



PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD
Tuesday, July 21, 2015 – 5:30 PM
Lakewood City Hall – Council Chambers
6000 Main Street SW
Lakewood, WA 98499

MEMBERS

Jason Gerwen, Chair
Sylvia Allen
J. Alan Billingsley
Vito Iacobazzi, Vice Chair
Anessa McClendon
Heinz Haskins

**Don Anderson, Council
Liaison**

STAFF

Mary Dodsworth, Director

**Persons requesting special
accommodations contact
Cameron at 253-589-2489 as soon
as possible in advance of this
meeting so that an attempt to
meet a special accommodation
need can be made.**

CALL TO ORDER

ATTENDANCE/ROLL CALL

APPROVAL of May 27, 2015 MINUTES
No minutes from June 23, 2015

PUBLIC COMMENT

NEW BUSINESS

UNFINISHED BUISNESS
Gathering Spaces – Update

DIRECTORS REPORT

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

NEXT PRAB MEETING – September 28, 2015

ADJOURN



**LAKWOOD PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, MAY 27, 2015 – 5:30 PM
Lakewood City Hall
Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

Vito Iacobazzi, Vice chairman, called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm

ATTENDANCE

PRAB Members Present: Vito Iacobazzi; Alan Billingsley; Annessa McClendon, Sylvia Allen, Heinz Haskins and Youth Council member Jack Bowen.

PRAB Member Excused: Jason Gerwen, Tanja Scott

Staff Present: Mary Dodsworth, Director; Cameron Fairfield, Office Assistant

Council Liaison: Don Anderson, Mayor

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Heinz Haskins moved and Alan Billingsley seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the April 28, 2015 meeting as presented. The motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT: No public comment

NEW BUSINESS:

Community Gardens / Urban Agriculture: Heidi Wachter, City attorney, gave a brief introduction and reviewed the memo provided regarding community gardens, farmers markets and urban agriculture. The purpose of the discussion was to review the topics and determine if new codes or changes to the City code are required. Heidi noted that there are current codes, permitting and enforcement procedures that are used for these topics / uses. Sylvia asked about liability related to city support of community garden sites or farmers markets. There were comparisons made to other community gardens around the surrounding area such as Tacoma and Pierce County. It was explained that this is not an urgent issue and we will update Council soon and provide additional information or request feedback as needed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Gathering Spaces: Mary Dodsworth reviewed the work that has been done at previous meetings regarding this topic, including listing Issues, impacts and solutions as well as the pros and cons of various structural aesthetics. Based on previous feedback three potential locations at the park and five preliminary designs were discussed. Paul Casey, a local architect, described the different design elements for each option. Staff noted that size / scale was not important for our next exercise as each design could be created as small or large as needed for space, activities, budget, etc... Tonight we are looking at design options.

Speed Dating - Meeting guests were broken into five groups where they had an opportunity to share their likes, dislikes, and general comments regarding design elements and site locations. After everyone had rotated to each station and shared their input, a leader from each group shared the general consensus about each design. Everyone was given six dots and asked to vote on the design they liked most. Following the exercise there was no additional public comment.

Code Update: Council directed PRAB to review the issues regarding model aircraft in parks and recommend potential code or policy changes. The board reviewed this topic and the current municipal code and developed a list of issues at their February meeting. A subcommittee met in March for further discussion. A matrix was developed to look at issues, impacts and solutions. Suggestions were made regarding potential areas at the park that may be used, code language changes and administrative rules. Questions (and answers) from the board and public included how many people / aircraft could fit in this area (six at a time); would we fence off the area (possibly); is there standard use times or hobbyist protocol for length of time in an area when people are waiting, how would we make sure walkers are safe (flags or signage), and why are we opposed to allowing fueled aircraft (noise and fire danger). A group of hobbyists volunteered to help manage the area (like we do at the dog park). Board will take action at next meeting.

Joint Meeting with Council: Board reviewed the PRAB draft work plan and suggested the following questions be included in presentation: what are the 2016-17 big ideas, does our work program align with Council goals, are they satisfied with the public processes we've been managing, how will we fund Legacy Plan projects in the future, how will organizational changes affect parks and recreation? Board will meet at 6:30 p.m. in advance of June 8 meeting.

DIRECTORS REPORT: Mary reviewed the monthly director's report and upcoming meeting schedule.

BOARD COMMENTS: None

NEXT MEETING: The next PRAB business meeting is scheduled Tuesday, June 23, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. at Lakewood City Hall.

