

**BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS  
MEETING MINUTES  
September 11, 2003**

**Present:**

Bruce Bentley, Chair  
James Fearn  
Sarah Neilson  
Kate Pflaumer

**Excused:**

Joanna Grist  
Terry Holme

**Staff:**

Ken Bounds, Superintendent  
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

Chair Bruce Bentley called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. **James moved and Kate seconded that the agenda consent items be approved, including the September 11 agenda, August 14 and August 28 minutes, and the acknowledgment of correspondence. The vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.**

**The Chair asked for a moment of silence in remembrance of the second anniversary of September 11.**

**Superintendent's Report**

Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds reported on the following:

*Budget 2004:* Ken will brief the Board on recent budget changes at the Board's retreat next week.

*YES Program:* During July and August, Youth Engaged in Service (YES) teens, ages 13-17 years old, contributed over 10,000 hours of volunteer service to community centers, playgrounds, parks, pool, and environmental learning centers.

*Puget Creek Acquisition:* The City added a .24-acre parcel to its 6.1-acre holdings in the headwater wetlands of the Puget Creek corridor in the Delridge neighborhood. The property lies on undeveloped 19th Ave SW, south of SW Brandon St. The Pro Parks Levy and the King County Conservation Futures funded this purchase.

*Smith Cove Acquisition:* Parks closed escrow on August 29 for the City's purchase of 7.3 acres from the U.S. Navy at Smith Cove in Magnolia. Ten years in the making, the

acquisition includes the return, at no cost to the City, of 1.72 acres of land that had been donated to the Navy at the outbreak of World War II.

*Volunteer Park Lily Pond Project Dedication:* The Board is invited to attend the Seattle Parks Foundation and Seattle Parks and Recreation dedication of the Lily Pond Restoration project on Tuesday, September 30, 5:45-6:45 p.m.

*Improvements in East Duwamish Greenbelt:* Efforts by the Neighborhood Action Team culminated in a three-day cleanup of campsites in the area known as "The Jungle". Efforts by Parks staff and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), accompanied by Seattle Police officers, has significantly reduced the number of persons engaging in drug use, prostitution, and burglarizing in the immediate area. Residents are very pleased with the use of the spider, an agile logger-type chipper used to remove large brambles and improve sight lines, near Jose Rizal Park. Two abandoned roads will be graveled to allow police to safely patrol the area on a regular basis and will facilitate cleaning of the area by Parks and WSDOT staff.

*4-H Fair:* The Seattle 4-H Fair was held over the weekend at the Pacific Science Center. Young people from the Ballard and Van Asselt Community Centers and from six King County Clubs participated in the event. Approximately 250 visitors to the Science Center stopped by the 4-H exhibits. Science Center staff invited the youth to come back next year.

*John H. Little Award:* Nominations are being received for the John H. Little Award. The winner of this award will be announced at a Park Board meeting this fall.

*New Deputy Superintendent:* B.J. Brooks, newly hired Deputy Superintendent, will attend the Parks Department employee celebration on Wednesday, September 16, at Sand Point Magnuson Park. She will also attend the Park Board retreat on September 18.

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

Bruce explained that the general public comment portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had or are not scheduled for a public hearing. Testimony is limited to three minutes per speaker. No one signed up to give testimony.

### **West Point Settlement Agreement Discussion/Recommendation**

Kevin Stoops, Parks Department project manager, briefed the Board at its August 28 meeting on the West Point Settlement Agreement. Tonight the Board is asked to discuss the agreement and vote on a recommendation to the Superintendent. Kevin distributed a decision agenda handout listing three options and a "Comparison of Citizens Advisory Committee and Staff Recommendations." Kevin gave a review of the project to date and the three options:

***Option 1- Accept Committee Recommendation***

The Board could accept the committee recommendation as originally drafted. However, the Nike building demolition funds would need to be held until a replacement facility is in place and material could be transferred. This could take several years longer than the implementation of the other recommended projects, since no replacement facility is readily available.

