

A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1542 | FAX 503 797 1793



METRO

Agenda

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL RETREAT
DATE: April 20, 2005
DAY: Wednesday
TIME: 1:00 PM
PLACE: Johnson Creek Watershed Council Conference Room
1900 SE Milport Rd Suite B
Milwaukie, Oregon

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1. DISCUSSION OF THE PARKS BOND MEASURE

ADJOURN

Potential Financing Options Nature in Neighborhoods Acquisition Program

General Obligation Bonds

Description – General Obligation Bonds are the most secure form of debt that Metro can issue. Repayment of the debt is guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the agency. With voter approval, G.O. Bonds can be issued with property taxes levied to pay for the debt service on the bonds. This mechanism was used to finance the 1995 Open Space bonds and the Zoo's capital bonds. Voter approved G.O. Bonds are not subject to the limitations imposed under Measure 5.

Advantages – G.O. Bonds are accepted by the financial markets. Interest rates are relatively low because of the limited risk to investors.

Disadvantages – G.O. Bonds can only be used for capital expenditures, not for operations. Voters must be willing to accept and impose on themselves higher property taxes.

Local Option Levy

Description – Local option taxes can be used for two purposes. They can be imposed for up to five years for operations or up to ten years for capital projects. If a local option combines operating and capital projects it cannot exceed five years.

The levy can be in the form of a rate per thousand of assessed value or a fixed dollar amount that will be levied each year. The same rate or amount will be imposed each year throughout the life of the levy.

All local option levies are subject to the limits of Measure 5. Even if the funds are used to repay bonds the district must categorize the local option levy as subject to the general government limitation. Local option taxes are the first taxes to be reduced if a property exceeds the limits of Measure 5 (compression). Only after the local option taxes are reduced to zero will taxes from the permanent rates be reduced.

The levy would require voter approval. Approval would require a double majority unless the election were held in November of an even numbered year.

Advantages – Property taxes have a lengthy history in Oregon. Voters understand them, and they are easy to administer.

Disadvantages – The levy requires voter approval every five/ten years if it is to continue. The yield can be difficult to estimate depending on the number of other local option levies in the region and whether properties are in compression under Measure 5 (this is not known until 4 months into the fiscal year). A local option levy will also place us in competition with a number of other governments in the region.

Regional Parks System Development Charges

Description – Systems Development Charges (SDCs) are fees that are generally collected when expansion, new development or an intensification of use occurs on property. The fees are used to fund the non-assessable portion of the construction of infrastructure (wastewater, stormwater, transportation and park facilities) needed to support growth in the community and to recoup a portion of the community's investment in the infrastructure already in place.

A Regional Parks SDC could be developed. Revenues would be restricted to capital expenditures. Typically, SDC amounts are determined based on the levels of service established and the estimated cost for each component of the service standards. These standards are multiplied by the per-acre cost for land acquisition/development or the per-unit cost for each component to get the cost per 1,000 population. Then the per capita amounts are derived by dividing by 1,000. The per capita component costs are then combined/summed to arrive at a cost impact per capita. The cost impact per capita is multiplied by the average number of persons per household for the region to calculate the cost per equivalent dwelling unit, the basis on which the SDC is charged.

Advantages – SDCs are becoming more common and accepted. New development pays the costs related to the demand for services generated by that development.

Disadvantages – There has never been a regional SDC in this region. SDC calculations require that service level standards be established, which has not been done on a regional system level. SDCs are prospective and are not used to make up for past deficiencies. SDCs increase the cost of development and could negatively impact affordable housing goals.

Summary of Election Data, Polls, & Community Surveys Regarding Parks and Open Spaces *2000 – 2005*

The following sources and reports were reviewed for this summary:

- Trust for Public Land's LandVote Database - 2005
- The Nature Conservancy/ Trust for Public Land's "Language of Conservation" Report – 2004
- Metro Open Spaces Survey – 2003
- Metro Public Opinion Survey – 2001
- City of Portland Parks Survey – 2004
- Wilsonville Community Recreation Survey – 2005
- Lake Oswego Parks and Recreation Facility Survey Report – 2004
- Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District Survey – 2002
- N. Clackamas Parks and Recreation Stakeholder Interviews – 2001
- Clackamas County Communities Survey – 2000
- N. Clackamas Parks and Recreation Operating Levy Assessment Survey – 2000

LandVote Database and 2004 Election Press Release

The Trust for Public Land

This database contains information about land conservation measures on the ballot around the country since 1996.

- 75% of the 35 land conservation measures around the country between \$150 and \$300 million have passed.
- Nationally since 1996, 70% of the 62 non-statewide land conservation measures that were for \$100 to \$400 million passed. In November 2004, 75% of over 150 local and state measures around the country were successful. In the 62 non-statewide elections since 1996, nearly 40% were sales tax, a third were bonds, a quarter were property taxes, and the remainder were some other type of measure.
- Voter support for land conservation came from Republican and Democratic strongholds alike.
- 12 of the 62 non-statewide measures between \$100 and \$400 million were in the West, and 5 of these passed. This constitutes a 42% pass rate for measures in the West (compared to the 70% pass rate nationally).
- The only bond measure between \$100 and \$400 million that passed in a metropolitan area in the West was Oakland's \$200 mil bond measure in 2002 (another midterm election). It was for "water quality and open space" and it passed with 77% of the vote.
- In Oregon, 5 of the 12 municipal parks bonds passed. These bonds ranged from \$1.5 to \$65 million. Of these 12 bond measures, 5 specified open space (although it is difficult to ascertain if this explicitly meant acquisition). And of these 5 open space measures, 3 passed (Lake Oswego in 1998 for \$6 mil and in 2000 for \$10 mil, and Corvallis in 2000 for \$8 mil). However, all 4 of the property tax measures proposed to raise money for parks/open spaces/acquisition failed. One caution in interpreting these local statistics is that some of the measures that failed lacked a strategic campaign.
- Washington's history is similar to Oregon's. In Washington, 5 of the 15 local parks bonds passed. These bonds ranged from \$3.5 to \$216 million. Almost all of these measures involved open space (although again, it is difficult to ascertain if this explicitly meant acquisition). The 5 bond measures that passed averaged \$6 million.
- An April 2004 national poll demonstrated 65% of voters support increasing taxes to fund state and local government programs to purchase land to "protect water quality, natural areas, lakes rivers or beaches, neighborhood parks, and wildlife habitat."

