

APPROVED

Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee (ABGC)

Web site: <http://depts.washington.edu/wpa/abgc/>

The ABGC is also closely monitoring the WSDOT SR520 project for impacts to the Washington Park Arboretum. Please see

<http://depts.washington.edu/wpa/520.htm>

*Joint effort of the Arboretum Foundation, Seattle Parks, and the University of Washington (UW)
December 12, 2007*

Voting

Members:

Arboretum Foundation

- Paige Miller, Arboretum Foundation Executive Director
- John Johnston, Arboretum Foundation President

City of Seattle

- Jack Collins, Mayoral Appointee
- Donald Harris, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Property & Acquisition Services Manager

University of Washington

- Theresa Doherty, University of Washington, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs
- David Maberley, University of Washington Botanic Gardens (UWBG) Director
- Iain Robertson, University of Washington Professor

Washington State

- Dave Towne, Governor's Appointee

Absent:

City of Seattle

- Vacant position to be appointed by Seattle Mayor

Others:

- Colleen Browne, Seattle Parks, Acting Pro Parks Levy Manager
- Fred Hoyt, UWBG, Facilities & Grounds Manager
- Neal Lessenger, Former Arboretum Foundation President
- Elizabeth Loudon, UWBG, Education and Outreach Manager
- Tom Mentele, University of Washington, Director of Development, College of Forest Resources
- Andy Sheffer, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Project Manager

Staff:

- Sandy Brooks, Coordinator

Standing Committees

Funding Requests to State Legislature: John (Arboretum Foundation), Jack (City), Dave T (Washington State)

Naming Recognition Policy: Paige (Arboretum Foundation), Donald (City), Teresa (UW)

Mission Statement: Kathleen Pierce (Arboretum Foundation), Donald (City), Elizabeth (UW)

SR520 Mediation (Group of 34): Paige Miller, representing both the ABGC and Arboretum Foundation

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am at Graham Visitors Center. The December 12 agenda, as amended, the September 12 minutes, and the October 10 minutes were approved.

Master Plan Implementation Group (MPIG) Updates

Pacific Connections Gardens

Andy reported that:

- Pacific Connections project is on schedule and under budget
- trail work is moving along well
- south entry shelter work will start next week
- holly collection project has involved minimal disturbance and no severe drainage problems [from the winter rains.] One modification came about from a re-survey, resulting in removal of a few trees. The logs were moved to the Magnuson Park wetlands for use there.

Japanese Garden Entry Project

Andy reported the project has been modified to accommodate a larger meeting room and a separate storage area. All the legislation has been prepared and is in review at the City Law Department. It is anticipated that the legislation to accept funding from the Arboretum Foundation for this project will be before City Council in February.

The permitting process is approximately 50% completed and construction is scheduled to begin in April 2008. Crews will work four 10-hour days weekly with the Japanese Garden closed those days. The other three days the Garden will be open, with no construction work so visitors can enjoy the garden. Andy is working with the Garden staff to coordinate these operational issues.

Paige reported that project fundraising began on September 10 and at that time the project was estimated at \$1.2 million. The Pro Parks Levy contributed \$450,000 to the project and today, only three months later, the Arboretum Foundation has raised an additional \$745,000. Several grant applications, requesting more than \$400,000, have also been submitted.

Madison Valley Drainage Project/Japanese Garden

Jack Collins sent the following information to the ABGC for discussion at this meeting: *“I just had a great chat with Linda DeBolt, Engineering Services Director at Seattle Public Utilities (SPU). In sum, I advised her of the preliminary interest of the ABGC to explore the potential of SPU's use of the south end of Washington Park for a large underground stormwater detention facility. I advised her that I think that the ABGC would like the overflow of the facility to go through the Japanese Garden and Arboretum rather than back into the city's stormwater/sanitary sewer system. SPU is moving quickly to develop a "preferred alternative" to solve the Madison Valley problems. I suggested that when appropriate, ABGC would like to meet with Chuck Clark etc. to express our sentiments. Linda said that she was working with Parks' Kevin Stoops, among others. I suggested that she include Donald and/or Andy Sheffer in staff level discussions. I hope that we can adopt a motion at next week's ABGC meeting expressing our point of view on this matter. (I have felt uncomfortable pursuing this matter based only on short conversations with John, David and Fred.)”*

Discussion

Andy reported that he has exchanged e-mails with SPU in regards to daylighting Arboretum Creek and the Madison Valley drainage project – and the drainage projects' possible impacts on the Arboretum and Japanese Garden. Jack stated that the discussions are taking place at a high level of SPU, the process is moving quickly, and a determination/option is to be made in January. He urged that the ABGC take a stand today, meet with SPU, and get consideration for the Japanese Garden if it is to be affected by the project.

