

**CITY OF BELLEVUE
PARKS & COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday
April 11, 2017
6:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-113
Bellevue, Washington

BOARDMEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Heath, Boardmembers Deng, Grindeland, Nieuwenhuis, Synn, Van Hollebeke¹

BOARDMEMBER ABSENT: Vice-Chair Kumar

PARKS STAFF PRESENT: Shelley Brittingham, Vicki Drake, Patrick Foran, Nancy Harvey, Emil King (PCD), Terry Smith

OTHERS PRESENT: John deVadoss, Stephanie Walter

MINUTES TAKER: Michelle Cash, *via recording*

1. **CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Heath at 6:00 p.m.

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Motion by Boardmember Synn and second by Boardmember Nieuwenhuis to approve the meeting agenda as presented.

Chair Heath noted that Boardmember Van Hollebeke requested to participate in tonight's meeting remotely, since he is currently in New York City and not able to be physically present at the meeting.

Motion by Boardmember Synn and second by Boardmember Deng to amend the main motion to approve remote participation for Boardmember Van Hollebeke at tonight's meeting and to add an agenda item at the end of the meeting agenda to establish the May meeting agenda. Motion carried unanimously (6-0).

At the question, motion carried unanimously (6-0) to approve the meeting agenda as amended.

¹ Via conference call.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion by Boardmember Nieuwenhuis and second by Boardmember Deng to approve the March 14, 2017 Parks & Community Services Board Meeting Minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously (6-0).

4. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS/PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

5. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS:**

Chair Heath explained that he recently met with Planning Commission Chair, John deVadoss, and Vice-Chair, Stephanie Walter, regarding the discussions that occurred at the March Parks Board meeting about the Downtown Livability Land Use Code Update. Chair Heath suggested that Mr. deVadoss and Ms. Walter attend tonight's meeting so that there can be a direct dialogue between the two Boards. He encouraged Boardmembers to have a two-way dialogue, allowing as much time as necessary for the discussion.

Mr. deVadoss noted that the Planning Commission has conducted approximately 18-20 meetings/sessions regarding the Downtown Livability Initiative. There has been a significant amount of community input. However, Mr. deVadoss noted that there has not been cross-Commission/Board dialogue with respect to the potential implications of the Downtown Livability Land Use Code Update and how to make it successful. He requested feedback from Boardmembers regarding livability.

Chair Heath noted that the Parks Board has been trying to address organizational development issues. With this said, he asked if it is practical for the Parks Board to weigh-in to the feedback that has occurred within the 18-20 sessions regarding the Downtown Livability Land Use Code Update.

Boardmember Synn clarified that the Downtown Livability issue that needs to be addressed is the impact to the Parks' strategy. He suggested that the Board clarify their vision for the Downtown Livability Land Use Code Update.

Chair Heath inquired if the Parks Board needs to review the 130 page Planning Commission memo regarding the Downtown Livability Land Use Code Update to develop a list of Parks Board proposals or if the Parks Board should provide feedback about the impacts to parks. Mr. deVadoss clarified that the Parks Board is welcome to provide feedback on the detailed memo—the Planning Commission welcomes all feedback. However, they are particularly seeking feedback on the larger scope of the project, not the micro details (i.e., the big rock level, not the weed level).

Ms. Walter asked Boardmembers to clarify their perspective on what is missing from the Downtown Livability Land Use Code Update.

Boardmember Deng explained that the Downtown Livability Land Use Code Update does not include requirements for developers to provide more parks and open spaces. Although there are incentives for parks, they have not promoted additional parks. Boardmember Deng would like to see a stronger impact for developers to achieve the vision of many parks in each designated quadrant. Chair Heath inquired if the Planning Commission has seen the Parks' goals for acquiring more land and having a park in each designated quadrant. Mr. deVadoss noted that this information was reviewed after he and Chair Heath recently met.

Boardmember Nieuwenhuis stressed that the Parks Board continues to advocate for as many parks as possible in the downtown corridor, particularly since Bellevue is a "city in a park."

