

Summary of Public Comments Received from 5/16/17-6/15/17 on the draft 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan

General topic	Emails/letters	Request/statement	Action taken or not
Pickleball	90 individuals emailed	Addition of pickleball to the outdoor sports court map.	The outdoor sports court map has been amended.
		Urging SPR to provide designated pickleball courts in every neighborhood of the city.	SPR currently has 3 outdoor pickleball sites with 5 courts. In addition, SPR is in the process of two new pilot project sites, to be completed summer 2017.
		Request for designated indoor pickleball facilities in each quadrant of the city.	Free drop-in pickleball is currently offered at 18 community centers.
		Offer to use volunteers to re-stripe the courts for SPR.	SPR is launching a Recreation Programming and Facilities Plan effort this summer – the pickleball requests have been sent to the project lead for consideration. Additional sites may be considered pending the success of the pilot program.
Lake City Community Center	3 emails, 2 letters	Wondering why Lake City Community Center was not on the facilities map.	This was a GIS mapping layer error and was corrected immediately on line and proponents were notified.
		Concern over funding allocation for the CC. (see below)	Funding allocations are dictated by the 2017-2022 Adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and cannot be changed at a staff
			Other related edits have been corrected in the final edition of the plan.
Funding/Maintenance concerns	3 emails, 1 letters	One very detailed letter from Tim Motzer with over 35 questions concerning Park District funding, Lake City Community Center funding, and future maintenance needs at facilities.	The project lead has sat down with Mr. and Mrs. Motzer and gone over each individual question – identifying which edits could be incorporated and which could not (and why).
			Broader funding questions have been brought up to the Board of Park Commissioners.
		Other emails were emphasizing the need to take care of what we have before acquiring more parkland.	Major Maintenance is a key component of the Asset Management Plan, which is included in detail in Appendix D.
Green Lake Community Center and Evans Pool	2 emails, 3 phone calls	Desire for information regarding the timing of the community center conditions assessments, need for funding for center renovations and facility replacements, request for identification of leftover funding from the 2008 Pro Parks Levy, questions about the adopted budget, request for the timeline for center renovations.	The project lead has had extensive conversations with the proponent and has promised to send follow up information addressing the questions posed by June 22.
		Specific questions asking if the Asset Management Plan list will include funding for the CC and pool.	Funding allocations are dictated by the 2017-2022 Adopted Capital Improvement Program and cannot be changed at a staff level.
Crumb rubber	1 email	Against the use of crumb rubber.	The use of crumb rubber is not addressed in the plan – this is a maintenance issue and would be addressed at the project level. A thank you response was sent to the proponent and the email forwarded to the Park Board.
Georgetown and the density mapping	3 emails	Constituents were concerned that the census data was not reflective of their neighborhood.	SPR has used a variety of mapping tools gleaned from the federal census – predominantly the American Communities Survey which tends to be the most up to date. Due to how the census blocks are drawn, Georgetown is included in the same census block as Boeing Field. This is a federal issue and outside of SPR's purview.
Walkability Analysis Mapping	7 emails/letters	Appreciative of the new approach, enthusiasm for access to the data, feel that the approach is more reflective of current situations and appreciation of SPR's public engagement efforts.	The majority of edits to the walkability analysis were made based upon public input gathered at the citywide meetings, the focus group sessions, and from the Planning Commission and Board of Park Commissioners. These significant changes were implemented prior to the release of the May edition of the plan. Changes implemented included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporation of a socio-economic analysis – race, ethnicity</li> <li>• Health, diabetes, obesity levels from Public Health Seattle-King County</li> <li>• Topography, sidewalk condition, transit – SDOT</li> <li>• P-patch gardens, street ends, schools</li> <li>• Exclusion of SPR owned boulevards that do not provide a recreation benefit.</li> </ul>
SEPA/DNS	2 emails	Overall complimentary, request for inclusion of potential project specific impacts.	This level of detail will be included in the project level assessment. Staff will respond once the comment period has closed. No modifications were made to the plan, since they do not impact the threshold determination.
Planning Confusion	1 email	This individual felt that SPR has too many ongoing planning efforts and was confused by them.	The project lead communicated with the individual (twice) and clarified what the various plans were, their respective timelines, and respective project leads. The 2017 Parks and Open Space flow chart was created to help visualize the planning relationships and incorporated into the plan and presentations.
Land Acquisition	3 emails/letter	Appreciative of the plan and the new walkability analysis.	Proponent was thanked for her support and project involvement.
		Desire for SPR to collaborate with Speaker of the House Frank Chopp for support in finding funding to redevelop public properties for public benefit such as open space.	Speaker of the House support letters were forwarded to the Superintendent's Office.
		Need to preserve what green open space we have.	No modifications were made to the plan.
Public Process and Volunteer Park	2 emails/2 letters	Desire for the continued use of the Public Involvement Process in future development of parks per the 2017 Open Space Plan. SPR has an extensive and robust history of involving the public in projects, developments and changes to the system. Proponent cites SPR's public involvement policy (PIP), the Parks Legacy Plan and the City's Comprehensive Plan.	SPR has a Public Involvement Policy (PIP) that is followed for all planning and project efforts and was followed in the implementation of this plan.
		Concern over Volunteer Park and the Seattle Asian Art Museum expansions.	Volunteer Park/Asian Art Museum project is outside of the purview of this plan. Park buildings are still a part of the park system.