ADJOURNMENT: Sylvia moved to adjourn the meeting and Heinz seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Jason Gerwen, Chairman

Mary Dodsworth, Director

June 23, 2015 PRAB Meeting Notes (unofficial)

Jason Gerwen attempted to call the meeting to order. The Board did not have a quorum so the official PRAB meeting was not held. The Board members present, Jason Gerwen, Vito Iacobazzi and Heinz Haskins, stated that they would like to hear the presentation regarding Gathering Places and Code Update since there were several people in the audience. Staff agreed to continue.

Gathering Spaces: Director Dodsworth reviewed the topics and information shared at the three prior meetings. Information included: concerns, impacts, solutions, potential locations, various gathering spaces in other cities, five different design options and the pros / cons of each.

Tonight is our fourth meeting. We reviewed the types of uses that a gathering area could support. We looked at the two most popular design options (after our speed dating exercise) and two most feasible locations. Locations were selected because they were open spaces, no trees or buildings would be removed, they are used for this type of activity now and close to power, water and parking. Using an aerial photo of the park, the footprint of each design option was shown on each of the two locations. The google map showed a 20 x 30 foot structure on one of the locations (photo must have been taken during a special event). This provided perspective for gathering space size. Staff used a 40 x 60 foot footprint for presentation purposes. We reviewed pros and cons of each design and site. Discussed merging the two designs into one but the consensus was that they are so different and would serve different functions that forwarding each one to Council was best.

General Comments: Joe C noted that he liked the gathering space designs. He liked the barn design best. Neither of the two locations would interfere with the race course route and he thought the kids zone location would work best for awards and announcements during a cross country race. He thinks this is a great project.

Ann G asked about seating and where people would park. Staff noted that the current designs showed informal seating and showed where current overflow parking for special events is located.

Larry G – noted he wanted “do nothing” as an option that is presented. He also noted that he hoped we weren’t making the decision based on the fact there may be resources to build it. Don’t do it if we don’t need it.

Ann G – asked if PRAB sent a recommendation, would it be changed in the future? Staff noted that the PRAB makes recommendations to Council and City Council makes decisions (regarding funding, development, etc...).

David F – Emphasized that the PRAB should be very specific with their recommendations. Define the scope and scale, use square footage. List uses you want to see and those you don’t. He’s concerned regarding scale of the project.

Becky H – Encouraged the use of temporary stages / structures until we determine there is a need. See how they work and analyze the information before you make permanent decisions.

Dave C – thought one recommendation to Council was best and prefers the barn option. Likes an enclosed facility for NW seasons / events. Noted that Rotary was still interested in providing funding and raising more funds if they thought the final design / plan was a good match for community and club. He noted that we should get it right the first time. Build what you can now, don't under build – it will be a long time until you go back. 40 x 60 stage is big enough for the symphony to come and play.

Vito – both are doable. Liked the vetting of the design options. We should be ready in July to send a recommendation or update to Council. Can we get a cost estimate for the various sizes?

Code Changes: Staff reviewed the process used to come up with the five recommendations to Council. Board members were satisfied with the due diligence and outcome but couldn't take action last month or this month due to lack of a quorum. Staff will forward information to Council for July 13 study session.

Comments: Jason noted the gateways were completed and beautiful. He attended the US Open and was very impressed with how Fort Steilacoom Park was used and managed during the event. He thought the USGA did a great job.

Next meeting was set for July 21 at 5:30 p.m. Board suggested meeting out at Fort Steilacoom Park to walk the site and see locations.

To: Park and Recreation Advisory Board members

From: Mary Dodsworth, Parks, Recreation & Community Services Director

Date: July 17, 2015

Subject: Gathering Places at Fort Steilacoom Park Update

Attachments: A: Gathering Places Issue Matrix
B: Preferred Design Options
C: Preferred Locations

Summary: Council directed the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board (PRAB) to review the topic of community gathering spaces and look at Fort Steilacoom Park as a site to host this use. This was a community planning process. No funds were allocated to this project or process. The board started discussing this topic in February, 2015 and developed a monthly community meeting process to gather information as well as receive feedback from the community. July 21, 2015 will be the sixth meeting regarding this topic. Public comment was taken at each meeting. The PRAB is ready to forward information, an update or recommendations to Council.

Information Gathering: A summary of the meetings is as follows:

February 24, 2015: PRAB reviews Council request, discussed the history of this topic and develops a four meeting process to gather information and review the topic.