Ms. Walter asked staff if parks can be required by developers or if they are all based upon incentives. Mr. King explained that the current/existing Land Use Code, developed in 1981, provided an incentive for park land dedication. Historically, the city has utilized the incentive approach or a CIP approach to develop park land. Mr. King noted that Washington State law allows cities to adopt, at their discretion, park impact fees. However, Bellevue does not currently have park impact fees.

Boardmember Grindeland explained that there was a Parks Boardmember that sat on the initial Downtown Livability Citizen Advisory Committee. She noted that the representative was extremely frustrated with the process and felt that the process was developer driven. Boardmember Grindeland would like to correct the process to promote park land growth, particularly in the downtown corridor, as soon as possible.

Boardmember Van Hollebeke questioned if a precedence-setting behavior has been established from the Downtown Livability Land Use Code by promoting incentives that were never implemented. Boardmember Van Hollebeke echoed the concerns expressed by other Boardmembers regarding preserving open space and incentivizing parks in the proper manner.

Boardmember Synn noted that Bellevue is perceived to be a "city in a park." There are expectations for growth. In addition, there are a number of factors to consider for livability, including parks. The availability of land should also be considered when addressing livability. Historically, developers have not taken advantage of incentives for park land for the last 30+ years. Boardmember Synn would like there to be investments in parks by developers.

Ms. Walter questioned if open spaces can take the place of additional parks to accommodate growth. Boardmembers confirmed that both park land and open spaces are necessary. Open spaces should not take the place of dedicated parks.

Chair Heath summarized the larger items that the Parks Board would like addressed:

- What is the impact of the Downtown Livability incentives for parks?
- What evidence is there that the Parks & Open Space Plan goals will be met?
- Should there be park impact fees?

- Does the Planning Commission consider plazas as parks?
- How are developers incentivized to proactively impact parks and open spaces? What are other potential levers or controls for making sure that the parks and open space goals are met?

Ms. Walter questioned if the Grand Connection is considered a park. Mr. Foran clarified that the Grand Connection and its function is an urban set of experiences, so in the broadest sense it could be considered one large, linear park. However, the intent of the Grand Connection is to provide a variety of experiences that some may consider park-like; or as a corridor with economic development, cultural/artistic experiences, or as a pedestrian/commuter corridor, etc. In an urban setting, a park is many things: it is a place for greenness, a place where activities and events can occur, etc. Greenness does not define a park. Chair Heath clarified that the Grand Connection is defined on the city's website as a "corridor." He added that the Grand Connection is not under the scope of the Parks Department for construction or maintenance management. It also isn't under the Parks Board's authority for policy decisions.

Mr. deVadoss suggested that the Parks Board compare Bellevue with other reasonably sized cities to see what has/has not worked regarding park-related incentives.

Chair Heath suggested that the Parks Board forward the questions noted above to the Planning Commission. Ms. Walter suggested that the Parks Board provide recommendations, rather than questions to the Planning Commission. In response to this suggestion, the Parks Board recommended the following:

- What is the impact of the Downtown Livability incentives for parks?
Recommendation: That the Downtown Livability Initiative result in achieving the Parks & Open Space Plan's goals, specifically including the Northwest Village Neighborhood and East Main Neighborhood.
- What evidence is there that the Parks & Open Space Plan goals will be met?
Recommendation: Sufficient evidence that the Parks & Open Space Plan goals will be met.
- Should there be park impact fees?

Boardmember Synn suggested that park impact fees be enacted. However, Mr. King cautioned Boardmembers to research the ramifications of impact fees before making a quick decision. He noted that park impact fees are a complex process.

- Does the Planning Commission consider plazas as parks?

After a brief discussion, Boardmembers concluded the following responses to the question "is a plaza a park?"

- Boardmember Synn—no.
- Boardmember Grindeland—no.
- Boardmember Deng—no.

The Parks & Community Services Board approved these meeting minutes on 5-9-17.

- Boardmember Nieuwenhuis—possibly.
- Boardmember Van Hollebeke—would like plazas to be part of the open spaces.
- Chair Heath—plazas are privately-owned property available to enhance the character of the building—they are not a park or open space.

Recommendation: Further discussion needs to occur regarding whether or not plazas are parks. This will be discussed at the next Parks Board meeting.