“Language of Conservation” Survey

The Nature Conservancy and The Trust for Public Land – June 2004

This survey was conducted to determine the everyday conservation vocabulary that resonates with the general electorate.

- The 3 Ws are: Water, Working farms/ranches, Wildlife.
 - Water: voters prioritize water as a critical reason to purchase and protect land, no matter how it is expressed (whether "protect drinking water," "improve water quality in lakes/streams/rivers" or "protect watersheds." Voters closely link land conservation with protecting water. It may be useful to stress "preserving" water quality (as voters do not see it as a problem now; but they recognize the need to preserve what we have.)
 - Working farms/ranches: voters see the loss of these as a bigger problem than the loss open space/natural areas. The term "working" is key.
 - Wildlife: "protecting wildlife" resonates, as voters interpret "wildlife" to fit their locale. However, the term "wildlife habitat" tends to speak more to environmentalists. "Endangered species" is a much more polarizing term than "wildlife."
- Open Space: people perceive this as empty land w/o purpose. "Urban open space" and "Loss of open space" rank even lower in voters' opinions. Other terms that receive negative reactions are "undeveloped land" and "green space." "Natural areas" however, is a term that resonates more positively.
- Trails: attaching a type of use, such as "hiking, biking, a/o walking trails" resonates more powerfully than just "trails."
- Parks: voters respond more positively when parks are connected to a broader goal, such as "creating parks where children can play safely." Repairing, maintaining, a/o preventing closure of neighborhood parks resonates more than creating new parks.
- Planning / Sprawl: the threat of "sprawl" elicits negative response. People dislike messages that evoke more people coming in to their area. Stressing "planning carefully for growth" tests better. Voters view growth as inevitable, so they tend to see "protecting quality of life" as an important reason to fund conservation.
- Ownership: the use of "our" to specify public ownership of the land is key.
- The Future: Evoking children and future generations consistently test well as a rationale for land preservation.
- Conservation: more people identify positively with "conservationist" as opposed to "environmentalist."
- Voluntary: "Voluntary agreements" between private landowners and local government resonate more positively than other land deal terms such as "buying development rights" or "buying interest in land" or "conservation easements."

Metro Open Spaces Survey

McCaig Communications – June 2003

This survey was conducted to assess public attitudes about the need for greater access to nature, support for future open space acquisitions and park development efforts.

- What are the most important environmental/natural resource issues in the community?
 - When presented with 8 different environmental/natural resource issues, “Water Quality/Pollution” and “Air Quality/Pollution” rank as the two most important, while “Growth/Loss of Open Space” ranks third.
- People are significantly more likely to support funding public schools, and slightly more likely to support police/jails and roads/light rail than they are to support buying/maintaining/improving parks.
- How do people respond to measure that would “preserve open space, provide more parks/trails, and maintain/improve water quality,” and which would cost \$30/yr?
 - A slim majority says they would support it (54% For, 43% Against).
 - When the amount is reduced to \$20/yr, 17% of those who were against the \$30 measure change their vote to For. Thus, 62% of all respondents would vote For a measure at \$20/yr.
 - And when the amount is further reduced to \$10/yr, 13% of those who were opposed to the \$20 measure change their vote to For. Thus, 67% of all respondents would vote For a measure at \$10/yr.
- How do the results break down across subgroups?
 - Percentages For and Against a proposed open spaces measure are pretty consistent across the 3 counties.
 - Age and gender, however, are a factor: 18-34 year olds and women are most likely to vote For. Seniors as a subgroup are will also vote For (although by a slimmer margin than the overall average), while men are the only subgroup slightly more likely to vote Against.
- What elements of a measure make voters more/less likely to vote For it?
 - When 16 projects/programs/services that could be included in the measure are presented, the 3 that would make respondents most likely to vote For are:
 - Water Quality
 - Protection for Fish & Wildlife
 - Park Maintenance
 - Nearly 3/4 of respondents indicate that these items would make them more likely to vote For, while about 1/4 of respondents indicated these features would make them less likely to do so.

- OVER -

METRO OPEN SPACES SURVEY – continued

- The 3 projects/programs/services that rank at the bottom of this list of 16 are:
 - Providing More Access to Local Rivers
 - Building 15-mile Trail from Willamette River to Tualatin River
 - Building 20-mile Eastbank Esplanade to Clack Co.

These are the only 3 projects that make a majority less likely to vote For the measure.
- "Protecting Fish & Wildlife By Buying Open Spaces" and "Opening 800 Acres to the Public and Improving Open Spaces" rank in the middle of the list of 16. Just over half of respondents indicate that these projects make them more likely to vote For the measure, while a third indicate they would make them less likely to do so.
- What are the public's funding priorities for the regional parks and trails system?
 - Of 3 issues presented, "Addressing Current Operations and Maintenance Shortfalls in Existing Parks" ranks as the highest priority. Over a third of respondents see this as important, and less than a third see it as not-so-important.
 - While about a third of respondents rank the other 2 issues – "Purchasing Natural Areas, Open Spaces, and Additional Land for Future Parks" and "Creating New Parks by Providing Public Access on Property Currently Publicly-Owned" – as important, a greater percentage of respondents (44%) view these issues as not-so-important.
- What issues are most important to people?
 - When respondents are asked how important 6 different issues are to them personally, "Protecting Water Quality" and "Protecting Local Streams and Rivers" are at the top of the list (over 90% of respondents see these as important).
 - The 2 issues that rank at the bottom of the list of 6 are "Guaranteeing Places of Natural Beauty/Solitude w/i 30 Min. from Home" and "Providing More Access for Recreational Activities." Still, about 2/3 of respondents view these as important, while only 1/3 viewed them not-so-important.
 - "Protecting Fish & Wildlife" and "Preserving and Protecting Open Spaces and Natural Areas" rank in the middle, with over 80% seeing these as important, and less than 20% seeing them as not-so-important.
- Respondents are split almost evenly regarding whether their community is growing too fast or at about the right pace.
- 75% of respondents are familiar with Metro, 25% aren't.