***Option 1A-Accept Committee Recommendation with Lighthouse***

The Board could accept the committee recommendation and earmark the proposed Contingency Opportunity Fund to the lighthouse project. The lighthouse was one of several projects identified for use of this fund once other commitments are fulfilled.

***Option 2-Accept Parks Staff Recommendation***

The Board could accept the staff recommendation. This would defer the Nike demolition until a replacement facility is found. Other funding would be needed in the future to implement the demolition. This option directly funds the lighthouse and reserves the Contingency Opportunity Fund.

Kevin stated that most correspondence received on the Settlement favored removal of the Nike Building. A couple e-mails requested that the chapel remain, with a couple additional ones favoring removal of the chapel.

**Board Questions & Answers**

***Nike Building Demolition Discussion***

Kate stated that both the discussion at the last meeting and a number of e-mails suggested either imploding or "building over" the Nike Building. She asked if Parks staff have given thought to these suggestions. Kevin said that none of the proposed projects are to the design stage yet and that these suggestions could be looked at during that stage. Due to the unusual nature of the Nike Building, he believes that a portion of it would be hauled away and a portion left on site and buried. Kate stated that testimony strongly favors demolition of the Nike Building. She appreciates the budget necessities and storage difficulties Parks staff face; however, she is persuaded that these are one-time only funds that should go for demolition of Nike. In 1986 City Council directed that Nike be removed. She believes that many forces are saying that now is the time to set that money aside to accomplish this within the next two years. It will be difficult, especially with the City's budget, to find these funds again in the future.

Sarah agreed with Kate that, according to testimony, the community wants the Nike Building removed. She understands that this is a timing issue for the Parks Department, not a "to do" or "not to do" decision. She believes the demolition money should be set aside, the Nike Building cleared out, and then the funds be used to demolish Nike. She also believes that not having restrooms seems an important issue, yet no one commented on this during testimony.

James commented that there seems to be a "tradeoff" between the lighthouse and demolition of the Nike Building. Kevin said in the Citizen's Advisory recommendations that funds for the lighthouse is held back in the Contingency Opportunity Fund to make sure all the named projects are first satisfied before proceeding with the lighthouse purchase. The staff recommendation is to set the demolition of Nike aside for now, and name purchasing the lighthouse as a project.

Bruce found it interesting that City Council authorized the removal of the Nike Building in 1986. He believes that Parks has to move ahead with cleaning out the Building. He agrees that this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to remove the building and to restore the area back to near its natural state.

James asked about the certainty of Parks acquiring the lighthouse. Kevin stated that 10-12 nonprofits have applied to purchase the lighthouse, with Parks being the only public entity. One group hopes to purchase it for an artist's retreat. James asked if funds could be preserved for either the Nike demolition or for acquiring the lighthouse at some time in the future. Kevin stated that, in a letter to the Parks Department, the National Parks Service wants assurance that Parks has the money to back up its proposed re-use for the site. James said that if contingency funds are dedicated to a particular item, then the funds are no longer contingency they become project funds. Ken agreed with this.

Sara asked if the Board votes in favor of Option 1-A, what wouldn't be done from the list. Kevin gave a detailed answer to that question, which included the Sherman Creek idea, North Bluff comfort station adaptation, and wetland areas. Sarah stated that at the August 28 meeting, testimony referred to the idea of a habitat project on the beach. Would there be funds for this if the lighthouse is purchased or would the funds be used just on the lighthouse. Kevin said that Parks staff has identified several hundred thousand dollars in repair work to the lighthouses and other buildings in the lighthouse complex. In addition, several hundred thousand more dollars would be needed for hazardous material abatement, remodel of the garage space, and upgrade of the residences.

James does not want to risk losing the lighthouse in order to remove the Nike Building. If it comes to a choice of the two, he would vote to use the Contingency Funds to purchase the lighthouse. Kate stated that the lighthouse is a magical space and asked if the non-profits competing for it plan to make it a public site. Charles Sablan, Parks' Environmental Learning Center Manager, stated that the Secretary of the Interior requires the lighthouse to be available to the public for a reasonable amount of time.