- How are developers incentivized to proactively impact parks and open spaces? What are other potential levers or controls for making sure that the parks and open space goals are met?

Recommendation: Additional levers and controls, including park impact fees, be identified to incent developers to meet the Parks & Open Space Plan goals.

Motion by Boardmember Nieuwenhuis and second by Boardmember Deng to recommend to the Planning Commission the following:

- **That the Downtown Livability Initiative results in achieving the Parks & Open Space Plan’s goals, specifically including the Northwest Village Neighborhood and East Main Neighborhood.**
- **Sufficient evidence that the Parks & Open Space Plan goals will be met.**
- **Further discussion needs to occur regarding whether or not plazas are parks. This will be discussed at the next Parks Board meeting.**
- **Additional levers and controls, including park impact fees, be identified to incent developers to meet the Parks & Open Space Plan goals.**

At the question, motion carried unanimously (6-0).

Chair Heath and Boardmember Synn will attend the April 19, 2017 Planning Commission meeting to deliver the recommendations listed above. Ms. Walter expressed concern with time availability on the Planning Commission’s meeting agenda. If needed, Mr. deVadoss noted that the time allocated for other presentations during the April 19, 2017 Planning Commission meeting will be utilized for this discussion. Parks Boardmembers agreed that Chair Heath and Boardmember Synn should attend this meeting. In addition, the above motion will be included in the Planning Commission’s meeting materials.

Chair Heath inquired if there are other park-related issues that should be added to the Parks Board Work Plan. Mr. deVadoss suggested that the Planning Commission and Parks Board should connect one time per quarter. Ms. Walter supported periodic check-ins. However, she expressed hesitation on a set timeframe for the check-ins due to the amount of Boards and Commissions within the city. Chair Heath explained that the Parks Board has an interest in reaching out to other Boards and Commissions to ensure everyone is working together.

6. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

- Follow-up on Oral Communications/public comments from prior meetings

In recognition of National Volunteer Recognition Week, a thank you card was distributed to Boardmembers from staff to express their appreciation to the Board for their dedication to Bellevue.

Mr. Foran called attention to a memo that was distributed regarding an analysis conducted on the Community of Christ property, brought up during Oral Communications in January.

7. **BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:**

None.

8. **DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:**

- A. Next Quarter's Agenda Items

Deferred until later in the meeting agenda.

- B. Follow-up on Oral Communications/Public Comments from prior meetings

None.

9. **DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:**

- A. Crossroads Community Center/CAYA Presentation

Ms. Drake explained that Crossroads Community Center is not only an international gathering place for programs and services but also a bridge for generations to build community, prevent isolation, and provide social opportunities. The mission of Crossroads Community Center states: *"Enhances and complements the Crossroads community by providing comprehensive recreational, educational and human service programs in the diverse Crossroads neighborhood."*

Ms. Drake noted that the 18-44 age range is increasing for Crossroads so the community center is responding to this growth as well. Bellevue has over 99 different languages and dialects spoken. The Crossroads Community Center responds to the various needs by providing conversation classes, ESL workshops, parent and child song/story time, etc. There are over 25 different countries represented through these programs with approximately 150 people served each week.

Ms. Drake showed a map of the Crossroads Community Center Park and Campus, which is located within a 34 acre park. The Crossroads Community Center was opened in 1981 and serves approximately 200,000 visits annually. Services are provided for all ages.

Ms. Drake noted that the Crossroads Afterschool Youth Academy (CAYA) was created approximately four years ago from a local Collective Impact Model that supports the Eastside Pathways' Cradle-to-Career Initiative supporting all young people. The concept facilitates collaboration with other community resources to ensure that children have the opportunity for: health/fitness, arts, academics, youth development/leadership, emotional/social skills and support, leisure interests/play, environmental awareness. Ms. Drake discussed CAYA's partners throughout the community to help make these resources possible.

Boardmembers applauded Ms. Drake and the Crossroads Community Center staff for their hard work and dedication with the Crossroads community. Chair Heath views the Bellevue Parks & Community Services Department as the best entity for partnering with other agencies and non-profits.