Metro Public Opinion Survey

Davis & Hibbits – May 2001

This survey was conducted to assess public attitudes towards growth management, land use, transportation, wildlife habitat, and parks/open space.

- Number of and proximity to neighborhood parks and natural areas are 4 features that rank in the top 5 out of 15 neighborhood features with which respondents are satisfied.
- Growth: when asked about the metro region's quality of life in the next 20 years:
 - Half of the respondents expect it get worse, and half of those people identify overpopulation/population growth as the reason.
 - Wa. County residents, longer-term residents, and residents living in suburban and rural-changing-to-suburban areas are more likely to maintain this view.
 - Traffic congestion is by far the biggest concern related to population growth
 - Air/water pollution and loss of forest/farm land are the next biggest concerns.
- Quality of Life Values: When asked about values that contribute to quality of life:
 - Respondents rank "Forest/Farmland Preservation" third and "Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection" fourth ("Home with Yard & Privacy" is by far the most important value, followed closely by "Less Traffic Congestion").
 - Clackamas Co residents are most likely to rank land preservation high, while younger respondents and those living in rural-changing-to-suburban areas are most likely to rank fish and wildlife protection high.
 - "Having Park or Greenspace Near Where You Live" ranks toward the bottom of the overall values list (but closer in percentage to the 3rd/4th values than the 3rd/4th values were to the 1st/2nd). Still, "park or access to park" is at the top of list of priorities that people have for regional centers (almost tied with street improvements and transit options).
- Acquisition vs. Maintenance:
 - A narrow plurality of respondents feel the focus for parks and open spaces regionally should be on maintenance rather than on purchasing additional open space/natural resource land.
 - Respondents in Damascus and those in rural-changing-to-suburban areas narrowly prefer acquisition.
- Park/Open Space Priorities: when asked to rank 6 spending priorities, respondents select:
 - 1st: operations and maintenance of existing parks
 - 2nd: acquiring property along streams to protect fish and wildlife
 - 3rd: planning and development of land for parks
 - 4th: completing the regional trail system
 - 5th: acquiring natural area lands and open spaces
 - 6th: acquiring new lands for neighborhood parks

City of Portland Parks Survey

Globe Research – August 2004

This survey was conducted to determine residents' preferences and usage patterns of park and recreation resources within the city.

- What issues are most important to residents?
 - Of 11 community issues, "Improving Water Quality in Local Rivers & Streams" ranks as third most important (after education and jobs), while "Increasing Open Space" and "Acquiring New Land for Parks" rank last.
 - Of 4 park-specific issues, "Improving and Maintaining Facilities and Programs" rank higher than "Increasing Open Space" and "Acquiring New Park Land."
- Trails: 30% of respondents use them, and most respondents are very satisfied with trail availability and quality. Thus, trails fall in the "Low Importance, High Satisfaction" quadrant of the matrix that compares park services.
- Natural Areas: "*Quality* of natural areas" is more important than "*availability* of natural areas." Respondents are generally satisfied with availability and quality of natural areas - they fall in the "High Importance, High Satisfaction" quadrant of the comparison matrix. However, focus groups indicate that there are not enough natural areas in/around Outer SE.
- Open Space: "Amount of open space" ranks 4th in services that residents are most dissatisfied with. But only 45% said this was a very important issue. Thus, open space falls in the "Low Importance, Low Satisfaction" quadrant of the comparison matrix.
- What are the issues that fall in the "High Importance, Low Satisfaction" quadrant?
 - restroom quality & availability
 - cleanliness and maintenance of facilities
 - programs for disabled individuals
- Resource allocation: When 3 options are provided, preferences are split:
 - 38% prefer developing local parks with traditional recreation services
 - 28% prefer developing natural open spaces
 - 22% prefer developing trails
- Natural Wildlife Areas: When 13 different types of park and recreation area facilities are presented, "natural wildlife areas" rank #1 with "swimming pools" as the type of facility respondents want more of.
- Misc. Portland Statistics:
 - Just over half the city's residents have lived here for 15 or more years, while 20% have lived here fewer than 5 years.
 - Almost 60% of households do not have children.

Wilsonville Community Recreation Survey

MIG – February 2005

This survey was conducted to elicit information about recreation interests, behavior, attitudes, and participation in Wilsonville.

- Use: 82% of respondents use parks. Of these, 24% do so to enjoy nature or the outdoors, while another 20% do so to walk or bike for exercise - these are the 2 most popular reasons for park use.
- Perception of Need: 85% of respondents feel that more parks are needed. As for type of park most needed, the highest ranked is "nature park with trails" (27%), while the next highest is "park with river/creek frontage" (19%).
- Trails: 90% of respondents think more bikeways/walkways are needed. 5 of the 10 most popular activities are trail-related. As for the type of trail most needed, the highest ranked is "off-street paved pathways for biking, walking, rollerblading" (30%), while "unpaved walking/hiking trails" and "multi-use trails" tie for second at 16%. Of the people who don't use trails, 22% don't use them b/c they don't know where they are.
- Water: 65% think greater access to the Willamette is needed, esp. for active use.
- Open Space: 95% of respondents feel that some type of public use of natural open space areas is appropriate; only 5% feel that these sites should be used for habitat protection only. Most people believe that the type of use is a site-specific decision.
- Priorities: The highest priorities for use of available \$ are "swimming pool/water playground" (29%) and "large, multi-use recreation center" (20%). Note: these were 2 of 9 facility types from which respondents were asked to choose, and all 9 types on the list were a physical facility as opposed to other types of spending like operation / maintenance / acquisition.
- Funding:
 - 68% of respondents indicate they would support some type of measure for parks/trails/recreation facilities, depending on the type of project proposed and the total amount of the bond.
 - A third of respondents said they would *not* support a tax measure. (The pollsters note that this is high - the average in other NW communities has been 20%.)
 - Of those who *would* support a measure,
 - half would support up to \$25 annually
 - a quarter would support up to \$50 annually
 - the remainder would support up to \$100 or more

Lake Oswego Park and Recreation Facility Survey

GreenPlay – November 2004

This survey was conducted to identify park and recreation facilities and activities that citizens desire for the next twenty years, and to determine the current funding climate for such improvements.