Iain stated that draining the water to the south end of the Arboretum could have a negative impact on the Japanese Garden, as both the koi and turtles require high quality water flowing through the Garden. If, as a result of SPU's project, flash flooding is expected in the Arboretum, it is a problem for the Garden. He asked Jack for a description of the proposed retention pond. Jack answered that it would be under the Washington Park playground and would be a way of storing and metering the excess water – it would not involve surplus water flowing through the Arboretum and Japanese Garden.

Paige asked whether this is an opportunity for the daylighting of the Arboretum Creek, if the project involves a detention facility with controlled water flow. David M commented that daylighting the creek is part of the Master Plan. Paige believes there are potential private partners who would help with the daylighting if the City does the technical parts of the project. Colleen Browne stated that this type of project was completed at Longfellow Creek with good results.

Donald stated that the ABGC needs a better understanding of the potential impacts of the project. **Jack moved that the ABGC explore the alternative of using the playfield next to the south end of the Arboretum for constructing a major detention pond, including that the Japanese Garden's quality of water be protected. David M seconded. The vote was taken and the motion passed, with Iain abstaining.**

Jack next moved that the ABGC chair appoint a delegation from the ABGC to meet with SPU Director Chuck Clarke or one of his designees. David M seconded. The vote was taken and passed.

Plant Procurement & Fundraising Strategy

David M wrote the following letter to the ABGC on November 13 and asked that it be discussed at the December 12 meeting.

Dear Member of ABGC

Yesterday's Retreat [November 7] crystallized a number of matters which, I believe, require our urgent attention. I am putting what I see as our major concerns under two headings, though the matters are of course interlocking. And I make some proposals for moving ahead.

PACIFIC CONNECTIONS

Andy Sheffer's presentation laid out very clearly the type of roadmap we need to complete this exhibit. At its most optimistic this is a project to take many years of implementation and each component garden within it has a logical sequence of design, plant-procurement and -raising, infrastructure installation and planting up. Each therefore needs at least two to three years to complete and there has to be funding for each stage as it is reached: before embarking on any such garden, there has, therefore, to be a rather firm belief that funding for the whole garden will be in the bank during the two-three year period.

The ABGC decided at its last meeting that if the Foundation's bid to Olympia were to be successful, then we wd proceed with the Chile Garden (which has high visibility from LWB and respects the original wishes of our greatest benefactor). We have in our UWBG schedule that the plant procurement expedition to leave in February. On the other hand, the ABGC decided that, should funding not be forthcoming, then we shd proceed with New Zealand, which is cheaper, has fewer permitting issues, and is conspicuous on Arboretum Drive, as well as balancing Cacadia the other side of the so-called meadow. To keep the momentum up, according to our present thinking, we wd need to replace the Chile Expedition by one to NZ - to leave in just three months' time. At the Retreat we heard that funding allowing the Chile option is now highly unlikely - and afterwards the Governor's representative opined that even if it were successful, we wd not get the money in time to proceed according to our present schedule.

So, *faute de mieux*, it is NZ. To do this, there wd need to be some very fast footwork on behalf of UWBG staff, our NZ contacts and friends to make this a reality. The UW wd also need to be guaranteed the funding for such an expedition (approx \$15K). Should Dan Hinkley be unavailable for this and to ensure that it wd actually happen, I myself wd be prepared to lead this expedition. However, before this expedition cd take place we wd need to have a design - which has yet to be commissioned (and we do not yet even have a designer). Moreover, we would need to be certain, or at least fairly certain, that the Foundation is able to raise the dollars needed for the NZ garden.

Looking at all these things - the design-time and the intolerable pressure that this will put on the Foundation at a time when it is undergoing very challenging staff resignations, my feeling is that we should postpone the NZ expedition until 2009 (UWBG's original plan).

I appreciate that this might appear to us inside the organization to be 'losing momentum'. However we have to face facts.

Moreover, looking at the thing from the outside, I do not think that there will be a perceived lack of momentum in Arboretum Master Plan Implementation as a whole. We are on target for ribbon-cutting on PCG I for next spring. With the opening of those so-called entry Gardens, and, in particular, the shelter, there will be HUGE interest in the Arboretum as a whole and that event will be followed in 2009/10 by the planting up and opening formally of Cascadia - both major things to show people interested in the remaining big-ticket items in the PCG. On top of this there will be the excitement surrounding the completion of the Japanese Entry pavilion and surrounding plantings.