Kate asked does the lighthouse need to be publicly owned, when the City is strapped for funds. Kevin said one of the main arguments in favor of Parks acquiring the lighthouse is that this is another step forward to acquiring what was formerly the Fort Lawton reservation, which later became a military base. Acquiring the lighthouse allows the Parks Department to have control of beach access and what occurs there. Charles and Kevin briefly discussed the benefits of Parks owning the lighthouse, rather than it being owned by a private entity.

**Kate moved to approve Option 1A which reads**

**"Accept Committee Recommendation with Lighthouse, [adding the words] reserving the chapel. The Board could accept the committee recommendation and earmark the proposed Contingency Opportunity Fund to the lighthouse project. The lighthouse was one of several projects identified for use of this fund once other commitments are fulfilled."**

**Sarah seconded the motion. The vote was taken with two members, Kate and Sarah, voting to approve and one member, James, abstaining. Motion carried.**

### *Chapel and Annex Removal Discussion*

Kevin said that these two buildings are not historic buildings. Kate referred to citizen testimony about the perpetual lease and the City's obligation to the chapel. Kevin read from the document and said that the issue comes down to "useful life." In 1995-1996, Parks staff estimated that it would cost almost \$700,000 to renovate both the chapel and annex. Kate asked about a proposal to sell and move the chapel. Kevin answered that in 1979 the City worked with the Ukrainian Church to sell the chapel; however, the transaction was not completed.

Kate said that this is a sacred site to some who want to keep the chapel. Sarah stated that it seems strange to her that government funds pay for the chapel's maintenance and she is unsure that it is appropriate to keep the chapel in this setting. James asked if the chapel must be dedicated to Christian purposes. Kevin answered no, that the language reads that it must be used as a shrine, memorial, or for religious purposes.

Kate stated that the chapel is meaningful to some and she is in favor of leaving both it and the annex alone. Use the \$250,000 it would cost to tear down and remove the two buildings on other projects. Ken said that the request to tear down the chapel and annex came from the Citizens Advisory Committee, whose goal is to eventually return Discovery Park to its natural state. Bruce asked how long the Committee met. Kevin answered that they met six-seven times in the summer and fall of 2002. Ken stated that some Advisory Committee members said that they originally supported demolition of the chapel and annex, but have since testified that they have changed their mind. James asked how much maintenance does Parks perform now on these two buildings. Kevin answered that the maintenance is minimal. The lights are in working condition; however, the furnaces have been disconnected. The roofs were repaired five-six years ago after being damaged by a windstorm.

Sarah agreed with Kate to leave the chapel and annex and put those funds into some other project. Bruce stated that the chapel is a secular building and he doesn't believe it belongs in a public park. He wants to respect the list that the Citizens Advisory Committee discussed and recommended. James asked if the removal is the best expenditure of the \$250,000 are there other items with a higher priority that this money could be spent for.

**Kate moved to delete removal of the chapel and annex from the list and put the \$250,000 that was earmarked for its demolition into the Contingency Opportunity**

**Fund. Sarah seconded. The vote was taken with two members, Kate and Sarah, voting to approve and James abstaining. Motion carried.**

Ken said this now makes the Contingency Opportunity Fund \$450,000. A short discussion followed on uses for the Contingency Fund.

**Sarah moved that the play area comfort station and north bluff comfort station adaptation be included in the Contingency Opportunity Fund options, in addition to the other two projects (lighthouse and chapel), as options for the Citizens Advisory Committee to consider. Motion died for lack of a second. Kate stated that she believes the Committee should work on this aspect.**

The Board thanked Kevin for the presentation. Kate and Bruce commented that this has been an amazing process, with both the citizens and Parks Department staff doing a great collaboration.