- Preferences/Use: when presented with a list of 31 park & recreation facilities, over 50% of respondents noted a need for "off-road walking & biking trails," "large community parks," "natural areas/wildlife viewing," and "small neighborhood parks." Of the 31 facilities on the list, these 4 (plus swimming pools/water parks) were ranked most important.
- Priorities: when presented with a list of 6 park & recreation goals, respondents were most supportive of assuring adequate funding for facilities and programs (80%). 68% of respondents were supportive of developing connecting trails, and 64% were supportive of acquiring property for open space and park development.
- Acquisition: 64% were supportive of acquiring property for open space and park development, 16% were unsupportive, and 20% were neutral. When respondents were asked to choose the top 4 goals (of the 6) that they would be *most* supportive of paying more money to fund, the acquisition goal overall ranked 5th.
- Funding: 82% of respondents felt it is important for the City to fund parks & recreation services. However, 30% of respondents were opposed to any tax increase to fund City projects.
- Findings & Recommendations: according to the report, there is a continued desire for acquiring land for the development of trails, and for acquiring land that may currently fall in rural areas for future park and preservation. Thus, the authors suggest that purchases of land should continue, with the City targeting areas along the Willamette as well as south of the existing urban services boundary.

THPRD Survey

Davis, Hibbits, McCaig – May 2002

This survey was conducted to gauge the reaction to a proposed property tax levy for operation, maintenance, and possibly acquisition funds for THPRD.

- ❑ People are more likely to support funding law enforcement than parks (49% to 12%).
- ❑ What are the chances for passage of a property tax measure for parks?
 - 57% of respondents would vote For a property tax increase of \$.15 per assessed value for maintaining and operating parks for 5 years.
 - Women and younger voters are more likely to vote For.
 - 49% of respondents would vote For a property tax increase of \$.34 per \$1000 assessed value to fund maintenance, operations, *and acquisition*.
 - According to the pollsters, it would be more difficult to sell a more expensive measure involving acquisition than a less expensive measure for just operations/maintenance, but voters did not necessarily reject acquisition. The difference in responses may have had to do as much or more with cost than with acquisition vs. operations/maintenance.
 - However, the pollsters remind their audience that tax increases which start polling at under 50% support do not have a great chance for passage.
- ❑ What makes people more/less likely to vote Yes?
 - Programs that keep kids out of trouble, funding to maintain and operate current programs & facilities, and improving security and safety make respondents *more* likely to vote yes.
 - Acquisition & building of sports fields make respondents *less* likely to vote yes.
 - 54% were more likely to support a measure if it included funds to purchase open spaces & natural areas that are threatened by growth and development.
- ❑ Neighborhood parks and open spaces are the most frequently used services/programs (at half using frequently/sometimes, and half using occasionally/never).
- ❑ The majority of district residents think the THPRD already has enough money to maintain existing programs & services. (Almost 40% of people who would vote FOR think the district has enough \$ to maintain current services, while 75% of those AGAINST think that the district has enough \$ already.)
- ❑ In the pollster's experience, it is easier to pass a tax increase measure when an electorate is upbeat than when it is in a grumpy mood about local conditions - and the pollster sees a significant majority of those w/I the THPRD upbeat about the direction of Wa. County.
- ❑ Those who claimed more knowledge of the District were more likely to favor a tax increase for the parks than those who claimed little/no awareness.

North Clackamas Parks and Recreation – Stakeholder Interviews

Barney and Worth – June 2001

Gathering 21 community leaders' perceptions of the issues and challenges facing the district was the first step in a public outreach process to ultimately update the master plan.

- Growth: increased densities push parks and open spaces to the top of the list of concerns - purchasing parkland while it is still available could appeal to those who disapprove of increased densities.
- Priorities: focus is shifting away from neighborhood parks and toward open space, linear bike and walking trails, and sport fields.
- Trails: besides open space, linear parks and walking/biking paths along stream corridors would be appealing.
- Service duplication: there is confusion about which government agency is in charge of various parks/facilities.
- Acquisition vs. maintenance: when presented with a choice as to where the last dollar in the budget should go, nearly all respondents chose acquisition.

Clackamas County Communities Survey

Riley Research Associates – September 2000

The purpose of this study was to hear from a representative cross-section of the County regarding the values and future needs of the citizens, while providing a gauge of current satisfaction with the County.

□ Parks and Open Space:

- Only 2% of respondents in the survey thought "Parks/Open Space" was the biggest challenge facing their community (as opposed to "traffic/roads" and "growth/sprawl" - each of which was selected as a big challenge by a third of respondents).
- Still, at least some folks did see more parks and green space as a way of *addressing* those big challenges: 10% of respondents suggested more parks (while a quarter of respondents suggested "more/improved roads" and "less development").
- In the satisfaction/importance matrix, "Parks and Open Space" was located squarely in the High Importance/High Satisfaction quadrant. ("Roads" and "Growth" were the only 2 issues that fell in the High Importance/Low Satisfaction quadrant.)

North Clackamas Parks and Recreation – Operating Levy Assessment Survey

Intercept – July 2000

- Over 2/3 of respondents think parks are "very" (as opposed to "somewhat" or "not-at-all") important.
- Satisfaction:
 - About 1/4 of respondents rate the park & recreation system as fair or poor, and the main problem these respondents cite is that there are "not enough parks in general."
 - 44% of respondents think there is the right amount of large regional parks in their area, while almost 38% think there are too few.
- Priorities: "Maintenance" and "recreation programs" rank higher than "open spaces and natural areas" and "trails and pathways."
- What are the chances for passage of a levy for parks?
 - Almost 70% of respondents would favor a \$.25 per assessed \$1000 for maintenance and acquisition.
 - Of the 20% who said they would oppose this levy, half cited "raising taxes too much" as a reason.
 - Of the 30% who were either opposed or unsure of that \$.25 per levy, 20% said they would favor a levy at a reduced rate of \$.15 per assessed \$1000.