On top of all this, there are a number of other projects in the pipeline - many of them of high visibility yet with MUCH much smaller price-tickets and which we can complete during the next few years if adequately funded: the completion of the Holly Garden with its important messages on invasives, evolution and the use of native plants; the completion of the Pinetum with the children's arboretum and the establishment of a proper pedestrian portal to WPA at Lynn Street; the renovation of the Camellia Garden (next to New Zealand) and other iconic NAPCC-type collections such as Sorbus, Viburnum and Nothofagus; the replanting with WPA selections (named cultivars etc. selected here) of the pedestrian plantings around the Graham Visitors Center; the daylighting of Arboretum Creek; the establishment of bike routes.

All these have potential new sources of funding (and recognition opportunities) and reach out to different, often new, audiences. Many chime well with the new Superintendent's remarks at the Retreat. They are all high-profile at either local, national or international levels, or more than one of those.

My proposal is that all these items need slotting into a two-year work-plan for the Arboretum, to run in parallel with whatever success we may have with the PC Campaign.

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

I was greatly pleased by the resolve at the Retreat to resurrect the defunct Joint Development Committee, which failed because the different parties had different agendas and - I fear - a lack of transparency leading to caution, fear or even hostility. It seems to me that the success of this committee is CRUCIAL to the wellbeing of the Arboretum and to relations with our donors. Since I have been here I have heard over and over again how perplexing it is for those who wish to do something for the Arboretum. The Committee should in effect be the donor interface of ABGC.

My proposal therefore is that this committee be a committee of ABGC and that it absorb the MPIG, which is trying to deal with these issues in a kind of sub rosa way in the absence of a development committee. The new ABGC Development Committee's make-up would hardly change from that of MPIG I think, but its remit from ABGC would more closely resemble what it is struggling to do.

We are all in this together and we all have the best interests of WPA at heart.

I look forward to the views of ABGC members - to be channeled via the Chair, please.

Pacific Connections

David M gave an update of events since he wrote the November 13 letter. He now recommends the gardens be planted in the following order: Cascadia, complete Australia and New Zealand, and then Chile and China, the two bigger gardens. He and staff are now strategizing funding, plant expeditions and procurement, and storage. However, they must have a funding commitment before doing the expeditions and getting plants. Jack commented that a cash flow design is needed. Paige agreed and stated that this hasn't yet been developed.

David continued that the University of Washington and Arboretum are both raising funds and must develop a means to coordinate their efforts. He believes an ABGC Development Oversight Committee (DOC) is the solution.

Donald commented that the dilemma here is whether the funding drives the project or does the project drive the funding? This issue was discussed, but not resolved, at the retreat and was also reflected in the critical path described by Andy. Andy commented that the planting and irrigation of Cascadia isn't too different from the New Zealand. He recommended that a consultant be hired now to finish the plans for both gardens at the same time – which would save money. Paige asked how much a consultant might cost and what funds would pay for this. Andy answered that, due to very close project management of Pacific Connections, there is a \$120,000 surplus from the project. These funds could be used for the consultant and he believes this would be a smart move.

Jack asked what the \$120,000 would be used for if it isn't spent for a consultant. Andy answered that his priority with the Pacific Connection funding is to (1) complete the Pacific Connection project. If he continues to be frugal, the (2) rockery project could also be completed and (3) the consultant could be hired for the Cascadia/New Zealand plans. Andy stated that none of the planned project components would be left undone by utilizing the funds this way. Neal stated that the ultimate determining factor is construction expediency for the gardens.

Tom M asked if any consultants would do the work pro bono. He also suggested that students with an environmental major be involved in the process and save the \$120,000. Tom urged that Andy try to get consultants who will do the work pro bono. Dave T commented that there is little control or input when the work is done pro bono.

Dave T asked what would appeal to the donors and Paige answered that the fundraisers need to show donors a plan for the gardens and a critical path for realization of those plans.

Paige moved that the ABGC authorize the sequencing of the next phase of Pacific Connections, comprised of Cascadia and New Zealand elements, and that it authorize the City to move forward with the designs. David M seconded. The vote was taken and was unanimous. Motion carried.

Andy can hire a consultant directly from the roster. Andy recommended, and Fred agreed, using Berger and Associates as the consultant. He also recommended that a variety of consultants be used during the Master Plan Implementation. Jack agreed that using a number of consultants is a very good plan. An interview panel will be convened and Andy was asked to bring Berger and Associates to interview before the panel.

Discussion continued about the best way to go about plant procurement for the New Zealand garden. David M stated that the garden design must be completed, the number of plants needed tallied (it will be in the thousands), and then a cost determination completed.