March 24, 2015: Large attendance at this community meeting. The discussion started where the “amphitheater” meeting ended a year ago discussing past issues and concerns and current ideas. A matrix was developed to look at issues, impacts and solutions (attached). Staff provided an overview of the park, how it is currently used by many different active and passive groups to host large and small events and shared the small town community farm theme and other ideas listed in the park economic feasibility study. A four meeting planning process was presented with dates assigned to each meeting. A cut and paste activity was facilitated to look at what an acre of use would support and how various events impact the park (event, parking, restrooms, access, etc...). An e-mail list was developed so we could send updates regarding this topic at future meetings.

April 28, 2015: Reviewed previous meeting topics and added to matrix list. Reviewed 60+ gathering spaces to determine what the community liked / disliked about each one. Using natural materials in and around it, making it look like it fits in the park setting, using current views as a backdrop, adding a roof/cover (northwest weather issues) and design it with acoustics in mind were all mentioned. Most didn't want a super modern looking structure.

May 27, 2015: Reviewed information from previous meetings including issues, impacts and solutions and the pros and cons of various structural aesthetics. Three potential locations at the park were shown along with five preliminary designs. Meeting guests were divided into five groups where each had an opportunity to share their general comments regarding design elements and site locations. After everyone had rotated to each station a leader from each group shared the general consensus about each design and location. Everyone was given six dots and asked to vote on the design or elements they liked most.

June 23, 2015: Staff reviewed information from past meetings. Types of uses for a gathering space were noted. The two most popular designs (voted by the public at the May meeting) were shared along with the two most feasible locations. Designs were selected because they fit aesthetically in the park, were constructed out of natural and durable materials, used current hedges as backdrops and were in open space areas that are currently used for similar types of activities/events. Option A would be more feasible for single day use while Option B could be used over a longer period of time since it could be closed and secured, provided more shelter from northwest seasons and would support more types of uses. Locations were selected because they were open spaces currently used for this type of activity and close to power, water, parking and roadways. Also no trees or buildings would need to be removed to support any improvements. Activities could be done in either location and not interrupt other park activities and events (5K's, bike races, walk a thons, sports leagues and tournaments). Using an aerial photo of the park, the footprint of each design option was shown on each location. Staff used a 40 x 60 foot stage footprint for presentation purposes.

Process Summary: The PRAB completed a comprehensive community process regarding gathering spaces for the Council. The topic has been called the amphitheater, an acre for the arts, gathering places and gathering spaces. A lot of information was shared and feedback was received. The park serves hundreds of thousands of visitors each year and provides space for a variety of active and passive uses and user groups. Although the park is used for gatherings of all kinds, Council asked for feedback on creating a more formal gathering space. Overall everyone believes that Fort Steilacoom Park is a special place and they want to preserve and protect it. How that is done varies from person to person. There are many in the community who do not want to see any changes at the park that would take away from the natural environment or their personal use. Others are open to improvements and changes as long as thoughtful planning is used regarding where the improvements are made and who, how and when the site is used. Based on Council direction and information gathered the Board has selected two potential design options and locations for gathering space improvements.

PRAB Update: A summary of the process will be shared with Council. Below are draft updates or recommendations that could be forwarded to Council with the summary. Board members are welcome to include additional information, recommendations or ideas at their July 21, 2015 meeting.

1. The PRAB recommends that no additional gathering spaces are needed at Fort Steilacoom Park so no options are recommended. OR
2. The PRAB recommends forwarding Option A or B to Council as the preferred design option and Location 1 or 2 as the preferred gathering location. OR
3. The PRAB recommends sending Options A and B to Council as the preferred design options and Locations 1 and 2 as the preferred gathering locations. OR
4. The PRAB would like more information regarding Design Options and Locations before they can make a recommendation. OR
5. The PRAB would like Council to request additional information from staff in order for Council to select a preferred option or location.