To: Metro Councilors
From: Carl Hosticka

3-22-05

042005c-02

SEATTLE.GOV City Services Departments Staff Directory About Seattle City Contacts



SEARCH: Seattle.gov Go

Seattle Parks and Recreation

Expands your sense of home

Ken Bounds, Superintendent

[Parks](#) | [Community Centers](#) | [Activities](#) | [Reservations & Rentals](#) | Pr

[home](#) / [news & publications](#) / [calendar](#) / [a-z index](#) / [jobs](#) / [contact us](#) / [faq](#)

Go



SEATTLE PARKS AND RECREATION

PRO PARKS LEVY Project Funding by Category

Click to scroll down to:

**NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS, GREEN SPACES,
TRAILS, AND THE ZOO LEVY**

Funding by Category for \$198.2 Million Levy Lid Lift

PROJECTS & PLANNING

- Board of Park Commissioners
- Pro Parks Levy
- A-Z Project List
- Acquisition
- Development
- Environmental Stewardship, Maintenance & Programming
- Opportunity Fund
- Citizen Oversight
- Pro Parks History
- Community Center Levy
- Major Maintenance
- Horticulture
- Sustainable Building & Development
- Neighborhood Matching Fund
- Planning Documents
- Parks Standards
- Seattle Parks Foundation

Acquisition	\$ 26,000,000
Neighborhood Park Acquisition	\$ 16,000,000
Greenbelts/Natural Areas Acquisition	\$ 10,000,000
Development	\$ 102,826,000
Neighborhood Park Development	\$ 52,854,000
Major Neighborhood Park Development	\$ 23,100,000
Playfields and Facilities	\$ 17,872,000
Boulevards and Trails	\$ 9,000,000
Maintenance and Programming	\$ 61,354,000
New Park Maintenance	\$ 7,649,000
Environmental Stewardship	\$ 9,701,000
Enhanced Park and Facility Maintenance	\$ 5,274,000
Recreational Programming	\$ 16,945,000
Zoo Maintenance and Programming	\$ 21,785,000
Opportunity Fund	\$ 10,000,000
Acquisition and Development Opportunity Fund	\$ 10,000,000
TOTAL*	\$ 200,180,000

GENERAL INFORMATION

Seattle Parks & Recreation
100 Dexter Ave N.
Seattle, WA 98109
(206) 684-4075
CONTACT US

* This figure represents \$198.2 million in levy proceeds and \$1.98 million in anticipated interest earnings

Updated September 13, 2002

(RETURN TO TOP)

[home](#) | [news & publications](#) | [calendar](#) | [a-z site index](#) | [jobs](#) | [contact us](#) | [faq](#)

[Parks](#) | [Community Centers](#) | [Activities](#) | [Reservations & Rentals](#) | [Projects & Planning](#)

Seattle.gov: [Services](#) | [Departments](#) | [Staff Directory](#) | [Visiting](#) | [Mayor](#) | [City Council](#)

042005c-03

Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

Vision, outcomes, objectives and means

DRAFT: March 15, 2005



METRO

A vision for the greater Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area

We envision an exceptional, multi-jurisdictional, interconnected system of neighborhood, community, and regional parks, natural areas, trails, open spaces, and recreation opportunities distributed equitably throughout the region. This region-wide system is acknowledged and valued here and around the world as an essential element of the greater Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area's economic success, ecological health, civic vitality, and overall quality of life.

As the region grows and develops, this region-wide system also expands, diversifies, and matures to meet the needs of a growing and changing population. All residents live and work near and have access – regardless of income – to nature, areas for recreation and leisure, and public spaces that bring people together and connect them to their community.

This region-wide system of parks, natural areas, trails, open spaces, and recreation opportunities:

- Drives the region's economy and tourist trade
- Preserves significant natural areas for wildlife habitat and public use
- Enhances the region's air and water quality
- Promotes citizens' health, fitness, and personal well-being

- Connects the region's communities with trails and greenways
- Provides sense of place and community throughout the region
- Supports an ecologically sustainable metropolitan area

There is a powerful, shared ethic that a region-wide system is essential. There is widespread recognition of its value from economic, personal health, community, and ecological perspectives. Tools for its support are well established, including partnerships, policies, and funding. Individuals and organizations from all parts of the region appreciate and champion the system through education, advocacy, and stewardship.

Definitions

Objective: 1. Something toward which effort is directed or an aim, goal or end of action. 2. A strategic position to be attained or a purpose to be achieved.

Outcome: Something that follows as a result or consequence.

Means: A method, course of action, or instrument by which an act can be accomplished or an end achieved.

Objective	Outcomes	Means	Who	When	Lead
1. Drives the region's economy and tourist trade	<p>1.1. The system is marketed as part of the region's overall quality of life and constitutes a strategic advantage in attracting new and expanded businesses. People and business interests alike value and invest in the system as an essential service that maintains clean water and air quality, preserves and restores habitat, manages storm water and provides environmental buffers.</p>	<p>1.1.1. Develop a marketing strategy that includes naming the system, developing a key message, and integrating the message into existing economic marketing packages. 1.1.2. Promote the system to all audiences using a speakers' bureau; publications that describe the system's value and importance to the region at all levels; web-based newsletters, journals, etc 1.1.3. Formally adopt fish, wildlife and botanical icons at the local and regional levels as highly visible public benchmarks for measuring the success of protection and restoration efforts. Publicize and integrate the icons by electronic and print media across the region, outside the urban growth boundaries, and on both sides of the Columbia River. 1.1.4. Research and distribute analyses of the economic benefits of the system to various audiences and integrate their findings into local economic development and other marketing strategies. 1.1.5. Establish a regional business council to promote the economic benefits of the system and to encourage investment in it by the business community.</p>	<p>1.1-3. Metro, local and county governments, park providers, conservation nonprofits, planning and other local and regional departments, business associations, chambers of commerce, media 1.1.4. Scientists, educators, agencies, consultants 1.1.5. Metro, key business leaders</p>		
	<p>1.2. The system is valued as a core element of the region's identity and is a significant attraction for tourists interested in nature-based experiences and recreation within a metropolitan and regional context.</p>	<p>1.2.1. Market the system, its attributes and uses – hiking, biking, boating, stewardship activities, etc. – as reasons to visit the region. 1.2.2. Integrate the message (1.1.1.) into local and regional tourism marketing strategies.</p>	<p>1.2.1. Metro, business leaders, local chambers</p>		
	<p>1.3. Elements of the system – natural areas, parks, trails and recreation resources – are strategically located in or near the region's employment centers to revitalize neighborhoods and commercial areas, and to provide attractive settings for new residential, commercial and industrial development.</p>	<p>1.3.1. Identify opportunities for targeted investment in parks, trails, natural areas, and/or recreation development, and amend local and county comprehensive plans and ordinances to include such opportunities. 1.3.2. Provide parks and open space, prior to redevelopment/construction, as an economic catalyst to developers. 1.3.3. Encourage developers to include tracts of accessible open space in development plans.</p>	<p>1.3.1-4. Metro, county and local jurisdictions</p>		
	<p>1.4. Elements of the system – natural areas, parks, trails and recreation resources – serve as catalysts for regional and economic development.</p>	<p>1.4.1. Work with state, business and local economic development groups to devise economic development strategies that promote the system as a key component of the region's livability, its high quality of life, enhanced property values, and attractiveness for new businesses and workforces, etc.</p>	<p>1.4.1. Metro, state and local economic interests</p>		

