

APPROVED

Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee (ABGC) Minutes

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

The Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee is a Joint effort of the Arboretum Foundation, Seattle Parks Department, and the University of Washington, and designated by Seattle City Council Ordinance 65130, approved December 27, 1934, and Ordinance 116337, approved September 8, 1992.

The ABGC is closely monitoring the WSDOT SR520 project for impacts to the Washington Park Arboretum. Please see <http://depts.washington.edu/wpa/520.htm>

Meeting Location: Graham Visitors Center, February 10, 2010

Voting Members

Present:

Arboretum Foundation

- Barbara Wright, Arboretum Foundation President
- Paige Miller, Arboretum Foundation Executive Director

City of Seattle

- Jack Collins, Mayoral Appointee
- Kjris Lund, Mayoral Appointee
- Tim Gallagher, Superintendent, Seattle Parks and Recreation

State of Washington

- Dave Towne, Washington State Governor's Appointee

University of Washington

- Theresa Doherty, University of Washington, Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs
- Sandra Lier, University of Washington Botanic Gardens (UWBG) Director
- Iain Robertson, University of Washington Associate Professor, Department of Landscape Architecture

Other Staff Present:

- David Graves, Seattle Parks, Project Manager
- Marnie Heffron, UW
- Fred Hoyt, UWBG, Associate Director
- Sarah Reichart, UWBG
- Michael Shiosaki, Seattle Parks, Planning & Development Deputy Director

Members of the Public Present:

- Dave Hutchins, Arboretum Foundation, Arboretum Foundation
- Jennifer Hutchins, Arboretum Foundation
- Larry Sinnott, Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks
- Skip Vonyx, Arboretum Foundation

WSDOT Staff Present:

- Kristin Dean, Michael Hontvedt, Julie Meredith & Jennifer Young

ABGC Staff:

- Sandy Brooks, Coordinator

Standing Committees

Building Committee:	Paige (AF); Donald (City); & Sandra (UW)
Funding Requests to State Legislature:	John (AF), Jack (City), & Dave T (Washington State)
Fundraising Policy:	AF: Paige Miller & Barbara Wright City: Tim Gallagher (Chair) & Donald Harris UW: Tom Hinckley & Sandra Lier
Master Plan Implementation Group (MPIG)	Michael (lead), Donald, Fred, Julia, Paige, Sandra & Tom
Mission Statement:	Kathleen Pierce (AF), Donald (City) & Sandra (UW)
Naming Recognition Guideline:	Paige (AF), Donald (City), & Sandra (UW)
SR520 Mediation:	AF, David Graves (City), & Theresa Doherty (UW)

Known Absences:

March: Tim Gallagher & Dave Towne

Barbara Wright, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30 am and the agenda was approved. Everyone introduced themselves.

Barbara reviewed the purpose of this meeting, which focused on the SR520 project. The ABGC held a special meeting on February 4 and developed a list of questions for WSDOT to respond to at this meeting. (The questions and introduction were sent to the WSDOT team on January 31 - copy below - and included the ABGC's Guiding Principles.) A four-member team from Washington State Department of Transportation, led by project manager Julie Meredith, responded to the questions. Following this meeting, Nancy Belcher, Fred Hoyt, and David Graves will begin formulating the ABGC's response to the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS.)

Julie distributed two handouts, (1) information on the bridge's pontoons and (2) the East Side Environmental Assessment published in 2009. She next referred to WSDOT's Resource Activity Coordination Process (RACP) and reviewed the regulatory agencies looking at the SR520 project. David, Graves, Fred, and Theresa are the parks representatives on a technical group focusing on the project, with a focus on the 4f, 6f, National Historic Preservation Act, and Section 106 designations. WSDOT is also performing a health impact assessment, although this isn't required by the National Environmental Protection Agency. In 2009, Theresa and Paige were part of a mediation group, whose charge by the State Legislature was to arrive at a consensus on three alternatives to be included in the Environmental Impact Statement.

The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement was recently released, which shows Alternatives A, K & L, with the recognition that any ramp into the Arboretum needs more discussion. A public meeting will be held on February 23. The current end date for the public comment period is March 8; that date will most likely be extended through March.

During April, WSDOT will continue its review of the three alternatives. The summer will be spent on mitigation discussion, and then the final Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared.