### **United Indians of All Tribes Agreement Briefing 15 minutes**

This briefing was re-scheduled from the August 28 meeting. The Board received a written briefing, included below. Kevin Stoops, project manager, also gave a brief verbal update to the Board.

#### **Written Briefing**

The Board previously received a written briefing which included:

- Brief History/Chronology (included below)
- Listing of parties to the agreement (United Indians of All Tribes Foundation, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Lawton Wood Community Club, Friends of Discovery Park, and Magnolia Community Club)
- Major provisions of the agreement (included below)
- Design features of People's Lodge and Discovery Park Improvements, and
- Implementation Plan

#### ***Brief History/Chronology***

**November 1975** United Indians of All Tribes Foundation (UIATF) and City of Seattle enter a 99-year renewable lease agreement for 19.13 acres at Discovery Park for the purpose of building an Indian Cultural Center (ICC)

**May 1977** Daybreak Star Cultural Center opens as the first building on the ICC campus. Master plan for the site calls for several additional buildings and facilities.

**December 1992** UIATF submits a Master Use Permit application to the Department of Design, Construction and Land Use (DCLU) for construction of the People's Lodge, a 148,000 square foot building.

**November 1998** Community groups request a formal interpretation by the DCLU

Director of the Zoning Code to determine whether the building was a "museum" and therefore prohibited under the existing zoning designation.

**June 1999** DCLU publishes the draft Environmental Statement for the project.

**June 1999** The DCLU Director issues a code interpretation decision concluding that the proposal falls within the definition of a "community center," and is therefore legal under the existing zoning designation.

**September 1999** Community groups appeal the DCLU Director's decision to the City Hearing Examiner; the Hearing Examiner reverses the Director's decision by concluding that the project comprises a "museum" and is illegal under the existing zoning designation.

**October 1999** UIATF appeals the City Hearing Examiner's decision to King County Superior Court, at which point the case becomes the lawsuit captioned as "United Indians of All Tribes Foundation v. City of Seattle, et al."

**Early 2000** All three parties (UIATF, the Community Groups, and the City of Seattle) agree to a stay on the lawsuit to provide an opportunity to seek to resolve issues.

August 2001 UIATF hires Johnpaul Jones of the Seattle architecture and landscape architecture firm Jones and Jones. Site plan is reconfigured to include three smaller buildings in a campus layout.

**March 2003** All three parties initial a Memorandum of Agreement intended to lead to signing of the Final Settlement Agreement to end the lawsuit.

**July 2003** Representatives of the parties sign the Final Settlement Agreement, agreeing to dismiss the lawsuit and enabling UIATF to proceed with the development of the People's Lodge.

### ***Major Provisions of the Agreement***

#### Revised Design & New Parking Configuration

- The original plan called for a single 148,000 square-foot building. The revised plan calls for three smaller buildings totaling some 96,300 square feet of interior space, nestled into the site and built away from the nearby ponds.
- Create a new parking area with approximately 200 spaces off Texas Way, west of the North meadow, to serve as the primary parking area for ICC events.
- Connection of parking areas by way of an access road.

#### Park Improvements

- Safer pedestrian crossings across Texas Way.
- Remove 40-50% of the impervious surface area at the existing north parking lot next to the meadow area.
- Expand the meadow area, daylighting two streams and creating a forested riparian corridor along streams that connect the forested area to the south with the ICC forested area to the north.
- Close Illinois Avenue, restoring portions of it to a natural condition.
- Plant vegetation along the northern boundary of the Park to provide greater screening between ICC and the Lawton Wood neighborhood.

## Easements

- A renewable 30-year conservation easement, which will incorporate a 100 foot buffer west of the ponds and stream, will be protected by the City and UIATF in a natural condition, and will continue to be open for public use and enjoyment.
- An Access Easement will provide UIATF access via Texas Way to the ICC and access to the new parking area.

## Discovery Park Long Range Plan

- Amendments will be drafted to both the Discovery Park Long Range Plan and the Park and Recreation Plan 2000 to reflect necessary changes to implement the Settlement Agreement.