Objective	Outcomes	Means	Who	When	Lead
2. Preserves significant natural areas for wildlife habitat and public use	2.1. Additional significant natural areas are conserved, protected and continually acquired ensuring that vital habitat and regional biodiversity are protected.	2.1.1. Develop, adopt and implement a regional biodiversity recovery and management plan. 2.1.2. Pool and share best management techniques and successes from around the region, and coordinate public and private resources to encourage and facilitate large-scale volunteer biodiversity protection efforts. 2.1.3. Focus acquisition efforts on prioritized habitat and natural areas as identified in the biodiversity plan (e.g., large tracts).	2.1.1. Metro, local and county jurisdictions, all natural resource managers (nonprofits, universities, state and federal agencies) 2.1.2. Metro, local governments, watershed councils, nonprofits, schools, private property owners		
	2.2. Functional wildlife corridors throughout the region are conserved, protected, restored and managed.	2.2.1. Coordinate and focus corridor acquisition, restoration and management activities on connections between habitat areas as identified in the biodiversity plan.	2.2.1. Metro, local jurisdictions, state and federal agencies, land trusts		
	2.3. Invasive plant, animal and aquatic species are removed, controlled or managed where appropriate. Native species are reestablished throughout the region.	2.3.1. Pool and coordinate public and private resources to conduct large-scale volunteer eradication efforts. 2.3.2. Pool and coordinate public and private resources via comprehensive database, forums and training sessions, etc. to share best management practices. 2.3.3. Develop a regional invasive plant policy and plan for aggressive removal, control, management and coordinated implementation at local and regional levels. 2.3.4. Develop education programs and outreach activities to increase public awareness of invasive species and to motivate citizens to eradicate and control them whenever possible.	2.3.1. Metro, local governments, state agencies, local and state weed boards, soil and water conservation districts, universities, neighborhood associations, private property owners		
	2.4. Activities that harm natural areas and interfere with public use and enjoyment, such as illegal dumping, discharge of pollutants, vandalism, and inappropriate recreation activities, are substantially reduced.	2.4.1. Pool best management practices and conduct large-scale volunteer clean up efforts. 2.4.2. Increase public education efforts, security and monitoring by land managers, rangers and law enforcement to reduce harmful activities. 2.4.3. Develop a process to identify, promote and publicize recreation activities appropriate for natural areas, wildlife corridors and other habitat areas.	2.4.1-2. Metro, local governments, private property owners, federal agencies (e.g., Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Forest Service)		
	2.5. People of the region treasure and enjoy immediate access to nature and its experiences within a short walk of their homes and work places, whether it's a natural area, inner city park, garden or green space.	2.5.1. Develop quantitative and qualitative level of service standards and implementation strategies at local and regional levels.	2.5.1. Park providers and planners		

Objective	Outcomes	Means	Who	When	Lead
	2.6. Schools and youth groups regularly visit and use natural areas as outdoor laboratories or classrooms which helps build a lifelong relationship with nature and an attitude of stewardship toward one's landscape.	2.6.1. Develop region-wide school and youth programs, field trips, volunteer and other educational activities to teach and offer practice in stewardship.	2.6.1. Metro, existing educational infrastructure, nonprofit groups		
	2.7. Citizens and private landowners, all levels of government, organizations (e.g., watershed councils, nonprofits, land trusts), and business interests (e.g., the development community) promote a united stewardship ethic that is reflected in the active protection and restoration of natural areas for wildlife and people.	2.7.1. Implement smart growth and other coordinated policy, planning, design and conservation efforts among residents, businesses, government and the development community to protect biodiversity. 2.7.2. Define what constitutes a 'stewardship ethic' and develop strategies for popularizing it at neighborhood, community and regional levels. 2.7.3. Incorporate 2.7.2. into existing local and regional economic development, tourism and other marketing strategies.			
	2.8. Ongoing funding is available for acquisition of significant natural areas for wildlife habitat and public use.	2.8.1. Develop a multi-tiered funding strategy.			
3. Enhances the region's air and water quality	3.1. A healthy urban forest canopy is recognized throughout the region as an essential element of the system that contributes to storm water management, habitat, and air quality.	3.1.1. Actively monitor, increase and manage the extent and health of the region's urban forest canopy through coordination with private property owners and public agencies. 3.1.2. Expand urban tree programs region wide including planting of more trees, expanded technical assistance and improved management of existing tree canopies.			
	3.2. An interconnected system of local and regional trails, bike paths, pedestrian-friendly streets and other transportation alternatives significantly reduces vehicle miles traveled and miles of impervious road surfaces. Both reduce air pollutants and storm water runoff pollution.	3.2.1. Continue expanding, improving and implementing the regional trails plan. 3.2.2. Identify and pursue alternative trail and transportation funding sources for planning and implementation. 3.2.3. Develop resources (e.g., plans, design guidelines) to help local jurisdictions develop and implement their own trail plans.			