The Seattle City Council sent WSDOT a letter dated January 28, 2010, requesting 120 days to complete the following: *"We ask that the State engage with the City of Seattle in a final stage of concept and design work on the Westside configuration. We request that WSDOT work with the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) on a technical review of alternatives to identify potentially acceptable design elements and modifications based on guidance and direction from the Mayor and City council. A wide range of alternatives and design elements have been studied through the EIS process."* Julie stated that WSDOT is now working with the City, which has also hired a consultant, to try to determine what this process will look like. WSDOT must make a decision in April where the interchange will be located.

Prior to this meeting, the ABGC chair sent the following background and list of questions to WSDOT:

Background

The Washington Park Arboretum is a stunning gem of the Seattle Park system, a 230-acre oasis of gently rolling land, bucolic watery islets and home to the best of the City's wildlife. It provides respite, scenery, recreation and solace to thousands of visitors in every season of the year. It provides educational and volunteering opportunities to thousands of friends, sightseeing to thousands of visitors and cultural enrichment in gardening styles and distant ecosystems to those who seek it out.

In May 2001, the Seattle City Council approved the long-range master plan for the Washington Park Arboretum, creating a road map for Arboretum improvements over the next 20 years. The master plan ensures the Washington Park Arboretum will effectively fulfill three primary purposes—conservation, recreation and education—for decades to come. Together, University of Washington Botanic Gardens, Seattle Parks and Recreation and the Arboretum Foundation are working to implement the master plan.

Substantial public and private funds have recently been raised and spent to improve the visitors' experience. The newly created Pacific Connection Gardens have been created, the Japanese Garden Gatehouse has been redeveloped and a number of other park improvements have been made. All these contributions potentially could be negatively impacted by a newly designed SR 520 project.

February 10 ABGC Meeting

The Arboretum Botanical Garden Committee (ABGC) is an advisory committee established the University of Washington Regents and the City of Seattle in 1934 to assist the City and University in establishing and maintaining the Arboretum. ABGC advises the University of Washington, City of Seattle and The Arboretum Foundation on the management and stewardship of the Washington Park Arboretum for the benefit of current and future generations. Members of the committee include a representative appointed by the Governor, three representatives appointed by the Mayor; three representatives appointed by the President of the University of Washington; and two members of the Arboretum Foundation (Current members are listed below.)

The Arboretum Botanical Garden Committee (ABGC) adopted Guiding Principles for the SR520 expansion in November 2009 (see below). In a special February 4, 2010 meeting, the ABGC agreed that "less is better" in all aspects of the 520 corridor design. Specifically, less noise, less width, less impact on Lake Washington Boulevard, less height, less pollution, etc is better.

At the February 10, 2010, ABGC Meeting, the ABGC respectfully requests the WSDOT team to address several specific questions rather than presenting a general project update. The following questions were developed by the ABGC to better understand WSDOT efforts to address our specific concerns about the potential impacts to the Washington Park Arboretum: [Note: WSDOT responses shown in italics.]

- 1. Has WSDOT looked at ways to minimize traffic on Lake Washington Boulevard, both during construction and once the project is complete. What opportunities are there through the project to encourage vehicles to take alternate routes to and from SR 520 and discourage vehicles from using Lake Washington Boulevard through the Arboretum as an extended access ramp to 520?***

Julie replied that it has looked at ways to minimize the traffic after the project is completed, but have not really looked at ways to minimize it during construction. Lake Washington Boulevard (LWB) is a city street and the three alternatives affect it in different ways. Jennifer added that WSDOT will develop a traffic management plan that includes specifics for the construction phase.

Paige has heard rumors that Miller Street will be used during the construction phase for traffic management and asked WSDOT staff to confirm. Julie responded that WSDOT is analyzing this option; however, the City will have a strong influence on the final decision. Michael H added that, once the preferred alternative has

been selected, WSDOT staff will refine the option and consider the most logical traffic routes. Responding to a question from Iain whether WSDOT looked at ways to minimize traffic on Lake Washington Boulevard and how to minimize impacts from the SR 520 project, Julie agreed it has.

Tim stressed that Lake Washington Boulevard is a park boulevard and not a transportation corridor. Theresa asked if the City influences its actual use, and Tim agreed that it does. Jack believes Parks has more influence on the use of LWB than does Seattle Department of Transportation. Theresa urged that Parks staff discuss and determine this with SDOT and City officials.

2. What has been considered to protect the visitors' experience while visiting the Arboretum, Japanese Garden and other adjacent park areas? Please address issues relating to noise, safety and access.

Julie responded that WSDOT will rely on feedback from the Technical Working Group to determine what mitigation measure will be required. Jennifer added that WSDOT is determining what mitigation will be required to satisfy the 4f and 6f classifications, and wetland and aquatic mitigation. Once the preferred alternative has been selected, WSDOT will better know what mitigation is required.

Jennifer spent additional time discussing this and how the different options might affect the mitigation. She noted that traffic reduction on Lake Washington Boulevard is within the City's purview. Paige questioned if the DSEIS reviewed SR520 project impacts if the City diverts traffic from Lake Washington Boulevard. Michael H responded that it is a given that Seattle will experience a 25% growth in traffic and Alternative A reduces traffic. WSDOT hasn't analyzed the implications of the City reducing traffic on Lake Washington Boulevard; the City must analyze the implications and then WSDOT will use that information.

3. What plans have been considered to provide safe pedestrian and bicycle connections for all users to access the Arboretum and move visitors between the park sites?

Michael H responded that WSDOT looked at the City of Seattle's bike system and suggested some improvements in relation to the SR520 project. A bike trail would go under and over Foster Island.

4. What efforts have been made to respect the historic, aesthetic and design integrity of the Park?

Jennifer responded that the footprint has been reduced considerably from previous designs and referred to Chapter 2 of the SDEIS. The protection will be determined when the preferred alternative has been selected. WSDOT will protect the historic, aesthetic, and design integrity to the greatest extent possible, and will work with the community to determine its values — and not just those of WSDOT.

The City and UW are consulting partners on Section 106, which requires that the project be designed in a historic manner. WSDOT is working with the State Historic Preservation office and must have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) within one year of the release of the EIS. She noted that the report is downloadable from the WSDOT project web site, and looks at the history of the project and how the land was acquired.

Jennifer added that the 4f and 6f designations will address the recreation uses of any affected park properties. WSDOT has received a list of candidate properties as determined by the City and UW. WSDOT must go through many agencies to get endorsement of these sites. The entire Arboretum is included in the discipline report. Julie added that the tribes are also important to the Foster Island process.

5. Has WSDOT negotiated with the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) to reduce standard design regulations to ones which would alleviate some of the negative impacts on the Arboretum and surrounding area?

WSDOT staff answered that they have and will continue to work with FHA to narrow the footprint. They added that the SR520 intersection near the Arboretum has a high accident rate because of its 1960's design. The City of Seattle will help determine the intersection design.

6. What has been done to address negative impacts to the visitors and plants from carbon emissions?

Jennifer responded that this is a good news story! The analysis shows that the emission rates are about the same for all three alternatives. Ways to actually reduce carbon emissions include tolling the road to reduce usage and requiring more people in fewer vehicles. The analysis shows a 7-8% reduction in emissions from all three alternatives, when compared to a no build.

Tim stated that the answers and analysis in these reports are based on current land use practices and do not acknowledge those practices need to be changed. People should be encouraged to get out of their cars, rather than making it easier for them to drive by adding more traffic lanes. Theresa commented that she and Paige were on the mediation committee that selected the three alternatives and that is what the State legislators directed they do. Tim responded that committees cannot just do what they are told to do, when they know it is wrong. The messenger (WSDOT) should go back to the State Legislature and say "this is the wrong way." Barbara stated that Tim's land use comments will be included in the ABGC's response to the SDEIS.

Jack asked how Tim's land use ideas could be incorporated into the current process, as the Legislature directed the mediation committee. Tim stated that the project should include language that reduces traffic. Why not consider that in this process?

Paige noted that there will be 6 lanes in the future when high capacity transit is added. She asked if that will require building two new lanes. Julie responded that the floating bridge is straight and can accommodate light rail; however, more pontoons will be needed to accommodate the extra buoyancy and stability that will be required. Future leaders will make the determination. The other big question is where light rail will run on both the east and west sides of the bridge. The east end of the project is wider to accommodate future light rail. It is yet to be determined where light rail would run in the Montlake area and how the intersection would be configured to accommodate it.

7. As the project is phased during construction, how do you see each phase impacting the Arboretum?

Julie responded that the floating bridge portion of the project is funded, but the east and west entrances aren't yet funded. WSDOT will build the floating bridge first. She expects the biggest impact to the Arboretum to be at the interchange. Kjrj asked how the construction will be phased, and Julie gave some info on this, including that the bridge will be closed during part of the construction.

8. What has been considered in design discussions to protect the cultural importance and the visitors' experience when using Foster Island? Please address noise, height, width and pedestrian access proposals when answering this question.

Jennifer responded that WSDOT staff members meet regularly with six tribes with interests in Foster Island. The SDEIS includes a great deal of information on this and refers to the importance of ceremonies held there and how the shoreline looked before the Ship Canal was built. The tribes want minimal disturbance in the area, especially where tree burials occurred. WSDOT will minimize the project footprint as much as possible when the alternative is chosen.

Second part of question: The project will include a trench across Foster Island and will include noise walls and accommodations for pedestrians. The highest walls will most likely be noise walls. There will be disturbances

at Foster Island during the construction. After the construction is completed, the ongoing disturbances will be from the operation of the highway. Julie noted that a pedestrian bridge design hasn't yet been decided.

9. *There are four significant projects at the north end of the Arboretum which are identified in the Arboretum Master Plan: complete the Waterfront Trail as a loop all the way around Duck Bay; add access, sitting and viewing areas on the west side of Duck Bay; daylight Arboretum Creek and create an entry at the west/north end of the Arboretum with the same grand character as the south entry. The redevelopment of SR 520 has the potential to negate the potential to undertake some or all of these projects to the detriment of the Arboretum and contrary to the goals set out in the Master Plan which was adopted by the City of Seattle and the University of Washington. What considerations are being given to the Master Plan and how are these potential impacts being addressed?*

Jennifer responded that the SDEIS discusses the Master Plan and pointed out the four significant projects that could be completed (as listed above.) Jack asked that ABGC members be kept apprised of any decisions the City and UW make in this regard. Sandra agreed.

10. *What measures have been considered to ensure that the Arboretum collections and park can continue to be safely used to teach plant identification, soils, water quality, and other natural resource subjects throughout the Arboretum?*

Julie responded the mediation group members worked to avoid impacts to the Arboretum, especially at the interchange. Jennifer added that WSDOT is looking at mitigation that would result in educational mitigation opportunities. She gave the daylighting of Arboretum Creek as a good example.

Julie stated that the SDEIS comment period will be extended through March, and possibly into April. The WSDOT presentation ended at approximately 9:45 am.

ABGC Discussion:

Kjris commented that Julie and the WSDOT team are doing a great job, considering the parameters they are working under. She recently met with Paula Hammond, WSDOT's Secretary of Transportation, and expressed the same sentiments to her. Barbara and Tim agreed and appreciate the challenges the team faces, as well as their professionalism.

Tim requested that the WSDOT team take the vehicle and land use comments from today's meeting back to the State legislators, and urged that the legislature and WSDOT look at land use issues and correct them before beginning projects. Julie responded that WSDOT doesn't determine land use; it is up to the legislature. Sandra added that the ABGC has been criticized that it did not take a strong enough stand to protect the Arboretum in the 1960's when SR 520 was built, and wants to do proper stewardship this time. Its Guiding Principles are to minimize any further impacts to the Arboretum. The Arboretum cannot be fenced off and the ABGC is concerned with traffic impacts from the project.

The discussion returned to light rail. Paige noted that light rail could be added to the water portion of the project and on the east side; however, it is much more difficult to add it on the west side. Julie agreed that the east side could accommodate light rail, but it wouldn't be easy on either the east or west side.

Kjris referred to Tim's comments on land use and transportation and believes Seattle is very focused on density and not adding more vehicles. Why, then, is there a need to increase the lanes? Michael H responded that many people choose to live on one side of the lake and work on the other. As the population increases, these numbers increase. Barbara commented that the traffic numbers on SR 520 are already staggering, even before the projected increase in population is figured in.

Jack agrees with Tim on the land use, but doesn't foresee it happening. He also agrees on the need for light rail, but doesn't think that will happen soon, either. He asked why WSDOT is resisting exclusive bus/HOV use on the outside lanes. Michael H responded that the two outside lanes will be transit and HOV only. However, by 2030 a vehicle will be required to have 3 passengers in order to drive in the HOV lane. He noted that King County Transit is increasing the number of Redmond-to-UW buses on the SR 520 corridor by 45 buses daily, to be funded by Sound Transit. WSDOT's analysis shows buses and carpools zipping along, while the other lanes will be congested.

Michael Shiosaki referred to City Council's letter to WSDOT requesting 120 days to complete its work and suggested that Parks use that time to slow down traffic along Lake Washington Boulevard. Tim noted that SDOT controls much of the traffic; however, it is working closely with Parks staff on the traffic-calming study because of pedestrian safety issues crossing the busy boulevard. Sarah added that the south end of LWB is especially dangerous to pedestrians. Julie stated that it would be valuable for the traffic calming to be implemented at the soonest.

Dave T asked if Lake Washington Boulevard were to be closed to through traffic, would that change the design of SR 520. Julie responded that the State would consider this change; however, the traffic must go somewhere. Michael H added that WSDOT staff looked at a design without ramps to Lake Washington Boulevard, but has not looked at a design with the Boulevard closed to through traffic.

Jack asked if it is possible that the ramps would be eliminated in the EIS stage. Julie responded that the City will continue developing its strategy over the next 120 days and WSDOT is looking to the City to give it guidance on this. She has not yet heard the Mayor direct SDOT to move ahead with altering Lake Washington Boulevard.

Barbara next asked the members of the public for any comments:

- Larry Sinnott asked the ABGC to unequivocally reject ramps to Lake Washington Boulevard. He referred to the Arboretum and Lake Washington Boulevard's historic Olmsted legacy. He was on the mediation group with Paige and Theresa and several members did not support the 6-lane alternative.
- Skip supports Tim's comment about reducing vehicles and revising land use policies.
- Dave H asked why WSDOT isn't building pontoons that will later support light rail. Julie responded that light rail has been the focus of a great deal of political discussion. The current plan is the compromise.

Barbara asked if WSDOT has drawings for the lid to be located next to the Arboretum that shows the height. She wants to promote transit, but the height will impact pedestrians and bikers. She asked how WSDOT plans to move people across the intersection. Julie and the WSDOT team then rolled out large drawings and pointed out the lid and a number of other areas in all three alternatives, including the general purpose lanes and transit ramps.

Dave T referred to the bill moving through the legislature for funding transportation projects and believes it allows WSDOT to move ahead on this project. Julie responded that WSDOT still needs permits from the City.

Barbara thanked the WSDOT team and stated that the ABGC greatly appreciate their attending today's meeting.

The meeting took a short break and the WSDOT team left.

Discussion continued on next steps for the ABGC and how best to organize its response to the SDEIS. It agreed to:

1. Move ahead with Lake Washington Blvd traffic-calming measures. Luke Korpi of SDOT will attend the March ABGC meeting and give an update; and

2. Fred and Michael are on the technical group and will get input from the ABGC to prepare responses

David Graves is also a member of the Technical Group and noted that it hasn't yet done a lot of work on the project. There are large agencies currently looking at the impacts including the Department of Ecology, Department of Fisheries, and the Tribes.

Paige noted that WSDOT says they will figure the mitigation later, after the preferred alternative is selected. However, the ABGC must continue its fight to ensure the project avoids, minimizes, and mitigates any impacts to the Arboretum.

Tim urged that the ABGC continue its message that the project should only enhance the Arboretum and should avoid all impacts. If there are any impacts, these should be mitigated to the fullest. The mitigation should include tolling, paying rental for the use of Lake Washington Boulevard if it is used as a traffic corridor, and ensuring Boulevard traffic goes no faster than 25 mph. The ABGC should take a radical approach and insist that WSDOT pay, pay, pay for any impacts to the Arboretum. Jack added that it should emphasize that all mitigation funds for damage to the Arboretum be used in the Arboretum to fund Master Plan implementation. Tim added that the ABGC has a good opportunity to state this and get the Mayor's and City Council's support. Sandra agreed — the freeway should never have been built through the Arboretum in the first place.

Discussion next moved to the tolling bill introduced by State Senator Ken Jacobsen and currently up for vote. **Kjris Lund moved that ABGC endorse the bill and send a letter of support for the bill as long as the bill agrees to tolling for SR520 use of Lake Washington Boulevard. Theresa seconded.** Paige stated that she doesn't believe the bill will pass. Sandra commented that it is still important for the ABGC to go to Olympia to discuss the Arboretum's needs and to build relationships with the legislature. Olympia is becoming more and more aware of these needs. Fred agreed with Sandra's comments.

Barbara and Paige stated that the Arboretum Foundation has directed them not to support the bill, as it likely won't pass. Jack protested that the tolling bill was Paige's idea! Paige agreed that it was, but the current bill morphed into something else. Responding to a question from Tim on why she doesn't agree with the current bill, Paige answered that it tolls cross bridge traffic and not Lake Washington Boulevard traffic. Tim commented that the bill might later be amended to get back to its original intent. Fred cautioned that the focus of the bill is the impact of traffic crossing through the Arboretum and not traffic impacts to Lake Washington Boulevard.

The vote was taken with 6 members in favor (Dave, Iain, Jack, Kjris, Theresa, & Tim); 2 opposed (Barbara and Paige); and 1 abstention (Sandra).

Discussion next moved to the ABGC's response to the SDEIS. Dave T believes the ABGC will be most effective if it takes the highest ground in its response to the SDEIS. This will set the tone and precedent for the public on the ABGC's stand on the project. Paige agreed, but wants a focus on designing the west side so it only needs to be designed once. The design needs to accommodate light rail within the 6 lanes. More discussion followed, with the group agreeing that this issue cannot be resolved at this time.

Kjris wants to ensure that the ABGC not limit itself for future steps. Tim suggested 2-3 responses be prepared: (1) technical issues. Parks will send a letter to WSDOT requesting that Lake Washington Boulevard be referred to as a park boulevard in all future SR 520 documents, with Tim's signature; (2) will be sent to the ABGC by March 1 for review; (3) the ABGC will not take a position on any of the alternatives; rather it will focus on the Guiding Principles adopted in November 2009. ABGC members want Tim's land use language included in this response, Iain's comment that "less is less", and a vision statement. This letter will be sent to WSDOT, City Council, Dow Constantine at King County, Mayor McGinn, and ABGC members. Tim

urged that the letters be sent as soon as possible, as WSDOT wants direction from the City. A draft of this will be sent to ABGC members prior to the March 10 meeting.

David reminded the group that it is only commenting at this time on what is in the SDEIS. The Technical Group will go back to the ABGC's Guiding Principles and prepare draft responses. They will also focus on noise walls and quiet pavements and Sandra asked that they focus on how the new road will impact the Arboretum experience. Jack asked if the loss of future space staff at the MOHAI building should be included in these letters. Sandra responded that this loss should be kept on the list, but not included in these letters.

ABGC members asked that the following speakers attend the March 10 meeting: Chris O'Claire of Metro; Greg Walker of Sound Transit; and Luke Korpi of SDOT. Barbara noted that the County took its position on SR 520 when Kurt Triplett was the County Executive.

Tim and Dave T will both be out of town at the March 10 meeting. Other voting members will want to attend to be sure there is a quorum. The meeting will be extended from 8:00 am to 10:30 am, with the guest speakers first on the agenda. Staff will aim to distribute the draft letters by March 2, incorporate comments by March 5, and distribute a revised draft before the March 10 meeting.

Old/New Business

ABGC Work Plan and Calendar: Barbara and Sandy will continue updating both these documents.

Master Plan Implementation Group: Did not meet this past month. The Gateway to Chile project will go out to bid this month. Contractors will remove 20 trees for this project the last week in February to early March. Fred will send the list of trees to be removed, as well as what will be re-planted, to Tim and to Parks' communication staff, Dewey & Joelle to keep the public informed.

Holmdahl Rockery: A site visit was suggested at the November 2009 retreat. Six people, including Jack, recently made this visit. Jack described the rockery and showed a photo of how it originally looked. The rockery has been overgrown by vegetation and is now being restored. Suggestions were to send a press release out that the restoration is moving ahead and to send the info to the online blogs.

Flower & Garden Show: Tim thanked Paige for all her work on this year's Show. Paige commented that the Preview Gala was quite nice and that attendance was down a small amount. She believes the Arboretum Foundation will make more money this year than it did in 2009.

Neighborhood Safety: Burglaries have increased in neighborhoods around the Arboretum. Fred noted that the number of "trollers" for illegal sexual encounters have recently increased in the Arboretum.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

APPROVED _____ DATE _____
Barbara Wright, ABGC Chair