Summary of Public Comments Received from 5/16/17-6/15/17 on the draft 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan

General topic	Emails/letters	Request/statement	Action taken or not
		Wondering why public involvement is not addressed and re-affirmed in this plan.	The draft plan includes a public engagement summary chapter and full comments are included in the appendices. Modifications to the PIP are outside of the scope of this plan. Reference to the policy will be added to Section 8 of the plan.
<b>Natural Areas</b>	2 emails/3 letters	Overall appreciate for the plan, and supportive of acquisition of new land and to be closely tied to social justice and resident's needs. Applaud efforts to strategically purchase greenways and natural spaces.	The Seattle Audubon letter, among others, was forwarded to the Superintendent's Office and to the Board of Park Commissioners.
		Desire for a new set of management documents be created for the major natural areas, expressing the need for preservation of natural areas and greenspaces in the City.	Recommended edits on wildlife habitat and forest restoration goals will be incorporated in the plan.
		Desire to foster access to public lands and shorelines.	The Walkability analysis and maps are a starting point for this.
		Desire for natural areas to be preserved for passive recreation, wildlife habitat and scenic beauty.	SPR is embarking on an environmental planning effort where many of the issues that are beyond the scope of this plan can be addressed.
		Desire for a city special task force to identify potential funding opportunities for park acquisition.	The formation of a citywide task force is outside of the scope of this plan.
<b>Broad/general</b>	2 letters	General focus was on the desire for the plan to have a broader ecological tie, desire for an expanded acquisition budget/strategy identifying future public-private partnerships, and more emphasis on interdepartmental collaboration.	Proponents letters were forwarded on to SPR's acquisition staff. SPR is embarking on an environmental planning effort where many of these issues can be addressed.
		Appreciation for the Open Space Plan overall, the flow chart, the demographic information and walkability mapping. Many of these components are valuable tools and of great potential benefit.	The structure of the plan is in response to mandatory section requirements by the State.
		Desire for more clarity on origin of the plan goals and policies, feeling that some sections are very long and cover many subjects.	Goals and policies were taken from the City's Comprehensive Plan and 2011 Development plan. These are outlined in Section 2 of the Plan. Previous documents have contained a plethora of goals, policies and guidelines. The 2017 Plan has tried to streamline this component.
		Question on if the public will have access to the asset management system data and analysis?	The Asset Management System is an internal tool to help the organization coordinate and track maintenance activities and is used to inform capital planning.
		Some sections would benefit from purpose statements, better clarification on need vs. desire in regards to recreation trends, and intrigue over the evolution of a system-based approach.	The project lead has had numerous phone and email conversations with the proponents over the course of several months and have adjusted language and clarified issues on an ongoing basis. Section introductions will be reviewed for better clarification.
<b>Broad/General – ecosystem health</b>	1 letter	Proponent feels that the current approach is "goods and services" and does not adequately outline how SPR will integrate access with ecosystem health.	The content of the plan is in response to mandatory section requirements by the State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) to be eligible for granting opportunities during the 6-year planning horizon, and as such focus on Needs Analysis, Recreation trends, Walkability analysis, Target goals – equitable access to facilities, Long-Term Acquisition Strategy, Highlights of capital projects that will be implemented over the next 6 years and that support the four strategic goals defined in the Plan.
		Desire for the plan to discuss Seattle's Tree Canopy goals, to not rely on Green Seattle Partnership.	The approach to the Citywide Guidelines and 2017 Level of Service is laid out in Section 6 of the plan.
		Desire for the plan to discuss metrics, to have land acquisition a high priority, lay out an acquisition plan, reexamine acquisition in the Downtown Core and industrial areas, identify how acquisition will foster ecosystem health, identify what money is necessary for land acquisition.	The long-term acquisition strategy is laid out in detail in Section 10, including the criteria for the acquisition of Natural Areas and Greenbelts. SPR's acquisition budget is currently set at \$2 million per year in Park District Funding. Additional funding can be leveraged through grants and King County Conservation Futures Fund.
		Include the amount projected from public-private partnerships.	At this point in time we do not have projected public-private partnership funding amounts for the Downtown Core; we do have a cost range for what land is selling for.
		Articulate how SPR will work with other departments to foster ecosystem health	SPR is embarking on an environmental planning effort where many of the issues that are beyond the scope of this plan can be addressed. SPR will continue to collaborate with OSE and SPU on future opportunities.
<b>GMA</b>	1 letter	Concern that the plan does not identify how much parkland is needed and where it should be spent.	The plan identifies gap areas in its walkability analysis and outlines the long-term acquisition funding and strategy in sections 7, 9 and 10.
		The plan needs to fund the park in North Rainier.	The plan does not create funding, but rather reports on what is included in the adopted CIP for the 6-year planning horizon.
		The responsibility for achieving the level of service must be a part of the plan.	SPR staff have worked closely with the City's law department to ensure that this plan meets the states Growth Management Act requirements. We are confident that this is so and that SPR can meet the level of service outlined in the plan.