Objective	Outcomes	Means	Who	When	Lead
	<p>3.3. The system is an essential, "green" part of the urban infrastructure and intentionally used to improve the region's air and water quality.</p>	<p>3.3.1. Establish a scientific target for Effective Imperviousness within each watershed and sub-basin. 3.3.2. Use public parks, natural areas, green streets, bioswales, etc. as demonstration sites for practical and innovative storm water management techniques, and as ways to educate public and private landowners about the multiple benefits that rivers, streams, wetlands and floodplains provide.</p>			
	<p>3.4. The region's watersheds successfully maintain the long-term ecological integrity of streams, wetlands, rivers and their floodplains, including their biological, physical, and social values.</p>	<p>3.4.1. Develop, integrate and implement cooperative watershed management strategies. 3.4.2. Focus land acquisition, restoration, regulations and stewardship programs on maintenance of the hydrological integrity of sub-basins, and watersheds as a whole. 3.4.3. Integrate existing surface water management plans with regional efforts, and coordinate overall goals for fish and wildlife habitat protection.</p>	<p>3.4.1-3. Bureau of Environmental Services, Water Environment Services, Clean Water Services, American Water Works Association, Clark County, Endangered Species Act plans</p>		
	<p>3.5. An informed, passionate public consistently advocates for restoration activities, resource conservation and appropriate use of natural areas to maintain the region's air and water quality.</p>	<p>3.5.1. Use public parks and natural areas as demonstration sites to illustrate innovative natural resource management techniques and educate private and public landowners about the multiple benefits that rivers, streams, wetlands, and floodplains provide. 3.5.2. Develop an advocacy strategy and implementation plan that will help residents recognize the importance of air and water quality, and encourage their active involvement in its maintenance and improvement.</p>			
<p>4. Promotes citizens' health, fitness, and personal well-being</p>	<p>4.1. The region's parks, green spaces, community centers and public/private facilities provide a range of diverse, affordable and accessible recreation resources to all, regardless of income, physical ability or location. People reach such resources easily by foot, bike, horse or public and private transportation.</p>	<p>4.1.1. Develop standards that, at a minimum, define measures of affordability, accessibility, desired facility characteristics, and funding strategies for every neighborhood. 4.1.2. Apply and coordinate these standards at regional and local levels to identify common goals, geographic and activity deficiencies, and development strategies responsive to local needs. 4.1.3. Formulate grassroots education programs to increase citizens' awareness of the connection between nature and an improved quality of life.</p>	<p>4.1.1. Existing scientific, educational infrastructure 4.1.2. Metro, GPAC, local jurisdictions, existing educational infrastructure, neighborhood associations, local citizen groups</p>		

Objective	Outcomes	Means	Who	When	Lead
	<p>4.2. People connect parks and green spaces with their physical and mental health. A variety of inviting, fitness-based resources enable everyone to improve and enrich his or her daily well being.</p>	<p>4.2.1. Develop full-service neighborhood community centers, trails and sports facilities within a short walk, bus/car trip or bicycle ride of every home in the region. 4.2.2. Develop education and activity programs that increase citizens' awareness of the connection between nature and an improved quality of life.</p>	<p>4.2.1-3. Local jurisdictions, private interests, existing educational infrastructure, neighborhood associations, local citizen groups</p>		
	<p>4.3. The regional system contains easily accessible places for contemplation of nature, appreciation of natural beauty, and refuge from the stresses of urban life.</p>	<p>4.3.1. Identify geographic and activity deficiencies to help determine development goals. 4.3.2. Develop and conduct education programs to increase citizens' awareness of the connection between nature and an improved quality of life.</p>	<p>4.3.1. Metro, local jurisdictions 4.3.2. Existing educational infrastructure, neighborhood associations, local citizen groups</p>		
	<p>4.4. The regional system provides places and settings that encourage creativity and other experiences that help residents maintain and improve their psychological well being.</p>				
<p>5. Connects the region's communities with trails and greenways</p>	<p>5.1. All residents have physical access within fifteen minutes of home or destination, by foot, bike, horse or transit, to a comprehensive, well-designed system of neighborhood, local, regional and inter-regional land and water trails.</p>	<p>5.1.1. Continue expanding, improving and implementing the existing regional trails plan. 5.1.2. Define accessibility, including distance and physical ability measures, and integrate them with regional and local service standards. 5.1.3. Identify gaps in the existing regional system, including neighborhood and other local connectors. Create and implement an integrated plan for their development. 5.1.4. Identify trail corridors that meet ADA and other accessibility requirements. Establish cost estimates and schedules for their development. 5.1.5. Develop and strategically distribute a variety of high quality, materials (e.g., signs, maps, brochures, web-based tools, etc.) to clearly identify the system and encourage its use among a broad public.</p>	<p>5.1.1-4. Metro, local and county jurisdictions, trails groups 5.1.5. Metro, media and graphic consultants</p>		