B. Board Work Plan Items

Chair Heath would like to complete several work plan items before his Chair term ends in June. Chair/Vice-Chair elections will be conducted in June.

Chair Heath noted that Parks Board applications are due on April 21, 2017. He encouraged Boardmembers to identify potential Boardmembers throughout the community to sit on the Parks Board.

Boardmember Nieuwenhuis expressed his appreciation to Chair Heath for serving as the Board Chair.

- Board Bylaws

Boardmember Grindeland noted that she met with representatives from the City Clerk's Office. The draft bylaws are ready for Parks Board review. Boardmember Synn suggested that the subcommittee review the bylaws one last time and then discuss them at the next Board meeting.

- Budget Process Review & Future Funding Strategy

Not discussed.

- Liaison(s) to other Boards/Commissions

Chair Heath distributed a handout regarding his viewpoints on Board and Commission Liaisons.

Mr. Smith reminded Chair Heath about the Parks Board quarterly reporting to City Council that is listed in Ordinance 6241. This quarterly reporting should be included in the Board's Work Plan. Mr. Smith noted that the Parks Board is past due for a report to City Council.

Chair Heath's handout included a list of the City of Bellevue's Boards/Commissions. He questioned if there should be a Parks Board liaison assigned to each Board/Commission. Since there were approximately 12 Boards/Commissions, Boardmember Van Hollebeke expressed his concern with the time available to meet with this many Boards/Commissions. Mr. Smith noted that not all of the Boards/Commissions are Council appointed.

Mr. Smith expressed concern about the Parks Board discussing items that are not included on the meeting agenda (i.e., spending a significant amount of time discussing the Downtown Livability Initiative during tonight's meeting agenda). Mr. Smith stressed that part of the purpose of the work plan and agenda is to notify citizens of discussion items so that they can provide feedback. If there is substance to a discussion (i.e., more than the five minutes allotted during Oral Communications) then the item should be included as an agenda item.

Boardmembers reviewed the list of Boards/Commissions that Chair Heath distributed. Chair Heath suggested that the following Boards/Commissions be communicated with on a regularly scheduled basis:

- Arts Commission
- Human Services Commission
- Planning Commission
- Transportation Commission
- Youth Link Board

Chair Heath inquired if Boardmembers would like a standing agenda item added to include *Communications from Boards and Commissions* with a notation that if it is a substantive discussion it should be added as a future agenda item. Boardmember Van Hollebeke clarified that this dedicated time slot on the meeting agenda should be dedicated to discuss relevant Parks Board topics.

Chair Heath inquired if Boardmembers would like to establish a Parks & Community Services Board Sub-Committee and have the committee report to other Boards/Commissions or have a Board designated liaison report to other Boards/Commissions. Boardmember Synn volunteered to be the Planning Commission's Parks Board liaison. Boardmembers concurred that either a liaison or committee should be identified to work with the other Boards/Commissions.

Chair Heath inquired if Boardmembers would like joint meetings with other Boards/Commissions. Boardmembers would like these types of meetings to be scheduled on an as-needed basis. Chair Heath noted that Mr. Smith mentioned that he could reach out to other staff liaisons and quarterly check-ins could be requested. Mr. Smith clarified that he can reach out to liaisons for other Boards/Commissions and request that they contact Parks staff if they have an agenda item that they view as relevant to the Parks Board. He added that staff has already been in communication with other Board/Commission staff liaisons and can continue this support. Parks staff would like to continue being proactive, rather than reactive.

Mr. Foran suggested that Parks Boardmembers identify how they would like to communicate their liaison reporting plan with other Boards/Commissions. He reminded Boardmembers that there are also Council liaisons to each of the Boards/Commissions who may feel differently about encouraging this level or type of Board interaction. There are also logistical challenges to consider, as well as staff implications. Mr. Foran suggested that Boardmembers codify the idea more concisely and possibly include it in the Board's first quarterly report to City Council as something that the Board wants to explore or implement. The Council may want to weigh in on the level and type of interaction and the implications that this might have for other Council liaisons and the Boards/Commissions that they are involved with.