Iain commented that these steps are the basic mechanisms for how any Arboretum collection is gathered and is unlike a construction project. The steps need to be written out so that donors and others can understand the complexity and richness of the collection. Donald agreed that it is difficult to understand the process if you aren't familiar with it. Fred commented that the Washington Park Arboretum has developed collections this way but never on a scale this large. Iain commented that it is the job of an arboretum curator to do this and the partners (City, UW, and Arboretum Foundation) are doing this without a curator. [Note: the curator position was cut due to UW budget reductions. See New Business below for additional information on efforts to reinstate the position.]

John stated that the Arboretum Foundation will go ahead with fundraising. This is the major capital project; however, there are other Arboretum capital projects that aren't part of the Master Plan.

Development Committee (Strategizing Fundraising Efforts)

Back to David M's letter: David stated that delaying the plant expeditions does not mean that the projects are losing momentum. Staff continue to move ahead with plant procurements and other components. There are a number of other very visible projects that can be completed with a small amount of funding that donors and the public can see being implemented. Daylighting of Arboretum Creek is one example and has been put on the Master Plan Implementation Group's (MPIG) project list. John commented that it is important for the ABGC to discuss the project list and then send that information to MPIG.

Jack commented that MPIG's work is mostly unknown to him. He noted a bicycle path proposal that came to the ABGC earlier this year and MPIG determined that it wasn't feasible. Donald thinks that MPIG is true to its title of "Master Plan Implementation Group" – and their focus is on the Master Plan Implementation. He asked if others think MPIG has overstepped its scope. It did not seem to be a widely held belief.

Paige commented that MPIG is not the place for oversight of the three development groups. Donald stated that MPIG is project oriented and wasn't convened to resolve a concerted donation plan. John commented that MPIG already has a lot of work to do and asking it to also be the development oversight committee would unduly burden it. Tom M also agreed that MPIG is not the right group to manage the three development team's fundraising efforts.

Dave T asked if information about a development oversight committee will be sent to the ABGC prior to the January meeting. Donald and David M agreed that a report and recommendation will be sent. David M asked that the January meeting be scheduled for 8:30 to 11:00 am (30 minutes extra) to discuss funding sources; project timelines; and a 2008 work plan of what actually can be accomplished with current staff and other resources.

David M commented that donors are now confused about the fundraising efforts for the Master Plan Implementation as Paige has appointed a development team, the UW College of Forest Resources has a development team, and the UW Botanic Gardens has a third development team. Having a development oversight committee is in the best interest of the ABGC. Jack agreed that the three development teams must work together so the donors know exactly what is happening – this is crucial to the success of the fundraising.

Tom M gave a recent example where two of the three development teams asked the Miller Foundation, without being aware that the other development team was requesting funds for the same project. The Foundation has asked that the development teams better coordinate their requests.

John commented that the three teams need to communicate more. He talked more about coordination and capital operating issues – there is a large pile of issues on the table. Jack suggested that Dave T coordinate the development teams, as he is a neutral party and experienced fundraiser. Dave T suggested that the three teams, at a minimum, not approach donors separately with the same request. Tom M added that there are times when two or more will request funds for the same project, but should ensure they do so in a concerted effort. He distributed a copy of the Joint Development Committee agreement (signed by the Arboretum Foundation, UW Dean of College of Forest Resources, and Seattle Parks Superintendent in 2004 for one year) and will send an electronic copy to the ABGC. He believes this agreement should be reviewed and renewed as it includes a good strategic development plan. Donald H will request that John J, Dean Bare, and Superintendent Gallagher renew the agreement. Note: A separate meeting is to be convened. He asked that the ABGC representatives take this request back to their respective organizations and move to re-establish the Joint Development Committee.

Paige agreed that the three should not approach donors if they are unclear what the other two are asking for. She suggested that (1) an ABGC-approved project list be developed, including Master Plan and non-Master Plan projects; (2) a lead fundraiser be determined for each; and (3) describe the project and any potential sources of funding.

This topic will be on the January 9 agenda for further discussion and recommendation.

SR520 Update

Paige and Teresa attended the November meeting of the "Group of 34" mediation group, convened by Governor Gregoire. The Danish firm determining the feasibility of a tube tunnel under Lake Washington presented a good report. A tunnel from the present Museum of History and Industry to Interstate 5 is cost prohibitive. A tunnel under Lake Washington is not feasible due to the depth of the water and the deep layer of silt. However, a tube located east of the Arboretum to MOHAI is feasible and worth continued investigation and pursuit.

During the second half of the meeting, the consultants asked each of the “34” members to make some proposal for the SR520 project. Paige proposed a hybrid with a viaduct through Portage Bay and a tunnel under the Arboretum. Her proposal is being drawn up by the Danish engineers, along with other options.