## Code Amendment

- Parks will initiate a code amendment to allow development of the Project as proposed in the Settlement Agreement.

## Stipulation Agreement

- The parties will sign an agreement to dismiss the Lawsuit that was filed in 1999.

## Indian Cultural Center Use

- The potlatch house shall have a maximum posted seating capacity of no more than 850.
- A transportation and parking plan will be developed for major events.
- Activities at the People's Lodge may be further addressed in the project EIS.

## Non-Opposition Terms

- The Community Groups agree not to oppose any future governmental approvals which UIATF may seek for this project.
- The Community and UIATF agree not to oppose amendments to the Discovery Park Long Range Development Plan and to the Park and Recreation Plan 2000.

Ken said this has been a long road, which has resulted in a good collaboration. Bruce agreed and thanked Kevin for the update.

## **Recommendation to Make the Northacres Park and Jose Rizal Off-Leash Pilot Areas Permanent Elements Briefing**

Jack Robinson, Parks strategic advisor in Parks Department Operations Division, came before the Board to give a briefing on this pilot program. The Board received a written briefing, included below.



## Written Briefing

In 1997, the Board authorized the creation of a number of off-leash sites throughout the City and by Resolution 29628 the City Council endorsed the Boards' actions. In that process, off-leash areas at Northacres Park and Jose Rizal Park were specifically authorized as pilot sites with various conditions attached to the authorization. (Community process, fencing, stewardship agreement with COLI, and an evaluation to be completed after 18 months of operation.)

During 1997 a number of criterion were used to evaluate and select off-leash sites. Those criteria have been used in subsequent discussions regarding off-leash sites (most recently in regard to an off-leash site in the Belltown area) and those criteria were used in this evaluation. The criteria are listed in the transmittal memo and include:

- Utilization
- Conformance with Off-Leash Adopt-A-Park Agreement during pilot project
- Site stewardship involvement and support for the site
- Deterioration or destruction of vegetation at the site during the pilot project
- Environmental concerns regarding water, dust, air, or noise pollution
- Distance from wildlife habitats
- Distance/buffer from nearby residences
- Availability of parking
- Public safety issues at the pilot site
- Possible offset of illegal activities
- Animal Control experience at the site
- Absence or interference with other Department-sponsored activities
- Distance from children's play areas
- Spillover impacts as a result of this pilot project

In performing the evaluation, Park Department file materials were reviewed, information was gathered from Parks crew chiefs and geographic managers, the Department's Senior Urban Forester, staff at Seattle Animal Control, and North and South Precinct police officers. Multiple site visits were made at different times of the day and on different days and "users" interviewed. Once the research and the draft reports were completed, copies were made available to people and organizations known to have an interest in the subject. The COLA Board received copies electronically as well as hard copies during a briefing at their September 3 meeting. We also mailed over 2,200 notices about tonight's presentation and public hearing on this matter to the mail routes adjacent to each of these off-leash sites and appropriate community councils. (These steps were taken in accordance with the procedural requirements in the Department's public involvement policy.)

The evaluation findings can be summarized in one sentence: As a result of these evaluation findings, staff advises that the Board recommends that the Superintendent adds the Northacres Park Off Leash Area and the Jose Rizal Park Off Leash Area as permanent elements of those parks and **that they be added to the network of off-leash**

**areas administered by the Seattle Parks and Recreation Department in partnership with the Citizens for Off-Leash Areas.**

### **Verbal Briefing**

Jack also gave a brief verbal history of the two pilot off-leash areas and reviewed the extensive public involvement process used in his evaluation. This process included mailers sent to 2,000+ addresses adjacent to the sites. He is requesting the Board to recommend to the Superintendent that these two off-leash areas be made permanent elements of the parks.

