

## SUMMARY and FISCAL NOTE\*

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Dept. Contact/Phone:</b>	<b>CBO Contact/Phone:</b>
SPR	Max Jacobs/206-930-0929	Anna Hurst/733-9317

*\* Note that the Summary and Fiscal Note describes the version of the bill or resolution as introduced; final legislation including amendments may not be fully described.*

### **1. BILL SUMMARY**

**Legislation Title:** AN ORDINANCE relating to Seattle Parks and Recreation; authorizing an exchange of City-owned property at Walt Hundley Playfield for property owned by Seattle School District No. 1 adjacent to West Seattle Elementary School; authorizing execution, acceptance, and recording of quitclaim deeds; authorizing an interlocal agreement ensuring public outdoor recreation use of a portion of property deeded to Seattle Public Schools; and finding that the land exchange meets the requirements of Ordinance 118477, which adopted Initiative 42; and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts.

#### **Summary and background of the Legislation:**

The City, through Seattle Parks and Recreation (“SPR”), enjoys a collaborative relationship with Seattle Public Schools (“the District”) regarding use of the agencies’ respective properties. This tradition stems from the large portfolio of property each agency owns that is adjacent to the other’s. In several locations, either the District uses portions of SPR-owned property, or vice versa. This shared use is handled via individual, site-specific leases or license agreements or under the overall Joint Use Agreement governing shared use of athletic fields among other facilities. This system of sharing generally works well except where, as here, one agency needs to develop a structure, requiring fee ownership of the subject property.

In this case, SPR operates an existing playfield at Walt Hundley Park in West Seattle, a portion of which is on District-owned land. The District is developing a new building at its neighboring West Seattle Elementary that needs to be located on land owned by SPR. The solution is a property trade of two pieces of land of equal size and value, as depicted in Attachment 1. This trade, which has long been the agencies’ intent to complete, will give SPR full control over its existing athletic field and the District full control, and the ability to develop its property.

Notably, an approximately 8,900 square foot portion of the property going to the District is encumbered with grant obligations from the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) that the property be forever maintained for public outdoor recreation. In order to preserve this ongoing public outdoor recreation use, the District and SPR propose to separately enter into an interlocal agreement (attached to the ordinance) that reserves this portion to such use. Under that agreement, the District would never develop or fence off the public recreation portion, despite owning it. The District will, however, have the ability to install a gate in the existing fence that will allow students to access and recreate on the

playfield during the school day. This arrangement equalizes the area of the transfers, and neither agency will be required to compensate the other for the exchange.

The Seattle Department of Constructions and Inspections (SDCI) is currently reviewing the District's Lot Boundary Adjustment (LBA) application and building permit application. If Council approves this property trade, the LBA will be finalized and recorded, and the agencies will sign and record the deeds.

## 2. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Does this legislation create, fund, or amend a CIP Project? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ X No

## 3. SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Does this legislation amend the Adopted Budget? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ X No

**Does the legislation have other financial impacts to the City of Seattle that are not reflected in the above, including direct or indirect, short-term or long-term costs?**

This may result in a small maintenance cost savings. SPR already maintains the property that is currently part of the Walt Hundley Playfield. Owning it in fee will not change SPR's maintenance work or costs. The portion of property going to the District not reserved for public outdoor recreation will be developed with a District building, so that portion will no longer need to be maintained by SPR.

**Is there financial cost or other impacts of *not* implementing the legislation?**

The primary immediate negative impact would be to the District, which is striving to develop a new elementary school building. Longer-term, there is a risk that a significant portion of SPR's current playfield could be disrupted if the District determined it needed to use that District-owned land for future school development. That scenario would result in a large replacement cost borne by SPR.

## 4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

**a. Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?**

This legislation is a required step in the District's development permit applications and LBA applications, currently under review in SDCI.

**b. Is a public hearing required for this legislation?**

No, however the Interlocal Cooperation Act, Chapter 39.34 RCW requires posting of the interlocal agreement before it goes into effect. That will be done through the Clerk's Office.

**c. Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?**

No.

**d. Does this legislation affect a piece of property?**

Yes, a map is included as attachments to the legislation.

**e. Please describe any perceived implication for the principles of the Race and Social Justice Initiative. Does this legislation impact vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities? What is the Language Access plan for any communications to the public?**

This legislation does not change the current use of the affected pieces of property. They will continue to be used as they are now, but with underlying ownership appropriately held by the correct agency user. To the degree this property trade and LBA allows the District to fully develop its property to serve public school students, it advances both the City's and the District's goals to build equity and racial justice.

**f. Climate Change Implications**

**1. Emissions: Is this legislation likely to increase or decrease carbon emissions in a material way?**

No, except as it relates to the District constructing a new school building on land that it will own if this property trade is approved. However, this legislation will not affect the District's need to add this building space to its inventory, the need of which is based on its projected student populations.

**2. Resiliency: Will the action(s) proposed by this legislation increase or decrease Seattle's resiliency (or ability to adapt) to climate change in a material way? If so, explain. If it is likely to decrease resiliency in a material way, describe what will or could be done to mitigate the effects.**

No.

**g. If this legislation includes a new initiative or a major programmatic expansion: What are the specific long-term and measurable goal(s) of the program? How will this legislation help achieve the program's desired goal(s).**

This legislation does not include a new initiative or programmatic expansion.

**List attachments/exhibits below:**

Summary Attachment 1 – Depiction of Exchange Parcels