answered that some emergency work will be done soon, with much of the work spread out over the next three-four years.
- would like a future briefing on the Central Waterfront and Freeway Park and asked if Parks has successfully removed some of the safety risks at Freeway Park. Mr. Stoops responded that the trees and shrubs that were originally planted in Freeway Park grew like crazy, making many hidden and unsafe areas. Parks staff has been removing some trees and some of the huge shrubs and adding better lighting and programming for the park, making the park much safer than it was five-to-six years ago. In addition, an apartment building located next door that was a known drug house burned which eliminated another unsafe element.

Comfort Stations

Commissioner Holme suggested a designated surcharge on rentals to help pay for a restroom remodel. Even with such a surcharge, renters are still getting a bargain. Commissioner Adams wondered if the comfort station's condition is important enough to ask the public to pay for a remodel. Commissioner Kincaid noted that Golden Gardens Bathhouse is a great venue for parties; however, the outdoor restrooms are awful.

Mr. Stoops responded that the difference between the restrooms that are located inside a facility and those that are accessed from outside a building is like night and day. The outdoor restrooms are the target of a great deal of vandalism. Commissioner Kincaid suggested that one of the mayoral candidates might focus attention on the condition of comfort stations. Mr. Stoops and Parks' Major Maintenance Manager, Dan Johnson, are developing a priority schedule for the comfort stations and will brief the Park Board when this is complete. He gave figures for two recent comfort station remodels as \$500,000 at Magnuson and \$400,000 at Atlantic City. Many of the comfort stations were built by the Workers (WPA) in the 1930's. Some are pressure washed two or three times a day by the crews; however, they are old and smelly and the crews can't make them sparkle.

Commissioner Holme has been on the Board for several years and each year the Department states that remodeling the comfort stations is too costly and only minor improvements can be made. He believes the Department needs a new approach and new funding strategy. The Superintendent responded that many park departments across the country face the same situation. There are no levies, fundraisers, or ribbon cuttings to build new restrooms, and politicians usually aren't pushing for these.

Responding to Commissioner Ramels' comment that new comfort stations are very expensive, Mr. Stoops responded that they are built to industrial standards and must last a long time. Commissioner Kostka also suggested a pre-pay system, and Commissioner Ramels agreed and stated that there are pre-pay restrooms all over Europe. Commissioner Holme suggested the Department also investigate pre-fabricated restrooms.

Commissioners thanked Mr. Stoops for the briefing and look forward to further information on re-building/remodeling Park's outdoor restrooms.

Old/New Business

Board Requested Agenda Topics: The Board's Coordinator has compiled a list of topics commissioners would like considered as future Park Board agenda items. Commissioner briefly reviewed the list. (1) Commissioner Kostka is interested in the Department adopting a dual trail system to improve safety on biking/walking trails. The Superintendent responded that the Department only has a couple dual use trails — Burke-Gilman Trail and Green Lake Park. Commissioner Holme added the trails along Lake Washington Boulevard between Mt. Baker Park and Stan Sayres Pits. The Superintendent noted that all of these trails have signs designating which lane

is to be used for wheels or feet. The safety issue is a result of the behavior of the people who use the trails.
(2) Commissioner Ramels suggested that historical videos, such as Gary Gaffner's video of Luna Park, be shown prior to a regular Park Board meeting, with Board attendance voluntary.

SR520 Project: Commissioner Barber reported that he and other interested parties met with Governor Gregoire on Monday regarding this project. He read a letter for the record that was addressed to the Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, and City Councilmember Tom Rasmussen. Superintendent Gallagher requested that Commissioner Barber also send the letter to Dave Towne, chair of the Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee, which is following the SR520 project closely. There was a brief discussion of the ABGC's support of Alternative K [with conditions], while Commissioner Barber, the Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks and others support a version of Alternative A, currently known as the A+ Alternative.

Mini-Retreat: Commissioner Adams thanked Susan Golub for facilitating and Sandy Brooks for coordinating tonight's mini-retreat, held just prior to the regular meeting.

There being no other new business, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

Jackie Ramels, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____