### **Board Discussion/Questions**

Sarah said she hadn't yet read the entire briefing packet from Jack, but she has heard some negative comments about Jose Rizal Park. Jack said he believes this park is a perfect site for an off-leash area. The area has a great view and is located near the East Duwamish Greenbelt Area. He talked more about "The Jungle" (see Superintendent's report above), located in the Greenbelt. Mark Mead, Parks' urban forester, has recommended cutting some trees to increase the sightline so off-leash users don't feel isolated. Jack said there is also discussion that off-leash users would schedule use of the area so that several people and their dogs would use the area at the same time. Bruce agreed that this is a good site for an off-leash area.

A public hearing will be held at the September 25 meeting, followed by the Board's discussion and recommendation at its October 9 meeting. The Board thanked Jack for the presentation.

### **Sand Point Magnuson Park Update Briefing**

Sand Point Magnuson Park Director Eric Friedli last came before the Board at its June 12 meeting to give an update on the Sand Point Magnuson Park Drainage, Wetland/Habitat Complex and Sports Fields/Courts Project. The appeal process has now been completed and the Board is being asked to discuss the project and make a recommendation to the Superintendent. The Board received a written briefing paper from Eric, which is included below.

### **Written Briefing**

Staff and consultants presented a report to you on the subject project at your June 12, 2003, meeting. During the public comment time at that meeting several citizens also spoke about the proposal. Minutes from that meeting are attached (Attachment 1) for your reference. The briefing memo for that meeting included minutes from previous Board meetings and public hearings where Sand Point Magnuson Park was discussed. On July 2, 2003, several Board members took a tour of the site. In addition, all Board members were provided a preliminary copy of an addendum to the EIS reviewing possible changes to the proposal as were outlined during the June 12 presentation to the Board.

Subsequent to the June 12 meeting, the adequacy of the Department's Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) was appealed to the City Hearing Examiner. The adequacy hearing was held on August 11. On August 28 the Hearing Examiner issued her ruling affirming the adequacy of the SEIS.

The Board is now being asked to provide its final recommendations on this project.

Staff has worked with the consultant team to prepare the revised proposal based on the findings of the environmental review and following additional input from the community. The changes to the proposal analyzed in the EIS and presented to the Park Board in 2002 are highlighted below. This information was presented to the Board on June 12 2003. Attachment 2 shows the revised proposal.

- **WETLAND HABITAT COMPLEX:** There are no proposed changes in the 65-acre wetland/habitat complex.
- **SPORTS MEADOW:** There are no proposed changes to the 15-acre sports meadow. It is proposed to be grass surface with no lights.
- **SPORTS FIELD COMPLEX:**
  - **Configuration:** The most substantial proposed change is in the configuration of the 11 sports fields proposed to have synthetic surface and be lighted. The proposed reconfiguration is in response to issues highlighted in the EIS pertaining to potential noise and light impacts on close-by existing residential buildings. The primary concern was the proximity of the full size baseball diamonds to the transitional homeless housing building to the west. The housing is operated by the Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI). LIHI originally appealed the EIS but after working with the Department on the proposed reconfiguration they withdrew their appeal and have agreed to support the new configuration.

In the revised configuration

- the five baseball/softball diamonds are moved to the south end of the site
- the 4 soccer and 1 rugby field are moved to the north end of the site
- the parking lot across the street from the housing is moved north across from the recreation center parking lot
- a more neighborhood-park like area is created immediately east of the residential area that will include the youth soccer field, the basketball and volley ball courts and other park amenities such as benches and picnic tables
- the pedestrian circulation is modified to fit the new configuration
- a stronger connection is created between the existing children's playground and the wetland/habitat complex
- the parking lot immediately across the street from the transitional homeless housing area has been moved north so it would be across from the community recreation center.

- Hours of Operation: The proposal recommended for analysis in the EIS left unresolved the hours of operation. The analysis conducted in the EIS assumed that all 11 fields could potentially be lighted until 11 p.m. with no restrictions as to seasons of play or days of week. As a result of the EIS analysis and working with LIHI the following revised proposal for hours of operation was developed.