Mr. Smith noted that when another Board/Commission wants to speak to the Parks Board they are typically included in the meeting agenda under *Oral Communications*. This is also consistent with meeting agendas for other Boards/Commissions. Mr. Smith asked Chair Heath if he wants this to still be the case—Chair Heath clarified that future reports from other Board/Commission liaisons should be included under *Communications from Boards and Commissions*, not *Oral Communications*.

If the above process is initiated, Chair Heath inquired if Boardmembers would like to ask other Boards/Commissions for their input after a one, three or six month trial period. If implemented, Boardmember Nieuwenhuis inquired if the communication should occur on a regular basis or as needed. Boardmember Grindeland reminded Boardmembers that a quarterly report should be provided to City Council.

Chair Heath suggested that the Parks Board prepare a value proposition for communicating to other Boards/Commissions. After a brief discussion, Boardmembers concurred that reports should be reported quarterly. Boardmember Grindeland suggested that the Parks Board person assigned to each Board/Commission monitor the meeting minutes to determine if there are parks related items being discussed at the meetings.

Chair Heath reminded Boardmembers that when attending other Board/Commission meetings, their role is to observe and report back to the Parks Board. It is not to speak on behalf of the Parks Board. Then, the Parks Board agenda would include any reports and elevate the discussions as determined at that time. Chair Heath inquired if Boardmembers were in agreement with the overall communication process to other Boards/Commissions. Boardmember Grindeland clarified that according to the draft bylaws (not yet adopted), the Board Chair has this authority.

There was general consensus to move forward with the above concept. Chair Heath will prepare a formal recommendation to be presented for adoption at the next Board meeting.

- Quarterly Report to Council

Not discussed.

- Board Visioning

Chair Heath reviewed his proposed ideas for Board Visioning and Planning, which was included in his handout. His goal is to allow Boardmembers time during the meeting agenda to discuss ideas and/or issues that should be addressed by the Parks Board and then make a plan for following through on the ideas.

Boardmember Deng favored the visioning and planning concept and suggested that it occur annually. Boardmember Synn concurred with Boardmember Deng. He questioned if there is a clear vision statement for the “community services” portion of “Parks & Community Services.” Mr. Smith explained that the term “community services” is more difficult to recognize and understand—it needs further explanation. Visual images help explain “community services.” Mr. Foran added that there is a Department mission that is more comprehensive. Boardmember Grindeland called attention to the list of upcoming Parks special events that was included in the Board packet. These typically involve community service events.

Boardmember Synn suggested that some of the information utilized during the CAYA presentation might be useful during his Planning Commission visit.

Boardmember Nieuwenhuis thought that the Board Visioning and Planning statement that Chair Heath distributed is a great start. He also liked the idea of the visioning and planning concept and favors doing this two times per year. Boardmember Grindeland and Boardmember Van Hollebeke concurred with Boardmember Nieuwenhuis. Boardmember Van Hollebeke noted that discussing the visioning and planning concepts one time per year may lose sight of the overall vision—he suggested that quarterly discussions be considered as well.

CONTINUED FROM ABOVE (Item 8):

Next Quarter’s Agenda Items:

Chair Heath suggested that the following topics be considered for the May Parks Board meeting agenda:

- Downtown Livability Initiative
 - Plazas versus open space
- Retreat Work Plan Items
- Recognition of Outgoing Boardmember Grindeland
- Bylaws
- Budget
- Education
- Work Plan Items

Chair Heath noted that timeframes for the meeting agenda items will be set after he and Boardmember Synn attend the April 19, 2017 Planning Commission meeting.

10. **BOARDMEMBER COMMITTEE/LIAISON REPORTS:**

None.

11. **NEW BUSINESS:**

None.

12. **OTHER COMMUNICATIONS:**

- A. CIP Project Status Report
- B. 2016 Volunteer Program Brief: Natural Resource and Resource Management Divisions
- C. Arbor Day—Earth Day Flyer
- D. Email re volleyball team
- E. Email re youth sports

13. **INFORMATION:**

- A. List of upcoming Parks special events
- B. Next regular Parks Board meeting—May 9, 2017

14. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS/PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

15. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Boardmember Grindeland and second by Boardmember Deng to adjourn the meeting at 8:21 p.m. Motion carried unanimously (6-0).