Paige is discussing the hybrid option with other Group of 34 members. Theresa stated that it would provide a good link for Sound Transit and Metro buses. Only a bike path would cross Foster Island. This plan meets the ABGC’s goals of the project causing the least impact to the Arboretum. Jack will attend the community meeting led by Fran Conley and will urge the community representatives to support Paige’s proposal.

Theresa commented that the Group of 34 is not concerned with how the project would be funded – only with the project itself. It is scheduled to meet again the week of December 17. Jack asked about the Environmental Impact Statement process normally required for public projects. Neal stated that the State legislature can call an emergency and dispense with the EIS process.

Jack and Iain recently talked with Deputy Mayor Tim Ceis, who believes that the project will be scaled down due to funding. Paige stated that Maurice Cooper of Montlake proposed that the current bridge be retrofitted and two lanes added. This would include salvaging portions of the current bridge, adding HOV lanes, and eliminating the west high rise.

Old/New Business:

2008 Meeting Dates: The ABGC meeting date was changed from the first Wednesday of each month to the second Wednesday. The time and location remain the same: 8:30-10:30 am at Graham Visitors Center (unless otherwise noted on the agenda.

2008 Officers Elected: Donald Harris has been chair during 2006 and 2007. Sandra Lier of the UW was chair prior to Donald. The preferred sequence of the position of chair is that it rotates between the UW, City, and Arboretum Foundation representatives. Following that pattern, the Arboretum Foundation would take over as chair this year; however, the two Foundation representatives agreed that they have a full plate with fundraising and stepped aside for this year. The rotation pattern will resume in 2009. **Jack moved that Dave Towne, as the Governor’s representative to the ABGC, be elected ABGC Chair for 2008. David Maberley seconded. The vote was taken and was unanimous. Motion carried.** Iain asked if the City would continue providing staff support to the chair and Donald answered yes, that both he and Sandy would assist Dave in his role. **Teresa moved that Paige Miller, as representative of the Arboretum Foundation, be elected ABGC Vice-chair for 2008. Iain seconded. The vote was taken and was unanimous in favor. Motion carried. Dave T moved that Teresa be elected ABGC Secretary for 2008. David M seconded. The vote was taken and was unanimous in favor. Motion carried.**

ABGC Vacancy: Mayor Nickels is considering appointing Kjrj Lund as his third representative to the ABGC. Donald has worked previously with Kjrj and believes she will be an effective member of the ABGC. Ms. Lund lives on 26th Ave, near the Arboretum.

City Council Budget Allocation to Arboretum: Donald reported that the \$58,000 for the Arboretum for “new facility” maintenance and operation costs for the Pacific Connections was included in the approved supplemental budget. This is good news for the Arboretum.

City Council Briefing on the Arboretum and Master Plan Implementation: This briefing needs to be scheduled.

Invite UW Provost and Budget Director to ABGC Meeting: Paige and Theresa will invite both to the March 2008 meeting, and the ABGC will exert pressure for the much-needed curator. This position was lost several years ago during budget cuts. It is critical to have the position restored and filled quickly. Neal stated that it is important to get the UW budget director to a meeting where the ABGC can present a prioritized list of its needs.

David Maberley’s Successor: David M has accepted a position with Kew Gardens, just outside London. Her Majesty made him an offer he couldn’t refuse. David will remain as University of Washington Botanic Garden Director until mid-February. Paige asked about plans to fill the directorship. Tom M learned yesterday that an interim director, still to be named, will be appointed. An ambitious schedule of filling the position by fall is planned.

Naming Recognition Policy Update: To be discussed at the January meeting.

Review Goals and Objectives (Work Plan) for 2008: Donald asked that all review the current version of the Goals and Objectives prior to the January 9 meeting. Any new work items that resulted from the November retreat should be

added. Any work items no longer feasible or completed should be removed. Send any suggestions to Donald before the meeting.

Park Board Tour: Jack recommended that the ABGC read the minutes of the October 25 Park Board tour of the Arboretum and their regular meeting, held at Graham Visitors Center. To read the minutes, please see:

<http://cityofseattle.net/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2007/10-25-07.pdf>

ABGC Retreat: Kathleen Miller has finalized the information gathered from the breakout groups at the retreat. She suggested an outside facilitator be hired to help determine roles.

Next ABGC Meeting: The next meeting is scheduled at Graham Visitors Center on January 9, 8:30-11:00 am.

There being no other business, the meeting concluded at 10:40 am.

APPROVED _____ DATE _____
David Mabberley, ABGC Secretary