The hours of operation revised proposal:

- The lights on the youth soccer field (#10) will be turned off no later than 9 p.m. year round
  - Lights on the 10 remaining fields may be on until 10 p.m.
  - Lights on 5 fields only may be on until 11 p.m.
  - Lights on the soccer (#7) and the little league field (#11) closest to the residential area would be the last ones to have lights on.
  - Minimal security lighting would remain on for 15 minutes after the main fields light are off.
- ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The Department has prepared a preliminary addendum to the EIS that provides a summary of the differences in the environmental impacts between the proposal as analyzed in the FEIS and the revised proposal. As documented in the preliminary addendum the revised proposal results in similar or less potential environmental impacts. Following the recommendations of the Board a final proposal will be prepared and the addendum will be updated and issued in final form prior to its transmittal to the City Council for their final review.

## **BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Board may make any recommendations it so chooses. Following is an outline of key decision components to assist the Board in its discussion and decision making process. The decisions are split into three major categories reflecting broad areas for discussion.

1. Recommend the wetland/habitat complex as proposed.

The wetland/habitat component of the project has not generated organized opposition nor has it generated significant organized support. Some people have raised concerns about the ability to create successful 'engineered' wetlands. Our consultants are confident that the wetland/habitat system as designed can be successful.

2. Recommend the athletic field layout as revised

As documented in the preliminary addendum to the FEIS the revised field alternative is expected to reduce the most significant impacts of noise and lighting on the Sand Point Community Housing Association Building 224 (Santos Place). By relocating fields farther away and in a different orientation from Santos Place the predicted maximum noise level is substantially reduced (Page 2-24). The addendum however does identify an area south of 65th Street potentially having periods of play when Seattle noise limits may

be exceeded. In addition, while the revised proposal decreases the amount of spill light south of 65th Street there is still some spill light that crosses onto adjacent residential property. The addendum also makes the point that some off site glare impacts are shifted from the areas west of the site to areas south of the site. That area is planned for future transitional homeless housing. Conceptual designs have been developed for the transitional homeless housing but not finalized and no funding is currently available for their construction.

### *Alternate Recommendations*

2. a. Rotate Field 11 so that home plate is at the northeast corner of the field.
  - This would reduce the potential for noise impacts on the area south of 65th Street.
- b. Utilize a hybrid system for lighting field 11. Use shielded conventional lighting technology for lights along 65th Street
  - This would reduce spill light to residential property south of 65th Street.
- c. Proactively monitor noise levels at selected locations to ensure compliance with Noise Ordinance
  - This would ensure that concerns about exceeding noise ordinance limits are resolved quickly.
3. Recommend the hours of operation as revised

The reduction in hours of operation of the sports fields lights included as part of the revised proposal mitigate the general impacts of noise, spill light, glare and sky glow. Suggestions have been made to further limit the hours of operation. Additional limits on hours of operation would further reduce potential impacts.

### **Verbal Briefing**

Eric gave a brief verbal review of this project, listing the extensive documents the Board has received. He referred the Board to the briefing paper presented at June 12, 2003, meeting, which lists these documents ([http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2003/06-12-03\\_Minutes.htm](http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2003/06-12-03_Minutes.htm)). He asked the Board to notify the Board Coordinator if they need copies of any of this material. He reported that many e-mails and other correspondence on this project have been, and continue to be, received.

Superintendent Bounds said the Board is being asked to discuss the project and make a recommendation at its September 25 meeting; however, the Board may take as much time as it needs.

### **Park Board Business**

- Sarah has been busy preparing for the October 2 Ghandi Festival. This festival involves teens in partnership with "Week Without Violence." Everyone was invited to attend.

- The Board was reminded of the September 17 retreat to be held at Carkeek Park Environmental Learning Center and given a handout. Sarah asked if the Board could work through dinner and end the retreat earlier. There was agreement to this suggestion. Ken said that Terry Thomas, head of the Ethics and Election Commission, has been invited to the retreat to answer Board questions.
- Sarah distributed invitations to a Service Board fundraiser.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

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

Bruce Bentley, Chair