**Attachment A - FSP Gathering Space Matrix - Created at March 24, 2015 meeting
(w/additions at following meetings)**

Issues / Concerns		Ideas and Solutions
Historic Preservation – protect the prairie, cemetery and connect to the past		Don't put in special places. Be aware of location. Add education and signage so new visitors know that certain areas are special. Be aware of traffic and pedestrian flow – so they don't trample special areas.
Impact to open space and wildlife areas		Don't locate in natural areas. Place active improvements in active areas. Education/signage of natural areas. Restrict size / control parking / don't remove natural buffers (trees and vegetation. They provide habitat
Impact to Pierce College or Western State Hosp.		Information communication with these agencies.
Neighborhood Impact	Noise	Don't want to hear music 1.5 miles away / limit event/use during certain hours and on certain days. Measure decibel levels. Design to direct noise away from houses. Design to push noise towards Steilacoom Blvd. Trees are natural buffers. Have an on-site monitor to supervise events. Who do we call if noise is too loud – 911 (non-emergency #).
	Parking	Need better parking at (Angle & Elwood) entrance. There is a path/shortcut at the end of Wauna Street. Need enforcement. Encourage use of Pierce College. Design off-street parking in adjacent areas.
	Crime	Add late night patrols if activity is in the park after hours. Create neighborhood block watch programs. Be aware of audience you are inviting to the park. Anticipate increased drug use at concerts (maybe not at the symphony☺).
	Property Values	Houses near well maintained parks have higher values. If you don't maintain or start removing vegetation – that could reduce values.
Vandalism and Graffiti		We deal with graffiti every day. Certain materials are easier to clean off or can be repainted. Some can be coated / treated in advance to make easier to clean off. Vandalism happens after hours so new events won't create vandalism. A new facility would just be a new place to tag. Lock Sanicans at night
It's a done deal? Who decides?		No, we're just planning. PRAB will make a recommendation to Council based on information they gather. Council decides next steps. No design has been done, no specific site has been determined. No city funds have been allocated. Lakewood Rotary is still interested in investing in a community project. Do nothing should be an option.
Revenue vs Expenditures Manage / maintain / fees Cost recovery		Create a business plan so you know what you plan to do, how much it costs to maintain and how much revenue you might generate. We charge fees for private use of site (special events, shelter use, tournaments, races, concerts, movies, walk-a-thons, etc...). Use a portion of the fees you charge to create a depreciation account to fix current and future deferred maintenance issues.

Temporary vs Permanent Structures	Create a pit stage so musicians are below ground. People would be up higher. That would reduce noise. Create a bowl / natural amphitheater. Pierce College used their hillside in previous years for events. People can bring their own chairs and/or sit on grass. Creating tiered seating is good.
Seasonal Use	Design for northwest / add a roof for rain/shade. Seasonal hours / dark earlier in the fall / spring – more light in summer
Safety – lighting at night ADA access	Temporary lighting so it's safe to get to parking areas. Use light shields so it doesn't disturb neighbors or drivers on Steilacoom Blvd. Need access to power for lights.
Alcohol use	Must get a permit for alcohol (from City and State). Non-profits can for events. Private citizens can't. We follow Washington State Liquor Control Board rules. Add police if alcohol is available.
Traffic - impacts roads	Roads are in bad shape. Need infrastructure upgrades. There are lots of overflow parking areas in the park. Control access so people use the areas reserved for them.
Use funds to fix what is already developed or in bad shape at the park.	Historic elements and barns (this would create an indoor space – less impact to park users), fix path around Waughop Lake and roads into the park. Pave parking lot.
Consequences?	Charge deposits. What happens if people don't follow the rules (noise, too many people)? Parks dept. is closed on weekend. Need an on-call phone number for parks staff. We encourage calling police so they can track and respond. They will triage based on what's happening in community. Parks staff can't enforce laws. We can share rules? Can we preview acts so we know if they are park/family friendly?
Sanitation	Need restrooms. What can current facilities support (223 flushes per hour and sanicans hold 125 uses per unit). When do you need extra restroom units? We use a formula based on # of people and # of hours to determine what is needed. Add extra Sani-can at dog park during events. Users also bring in garbage cans for larger events.
Current existing activities	Be sure new things don't conflict with current activities, events, sports leagues, etc... Partner with other venues (Pierce College or UP). Other cities have nice spaces, why can't we?
Other Locations – where else could this project go (besides the park)	Town center (we don't own the land there and owners aren't interested in changing parking/retail space for community space). Pierce College (they have indoor spaces and outdoor areas) In a barn (less impact on park users). Send people to Steilacoom or UP, they have gathering spaces.
Volunteers	We need volunteers at the park. If you want to volunteer go to the city website – go to <i>I WANT TO...</i> Volunteer. You can sign up on-line. This process can be cumbersome. If you want to volunteer, call Parks and Rec and we'll put you to work.

Attachment B - Preferred Design Options:



OPTION A



OPTION B

Attachment C - Preferred Location Options:

