

Saint Edward Planning meeting January 14, 2014

North Shore Utility District Meeting Room

Miscellaneous

Is it significant we had double packets stapled together? Dollars.

Historical Preservation

We PERK, want, first and foremost, protection of the natural habitat at St. Edward Park. The protection of the park as a forested open space is critical for the protection of the ecology on the shores of Lake Washington, and for the education of our future generations. We want to ensure that we retain in an urban setting, a glimpse of what it might look like in pristine areas such as Olympia National Park or the Redwoods, etc. People for an Environmentally Responsible Kenmore strongly encourage the habitat protection of St Edward Park to be the top priority.

How much will it cost to stop the water intrusion?

Can the building be removed from historical status to release the park department from renovation costs?

The park should be for public. Not private companies. Appropriate uses could include community center activities, classes, etc. It would be better to leave it vacant than to privatize it.

It's the cultural significance of the building, not just the building.

Questions Related to the Camp Plan

Don't want to lose access to interior space.

How can we see or access the CAMP plan? Is it available on-line?

Is plan to ignore CAMP recommendations? Can you give budget numbers from time CAMP was done compared to today? (2008 to 2013)

With regard to fixing up the building, circumstances have NOT changed since '05-08. It was always beyond State Parks' means to do this. The CAMP was drafted with that unfortunate fact in mind.

Therefore an use of the Seminary Building must be a) **????** note and complimentary to the primary attraction and use of the parks as a natural sanctuary and place of outdoor recreation and, b) secondary and compatible with outdoor recreation a specified in the Land and Water Conservation Fund deed limitations, rules and policies. This is solid and needs to be followed not thrown away!

If the building cannot be saved without adversely affecting the natural areas of the park, (in at least someway), which is more important? And who decides that?

Listen to the CAMP..." the introduction of new uses into the Seminary Building is not needed to further the primary purpose of the park as a place of outdoor recreation and enjoyment of nature. SESP is already a "premier destination of uncommon quality" as envisioned in the Centennial 2013 Vision of the State Parks Commission. The introduction of new uses into the Seminary Building is not needed to increase park visitation or improve the experience of park users.

How can the building be separated from the park so that the most favorable uses for each can be realized?

Can the "CAMP" plan be revised? If so how soon?

Building Condition

We PERK, want, first and foremost, protection of the natural habitat at St. Edward Park. The protection of the park as a forested open space is critical for the protection of the ecology on the shores of Lake Washington, and for the education of our future generations. We want to ensure that we retain in an urban setting, a glimpse of what it might look like in pristine areas such as Olympia National Park or the Redwoods, etc. People for an Environmentally Responsible Kenmore strongly encourage the habitat protection of St Edward Park to be the top priority.

Can a decision be made before it's too late to save this historic building?

How can several citizens have such a negative impact on a major opportunity to save this endangered structure?

In view of there having been 33 other sites delisted from the National Register of Historic Places just in Washington over the last few years, what jeopardy would Saint Edward have if the seminary building were to disappear? Removal from the register?

I am encouraged that the State Parks Commission is committed to engaging the public in serious discussions regarding ways to preserve and rehabilitate the Saint Edward seminary building. The Seminary Building is a local treasure that deserves to be preserved. Saint Edward State Park without the seminary building would still be a beautiful facility but it would lack the very thing that gives the park history and character, the very thing that makes it unique among all the state parks. As a former student at St Edward's (1955-61) and a former faculty member (1970-1976) I have a passionate interest in preserving the seminary building and I know I am far from alone. It has been painful over the years to watch a beautiful, historic and architecturally significant building steadily deteriorate. To allow this to continue when there are undoubtedly ways by which it could not only be preserved for the ages, but enhanced, would be irresponsible in the extreme.

How much of the building is currently used? Can we slowly reclaim small parts of the building?

How much to rehab the building?

Does the dining room need retro-fitting if it is being used regularly?

It is heartbreakingly deplorable, and the State Legislature should make it a priority. Raise my taxes!

Don't let the historic building rot away. Be open and invite public comment. The secrecy of the lease caused the kerfuffle.

You might consider improvements over a period of years and proceed "gently" as funds are available. 30 year loan?

What is the approximant cost of making the building safe?

How many architecture assessments did we get? What is the consensus cost of stabilization?

In reality, what is the "cost" for getting basic occupation of this building? Does this cost have any chance of bringing met – Realistically? At what point do you cut your loss and stop the process? At some point, would this building just be taken down and something put there that could be occupied at a lower cost than rehabbing current structure? Are we just spinning our wheels doing this since this could cost millions?

Can the public get a copy of the breakdown of the \$40 M rehab estimate? I want a copy of the detailed cost breakdown.

The building, though nice enough, does not seem remarkable enough to go to heroic lengths to preserve.

Alternate Solutions

Historic Society: Where does their funding come from? Donations from local: churches, (invite the pope to visit!); businesses; hikers/visitors; on line donations; for those that donated over \$xxx,xxx, free rental (which room?) first year its open (only 1st year); event planners pay to plan/cater there o/b/o those renting space. Rent to: business for parties, business meeting, seminars, conventions; Boy & Girl Scouts; weddings, wedding rehearsals, and rehearsal dinner; dance classes, port/city events. Give tours of the rooms so they can start envisioning their parties and meetings there. Advertise on the news and radio. Open the pool and use non-chlorine cleaners.

Revenue ideas: partner with tribes (and Archdiocese) to play bingo? A tasteful tribal casino might solve several problems. Also, gym roof is ideal solar locations. Is pool building renovatable into a revenue creating space or best torn down?

Form a broad based statewide grassroots organization that will lobby our state legislature to increase taxes. So that the treasures in our state parks statewide can be preserved. The legislature needs to understand that their current underfunding is ridiculous.

We PERK, want, first and foremost, protection of the natural habitat at St. Edward Park. The protection of the park as a forested open space is critical for the protection of the ecology on the shores of Lake Washington, and for the education of our future generations. We want to ensure that we retain in an urban setting, a glimpse of what it might look like in pristine areas such as Olympia National Park or the Redwoods, etc. People for an Environmentally Responsible Kenmore strongly encourage the habitat protection of St Edward Park to be the top priority.

The building is a liability. It does not contribute to the people's main use of the park recreation. Cost of maintenance is passed the point of no return at current funding levels.

Any alternate use must have direct benefit to the public. Not a private entity using the space for their own business space.

If you MUST bring in some sort of additional revenue from private entities, (and I wish you'd just tax us instead) make certain that the uses are of a recreational or relaxing nature. Kayak rental, horseback riding and stable, rec classes (swimming, triathlon, mountain biking, kids day camps, overnight camp retreats, etc.) As low impact as possible.

What ideas have you found to generate funds to renovate the building?

Redevelop the seminary building as an assisted living center. Partner with a real estate investment trust and an existing company like Aegis or Trillium. The pool and basketball courts would be made open to the public. Is there another "McMenamins" who could develop the building? Google? Do the redevelopment in small stages?

Raise money thru a park bond?

Why not standard gutter rehabilitation and save seismic of sound building for later?

To avoid traffic and parking issues, could the seminary building be leased for use as a school, residential or day use? Public or private.

Washington State Parks should make a concerted effort to recruit corporations and wealthy citizens to raise money for seminary and grounds restoration. Washington is rated as 7th wealthiest state in U.S., we should be able to generate needed funds.

Would you be interested in meeting with public development authorities and historic preservation developers/experts?

Possible concert, venue like gorge amphitheater in eastern Washington?

Renovate to use as a school or camp for youth.

How about getting tax money again? State Parks used to have a budget supported by taxes. Is it out of the question that parks can once again have tax money dedicated to their support? How can we influence, persuade state legislature that parks are important too. How many billion did we just give Boeing to promote their business?

Grey water use. Because of the elevation of the park and the large roof of the structure, a storm water storage system could be constructed and the "mined" water could be sold to the golf course.

Establish a foundation for Saint Edward Seminary preservation and rehabilitation.

Is development of the waterfront as a marina feasible/possible?

Is it possible to maintain the facility for family oriented purposes?

Without a viable economic solution (lease, renovation, redevelopment) option. How will Parks ever hope to save the viability of the building? And surrounding grounds? A public/private partnership that respects the history and intended use of the park while driving an economic solution, is the only way to begin to find a solution, especially if the goal is to save the building.

Other

Given the huge size of the building and the number of occupants that would be necessary to fill it (300-400) would it be possible to eliminate the dormitory side of the building and keep the parts that could be used by the public.

My concern is that a lessor with deep pockets for repairs will never be found that will meet the approval of the neighborhood. We, as neighbors, have become accustomed to our quiet “private” backyard, too much.

If private enterprise takes over the building, will state ensure continued public access to the park? High tech corporations typically have security access requirements.

When considering a lease, state MUST consider the impact on traffic on Juanita Drive when getting public buy in.

Restoration of the pool?

The community play ground that was built with all community dollars and maintained was all community effort is an example of grand interest in a special place for the next generation.

I moved to Washington 7 years ago and have enjoyed several of the State Parks. I live in Redmond and was not aware of this park until a woman visited the Eastside Audubon Conservation Committee Meeting and made us aware of the issues at hand. I volunteered to follow up and attend this evenings meeting. Prior to that I came over to the park on Sunday and hiked down to the lake and around the grounds/Bastyr. I was impressed with the forested area and the lake front. I (and I believe Audubon) would be very supportive of the park maintaining the natural areas around the building for birds and other wild-life. Any use of the building should be supportive of that as a primary goal. Without the dollar issue, ideally, lease to environmental organizations/recreational entities (and perhaps even some of a “commercial” (REI) nature)/scouts/Camp Fire, etc. It could also serve as an educational institution/school/retraining facility, etc. As an individual, it would seem to me that the buildings state of disrepair may be beyond the State/City/private citizens ability to budget. But a consortium of public and private entities may be able to raise funds. But I do agree with the gentleman who stated that this large amount of dollar to expect any entity to put into this square footage.

Concerns About Natural Systems

We PERK, want, first and foremost, protection of the natural habitat at St. Edward Park. The protection of the park as a forested open space is critical for the protection of the ecology on the shores of Lake Washington, and for the education of our future generations. We want to ensure that we retain in an

urban setting, a glimpse of what it might look like in pristine areas such as Olympia National Park or the Redwoods, etc. People for an Environmentally Responsible Kenmore strongly encourage the habitat protection of St Edward Park to be the top priority.

Keep natural areas as is. Especially water front.

No new use that compromises the natural habitat and surface water, water patterns should be entertained.

Volunteers needed for more cohesive landscapes and maintenance program using native and drought tolerant plants and trees.

What is most important to me is the protection of the natural environment of the park. My sons call this the "Super Park", not because of some building, but because of the trees, water, trails, etc. How can we ensure the voices of our children's children are heard in this process moving forward?

Repave (porous material I forgot name??) existing lots and create more parking within existing areas with flow of traffic efficiently and considered with water run-off. Seminary proposals: (usage) weddings, religious retreats, conferences, classes, pool rehabilitated for use, classes = funds. Rent office spaces (created for other business, kayaks, outdoor equipment.)

Development needs to be traffic sensitive. Use should be consistent with the mission of the park.

Danger in leasing to private companies lies in the gradual but inevitable, restructuring on public use and access of the park.

How will the increased traffic on Juanita Drive be addressed.

Park is primary building secondary, see CAMP! Buildings can be replaced, natural, **sublime** park can't.

How can any use of such a large building including many people coming to it, be considered to not impact the rest of the park and the natural experience?

Fish and wildlife preservation? More garbage units?

No more trails!

Highest priority should be protection of natural resources in the park, which I believe is in the CAMP plan, however this should not block construction and remodeling of seminary. The two are compatible.

The paramount and truly unique value of Saint Edward is the natural forest and shoreline environment. I urge WSP not to let the tail wag the dog that is, concern from the building should not compromise the natural environment, in its desire to save the building. We should not sacrifice the truly unique most valuable aspect of the park. The guidelines offered in the CAMP should be respected.

The dorm part obsolete? Save the meeting rooms provide open air education, flora, fauna.

Clarity on impact of building plans (traffic/parking, etc.) on recreational use has not be address.

If the park system doesn't have the money to restore the building. Keep it standing until you do. Don't compromise the purpose of the public park.

How much additional car traffic would not be incompatible with park use. Assuming any new main building use would mean more traffic? Is the orchard productive? And if not, why not? It's only a little dollar but it's be something XXX a lease.

What actions if any are on the record showing proactive agency efforts to devise an appropriate use for the building that would not interfere with the character of natural environment since end of CAMP and McMenamins proposal and temporal defense proposal?

The natural aspect of the park is its most important feature. The building is secondary. Let it crumble rather than lease it to any business, cyber, Bastyr or otherwise.

No more development of additional trail. 8 miles is just right.

What percentage of tax would Kenmore get vs State Parks get if there were a private entity leasing? What triggers the state needing to lease building out? Volunteers' offers can we measure the ecology first? UW Baseline Study.

Lease Process

We PERK, want, first and foremost, protection of the natural habitat at St. Edward Park. The protection of the park as a forested open space is critical for the protection of the ecology on the shores of Lake Washington, and for the education of our future generations. We want to ensure that we retain in an urban setting, a glimpse of what it might look like in pristine areas such as Olympia National Park or the Redwoods, etc. People for an Environmentally Responsible Kenmore strongly encourage the habitat protection of St Edward Park to be the top priority. Can you lease the habitat? To non-profits?

This is a public park and I feel strongly that it should not be used for private business use. I find it outrageous that such a plan was considered and particularly that it was considered in secret.

Full disclosure and public involvement.

Lease 50 years? Who would decide future occupants and if an occupant takes on the building and has relatively few employees and can use existing parking, what would happen with a future lessee with 300 – 400 employees.

Please elaborate on today's Seattle Times article regarding the failure of the lease negotiations with a software company: Was the name of the company not redacted from information provided to the Times as a way of terminating negotiations and causing the company to withdraw? Or if not, who was responsible for the error and will they be disciplined?

Saint Edward is a state park it belongs to us, not to you and certainly not to any corporate business interest under no circumstances should any part of it be leased to private interests.

Is the building currently available to lease? How is it advertised for leasing/renting? Can it be more actively advertised?

Is the state open to a proposal whereby the tenant would fund and do all rehab and TI's in exchange for rent credits in say years 5, 10, 15? Is there a minimum yield the state expects on the facility?

Was the ?? corp proposal (their propose) in line with the general purpose of the park? If so, how was this determined.

Lease process needs to answer the questions in the Friends motion BEFORE the commission is allow to make ANY decisions or commitments. The process must be public.

Solicit businesses to renovate and restore the use as their place of business.

We have been using the Grand Dining Hall for classes 4 months each year since 2007. Our concern public / private partnership expands public access and use of the building rather than eliminate it.

WAVE aquatics is planning to build a pool they need 5 acres. www.renewthelegacy.org

How have you reached out to developers/potential lessors with expertise and passion about historical reservation, communities and revenue?

What became of conversations with Bastyr about possible historic restoration and use for class rooms and student housing? What are the prospects for continuing those discussions?

Do not rush forward without "due diligence". Do not enter agreement before involving the public and do not deal with any unnamed tenant, a violation of state law. Lift the veil of secrecy. Transparency, transparency.

What is the potential for intergovernmental cooperation to occupy the building?

How can you enter an office lease, when office use is not permitted in local zoning or the Park's Commission land classification.

Is the Park's lease decision required to undergo NEPA/SEPA or other environmental review?

The process of changing park use from recreation to commercial business need stronger local participation by: 1) Increased mutual understanding of the issues and facts with an online debate, summary hosted by the City of Kenmore and including State Parks. 2) The required zoning change by Kenmore needs to change from the current "Type 4" decision (i.e., city manager to hearing experience to City Council) to a "Type 5" decision that is only made by the City Council (with public input).

Seminary Building a cherished asset, must be preserved historic asset!! Public, Private Partnership is essential! Only way to realistically finance renovations. This park is for EVERYONE! All users, all types.

On what basis do you have legal authority to lease park land to private developers for a commercial use unrelated to park and recreational activity.

Please invite public participation from the very start of any consideration of other lease proposals.

I, as a citizen, support state parks finding an occupant by extended lease for Saint Edward State Park as long as the basic appearance remains the same for the original structure and the public retains use of the trails, waterfront, and open spaces.

Why can't the Saint Edward State Park accommodate two variety of uses to appeal to an entire community and region.

Of the 2,000+ buildings that Parks manages, have any been leased strictly for private purposes? Do you distinguish between private purposes and leases to private companies for a benefit ancillary to public use? E.g. A hotel, golf course, restaurant etc. which allows the public arguably better **uses**.

Keep government control limited length lease strict use guidelines. Be guided by public trust doctrines.

I do not accept the notion that parks must have concessions and leases and be self-sustaining. Parks are owned by the entire public, are for the enjoyment of the public, and are the responsibility of the public. Legislators must have the courage to tax us for the things that benefit ALL of us (also providing jobs and tourism, btw.)

Since the state can not stabilize the seminary, are we will to sell the building outright?

You stated that the park "must be used for recreational purposes" as per the original charter. How then, can you justify allowing and/or considering use by a commercial business which by its very purpose has not a damn thing to do with recreation? It's about the money and you will twist the rules that the state agreed to originally just to get the money. Stop lying and tell the truth, please.

Lease process was secretive and fast track with no apparent opportunity for public input. What does parks plan to do better in the future?

Can you elaborate on planning/options in recent past McMenamins **???** now? Why is the building important to the mission of the park. How is it currently meeting this need? What is the vision for building use?

How can you balance need for confidential preliminary lease and necessary discussions with public interest in full disclosure and meaningful input?

Before approval, building use should be thoroughly vetted and reviewed to make sure the park natural environment is not harmed: air, water, forests, human impacts, traffic, noise, light levels (light pollution) invasive species. This should be a transparent and public process.

I'm a lifetime user of the park, grew up within walking distance and now raising my own family in close proximity. The natural experience of the park is the heart and soul of the neighborhood. I feel it is

inappropriate to consider using the building in a public park for a private company. The building, if used at all, should be for public use. If that is not financially feasible, I would prefer it not be used at all in order to preserve the natural atmosphere of the park.

Save the forest. Who allowed this building to deteriorate in these 40 years? Cleaning the gutters, mending the roof would not have cost 40 m. Can anybody be sued? Their pensions, their property confiscated? Politicians? Bureaucrats? They had the responsibility to care for St Edward! But acted irresponsibly, let the building go as a **mahnmal** for irresponsibility.

State must be completely transparent when considering a lease. No more of this secret crap!

January 10, 2014

WHEREAS:

1. For many years finding an adaptive re-use for the Saint Edward State Park's Seminary Building to attract funding needed to rehabilitate and maintain this historic structure, without adversely impacting the park as a forested open space of state-wide and regional significance, has been a difficult issue for the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission and the communities valuing the park.
2. For several months the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission has been considering a proposal for re-use of the Seminary Building as a private office.
3. The issue was formally brought before the State Parks and Recreation Commission at its November 14 meeting with little or no public notice or input.
4. Friends of Saint Edward State Park and the general public did not find out about the proposal until the story broke on the Crosscut Seattle news website on November 22.
5. State Parks staff told the Commission it needs to take action in January 2014 to keep this project moving forward without any specific information beyond an expired Letter of Understanding from commercial real estate broker Kidder Mathews on behalf of a client who wishes to remain anonymous and who has not disclosed a detailed proposal for reuse of the building. The action the Commission was being asked to take in January 2014 is a "temporary right of entry agreement" to allow the yet-unnamed tenant to make improvements to the building in advance of anticipated future full occupancy.
6. On January 9, 2014 a story appeared in the Seattle Times saying the project was dead because State Parks could not continue to honor a non-disclosure agreement several staff members had signed in connection with the proposal.

MOVED: Friends of Saint Edward State Park recommend that the Commission not take any action on any proposal until the public, agencies with expertise such as the office of the Attorney General, and the Commission itself, have had adequate time to review it for compliance with the Saint Edward State Park Classification and Management Plan (CAMP), applicable Federal, State and City of Kenmore laws, and for analysis of its potential impacts on Saint Edward State Park. Friends of Saint Edward State Park recommend that the Commission and State Parks staff develop an open, competitive and rigorous process for analyzing any future proposals for re-use of the Seminary Building.

Specific questions and issues that should be part of such analysis include:

1. Does the Commission have authority to lease park property for commercial or any other use unrelated to operation of the property as a park?
2. Is there a land classification within the State Parks CAMP system that allows the proposed use? If so, was it applied to the CAMP map adopted for Saint Edward State Park?
3. RCW 79A.05 places restrictions on leases in state parks; has the proposal been evaluated for compliance with this and other applicable state laws?

4. Saint Edward State Park is zoned "P" (Park) by the City of Kenmore; has the proposal, including whatever occupancy and uses would be allowed either permanently or under a "temporary right of entry agreement", been evaluated for compliance with the City of Kenmore's Zoning Code? Has the City of Kenmore issued any required permits, or any official statements of consistency with its regulations, for the occupancy and uses that would be allowed either permanently or under a "temporary right of entry agreement"?

5. After an intensive and extensive public review process, the Commission adopted the CAMP for Saint Edward State Park in 2007 and finalized it with respect to the Seminary Building in 2008. The final adopted language governing possible re-use of the Seminary Building (pp 17-18 of the pdf document on the State Parks website) reads in part as follows:

"... The introduction of new uses into the Seminary Building is not needed to further the primary purpose of the Park as a place of outdoor recreation and enjoyment of nature. Saint Edward State Park is already a "premier destination of uncommon quality" as envisioned in The Centennial 2013 Vision of the State Parks Commission.... The introduction of new uses into the Seminary Building is not needed to increase park visitation or improve the experience of park users. Therefore any use of the Seminary Building must be a) subordinate and complimentary to the primary attraction and use of the park as a natural sanctuary and place of outdoor recreation and, b) secondary to and compatible with outdoor recreation, as specified in the Land and Water Conservation Fund deed limitation, rules and policies."

Has the State Parks and Recreation Commission, or State Parks executive administration, conducted any analysis of the possible impacts of the proposal on Saint Edward State Park, to comply with the CAMP and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)? Has the State Parks and Recreation Commission, or State Parks executive administration, analyzed the proposal to determine if it would be a "conversion" that would trigger the replacement requirement in the Land and Water Conservation Fund deed limitations, rules and policies governing the federal grant that funded purchase of the Saint Edward State Park property by the State of Washington?

6. A December 16, 2013 memo from State Parks staff (Peter Herzog) to the Commission states: "The temporary right of entry agreement [with respect to the November proposal] does not in any way commit the Commission to any future long-term lease." Is there in fact language in the agreement, or in any agreement governing a future proposal, that states this clearly?

7. In the same Herzog memo it was stated that the tenant would be making improvements to the building. In a meeting with several members of Friends of Saint Edward State Park the proponent's representative, Mr. Dan Mathews, stated that any improvements made under this agreement would be "sunk costs" not recoverable from State Parks in the event a long-term lease does not occur. Does the actual language of the agreement, or in any agreement governing a future proposal, in fact indemnify State Parks against any financial liability for those improvements if there is no long-term lease with this tenant?

8. Various estimates of required parking for re-use of the Seminary Building for office space (at partial to full occupancy) have ranged from over 200 spaces up to 400 spaces. The required surface area for such parking could range from two to four acres, depending on location and layout. Per Kenmore's Zoning Code, other possible re-use activities in the building would trigger different requirements. Analysis of the impacts of such additional traffic and parking on the park's primary functions of recreation and open space, and on the aesthetics of the designated historical landscape surrounding the building, should be included in the initial description of any proposal submitted to State Parks.