Objective	Outcomes	Means	Who	When	Lead
	5.2. Trails and greenways are a fundamental infrastructure actively used to augment transportation networks and link parks, natural areas, waterways, public facilities (schools, libraries, etc.), neighborhoods, communities, towns and regional centers.	5.2.1. Develop and strategically distribute a variety of high quality, materials (e.g., signs, maps, brochures, web-based tools, etc.) to clearly identify the system and encourage its use among a broad public. 5.2.2. Adopt and incorporate pedestrian, bicycle and waterway networks into all existing transportation systems and transportation planning. 5.2.3. Expand the regional trails inventory and plan by integrating identified local connectors to and from neighborhoods, parks, public facilities, waterways and other system features.	5.2.1-3. Metro, local and county jurisdictions		
	5.3. The trail and greenway system connects existing and future natural resource and other significant areas on the edge of and beyond the metropolitan region (e.g., the coast, mountains and Oregon's wine country).	5.3.1. Develop a plan for a larger trail network that connects significant natural and cultural landscape resources.	5.3.1. Metro, four county jurisdictions, Willamette Valley interests, scientific and cultural stakeholders		
	5.4. The trail and greenway system is funded on an ongoing basis as an affordable commuter transportation alternative that also provides access to nature, diverse recreation opportunities, and other settings that improve peoples' health and well being.	5.4.1. Seek bond measure funding for regional trail and corridor acquisition, construction and maintenance. 5.4.2. Seek dedicated state funding (e.g., State Recreation Trails Program, etc.) for interregional trails planning and implementation. 5.4.3. Maximize use of Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and other transportation funds for trail development throughout the region.	5.4.1-2. Metro, trail advocacy groups		
	5.5. The region's major arterial streets complement the trail and greenway system as well-designed, attractively planted corridors for pedestrians, cyclists and autos alike.	5.5.1. Develop and adopt arterial design and planting standards and integrate them into local and regional transportation plans.	5.5.1. Metro, local jurisdictions, Portland Department of Transportation		
6. Provides sense of place and community throughout the region	6.1. The system as a whole is an integral part of our identity as a region – a shared sense of place that crosses all boundaries. Elements of the system – significant natural, scenic and cultural features, and the ordinary landscapes of our daily lives, reflect the region's essential character and identity, regardless of boundary.	6.1.1. Develop a coherent, readily understood message about the region, including key phrases, images and aspirations. Integrate it into existing local and regional marketing and acquisition strategies. 6.1.2. Acquire and manage areas of varying size, from small neighborhood pocket parks and gathering spaces to public plazas and regional scale nature preserves.	6.1.1. Metro, local jurisdictions, citizen and "friends" groups		
	6.2. Individual elements of the system, such as natural areas, interconnected trails, parks and public spaces, help physically and visually define and distinguish each neighborhood, community and city in the region.	6.2.1. Identify features whose character and value to citizens helps define individual places.	6.2.1. Metro, local jurisdictions, citizen and "friends" groups		

Objective	Outcomes	Means	Who	When	Lead
	6.3. Elements of the system facilitate a sense of community by providing physical and cultural settings for diverse activities that foster community interaction at all levels.	6.3.1. Use elements of the system to organize volunteer, nonprofit, business and governmental activities that support and protect the system, and encourage active participation in neighborhood, local and regional community life. 6.3.2. Develop public gathering spaces and/or facilities in residential neighborhoods, town and regional centers.	6.3.1. Metro, local jurisdictions		
	6.4. People value and appreciate 'living in nature' as part of the region's identity.	6.4.1. Acquire and ecosystem-manage natural areas of varying size – from small neighborhood pocket parks to regional scale nature preserves and refuges – throughout the region. 6.4.2. Where natural areas are no longer possible, provide small parks, gardens or restored green spaces as nature experiences at the neighborhood, community and city level.			
7. Supports an ecologically sustainable metropolitan area	7.1. The region's diversity of habitat types, plants and animals is protected, conserved and restored across the region's urban and rural landscape.	7.1.1. Develop, adopt and actively implement a bi-state, four-county Regional Biodiversity Recovery and Management Plan. Integrate it with other sustainability and transportation plans and planning efforts. 7.1.2. Identify significant natural areas for acquisition/protection and formally integrate them into transportation, land use planning and other sustainability plans and projects (e.g. green streets) through regional and local policies. 7.1.3. Develop and implement a tool box of innovative strategies (e.g., acquisition, regulatory, stewardship and incentive programs) to conserve the region's natural resources and ensure that large and small refugia are interconnected in every neighborhood in the region.	7.1.1-3. Metro, four-county coalition, scientific community, natural resource managers		
	7.2. In all the region's neighborhoods, parks, greenways and other natural areas protect and maintain clean water, wildlife and access to nature.	7.2.1. Use parks and natural areas as models of best management practices for storm water, water usage, and pest management. 7.2.2. Partner with nonprofit organizations, schools and government agencies to use natural areas as classrooms and on-site laboratories for environmental education and interpretation of watershed health, fish and wildlife habitat issues.	7.2.1. Local jurisdictions 7.2.2-3. Metro, existing educational infrastructure		
	7.3. Long-term, comprehensive federal, state, and regional funding, strongly supported by elected officials at all levels, the business community and the general public, is established to continually expand, operate and maintain the system.				

Objective	Outcomes	Means	Who	When	Lead
	7.4. Full-time professionals staff regional and local elements of the system and collaborate with nonprofit organizations, private property owners and citizens to protect the diverse flora and fauna associated with urban natural areas.	7.4.1. Hire and fund, on an ongoing basis, staff with expertise in urban ecosystem management, restoration practices and community collaboration projects.			
	7.5. The ecological health of the system's natural resource elements is continually monitored.	7.5.1. Establish standards and monitor changes in the system on a site specific, and watershed and regional scale over time. Produce a bi-annual "Ecological State of the Region" report and distribute to all residents of the region. 7.5.2. Establish a regional ecosystem research consortium to conduct, document and apply new research to strategies that protect, restore, and manage the urban ecosystem and the region's natural areas. Develop monitoring as a combination of adaptive management and new information to influence choices and applications. 7.5.3. Complete a regional assessment of and recommendations for the ecosystem services or "natural capital" values of the system, including natural areas, streams, floodplains, and wetlands. 7.5.4. Place quantitative and qualitative values on individual elements and on the system as a whole to help make policy and investment decisions.	7.5.1-3. Metro, universities, scientific community, nonprofits, land trusts 7.5.4. Universities, federal agencies		
	7.6. Biodiversity protection and recovery efforts in the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Region are integrated with similar urban initiatives in Salem, Albany, Corvallis, and the Eugene-Springfield area. Parks, trails, and natural area planning in the urban areas are integrated with efforts to maintain biodiversity goals throughout the Willamette Valley.	7.6.1. Develop, adopt and implement a Willamette Valley Ecosystem Protection and Enhancement Strategy.	7.6.1. Metro, four-county coalition, Willamette Valley coalition, scientific community, Willamette Urban Watershed Network, Governor's Willamette Initiative, nonprofits, Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center		
	7.7. Natural areas, parks, trails and recreation resources are recognized, embraced and used as an essential infrastructure in public and private community planning and design, permitting and development, especially in areas outside of the Urban Growth Boundary and throughout the Willamette Valley.				

042005CR-04

CD-R

Verbatim

D31271A281344111

BALLOT 2006

COUNCIL VERSION

COMPACT
disc
Recordable