CITY OF KIRKLAND
Department of Parks & Community Services
505 Market Street, Suite A, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3300
www.kirklandwa.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: Kurt Triplett, City Manager

From: Jennifer Schroder, Director of Parks and Community Services
Michael Cogle, Deputy Director

Date: June 30, 2015

Subject: PROS Plan: Final Draft

Recommendation

That the City Council reviews a final draft of the Park, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan and provides input and feedback. Following Council review, the PROS plan will be brought back to a future Council meeting for final adoption along with final park impact fee rates.

Background

An initial draft of the updated Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan was reviewed by the City Council in 2014. A final draft of the PROS Plan has now been completed, with review of goals and policies by the Park Board, Planning Commission, and Houghton Community Council. The PROS Plan has also been presented to the community as part of the City's Kirkland 2035 planning process.

The Goals section of the Plan is provided herein as **Attachment A**; the entire plan can be reviewed on the City website (here). A printed copy of the Plan has been placed in the Council's study room.

The final draft features primarily minor edits and corrections with the exception of two substantive policy changes:

Level of Service – Investment per Person

At their meeting of April 7, 2015, the City Council reviewed park impact fee methodologies and expressed a preference for the City to develop a new standard for determining level of service (LOS) for the park system. This standard, referred to as "Investment per Person", looks beyond typical quantitative measurements (such as acres per capita) to consider the full breadth of the City's capital assets (both land and improvements) to ensure that each resident continues to receive an adequate amount of parks and recreational services. This methodology is gaining popularity in the region and is being used by a number of local cities.

In part, the methodology will be used to calculate park impact fees, ensuring that the City's park system is able to keep up and adapt with future growth. An impact fee rate study will be completed later this year, with new rates anticipated to be adopted by the end of 2015. Once the rates are determined, the PROS Plan will be edited to include the new LOS measurement and will be brought back to the City Council for final adoption.

The "Investment per Person" LOS does not preclude the City from maintaining acreage goals and other targets, such as ¼-mile park proximity to households, and the final draft Park Element continues to refer to these traditional measurements to guide future planning for the community's park system.

New language describing the "Investment per Person" LOS can be found on page 134 of the Plan, which is provided as **Attachment B**. In a related change, goals for park acreage are now described in the plan as "guidelines" or "goals" rather than "standards".

Legal and financial analysis of the new methodology in still underway. The final document may include technical changes to the proposed "investment per person" methodology sections and guideline descriptions to ensure the new LOS methodology/guideline mix is appropriate and defensible.

Economic Development

As requested by the City Council, a new policy, found on page 36 of the Plan, has been added to support the City's economic development efforts. The specific new language is as follows:

Policy 10.1 – <u>Support Economic Development</u>
Utilize strategic capital investments in parks, trails, open spaces, recreation and art to encourage and support economic development and revitalization.

<u>Actions/Objectives</u>

- Target and time investments in park facilities to support economic development in and around the Totem Lake Urban Center, downtown Kirkland and its waterfront, and along the Cross Kirkland Corridor.

Next Steps

Staff is seeking final comments and input on the PROS plan from the Council. Any changes will be incorporated into the final version of the plan which will be brought back to the Council for adoption later this year.

Attachments

10 SERVICE GUIDELINES

In addition to and in support of the parkland gap analysis discussed in Chapter 4, a level of service (LOS) review was conducted as a means to understand the distribution of parkland acreage by classification and for a broader measure of how well the City is serving its residents with access to parks and recreation facilities. Service guidelines are the benchmarks the City is trying to attain with their parks system; the level of service is a snapshot in time of how well the City is meeting the adopted guidelines.

Service Guidelines

As part of the 2010 PROS Plan, the City of Kirkland adopted a set of guidelines for parkland classifications and recreation facilities. These guidelines reflect Kirkland's unique qualities, inventory and community interests.

Figure 8. Parkland Guidelines

Type	*Existing Guideline*
Community Park	2.095 ac/1,000
Neighborhood Park	2.06 ac/1,000
Waterfront Parks	--- ac/1,000
Natural Parks & Open Space	5.7 ac/1,000
	9.855 ac/1,000

Attachment A

Figure 9. Recreation Facility Guidelines

Type	*Existing Guideline*
Baseball Fields	1 field/5,000 people
Softball Fields	1 field/10,000 people
Soccer / Football	1 field/7,500 people
Tennis Courts	1 courts/2,000 people
Skate Parks	1 per 20,000 people
Outdoor Pools	1 per 35,000 people
Indoor Pools	1 per 20,000 people

Level of Service Assessment

The level of service assessment is based on the existing parkland and facility inventory for Kirkland.

Inventory Adjustments

Residents of Kirkland have access to a wider array of parks and facilities than those provided only by the City itself. The community makes use of school sites, private parks and other facilities to meet their recreation needs. Upon review of the City's land inventory and past practices regarding how recreational lands are accounted, a few adjustments to the inventory are warranted and proposed as follows.

In the neighborhood park classification, this Plan recommends that the acreage for North Rose Hill Woodlands Park and Carillon Woods be reallocated between neighborhood parks and natural parks. Both of these parks are larger than the typical Kirkland neighborhood park, and both contain areas more appropriately suited to the natural park classification. Instead of the entire acreage for these properties being allocated to only the neighborhood park classification, this Plan recommends a minor redistribution to reflect the use and nature of these parks and better reflect the more active park areas within the neighborhood park classification.

Figure 10. Neighborhood Park Rebalancing

		Re-Allocation by Classification	
Park	Acreage	Neighborhood Park	Natural Park
Carillon Woods	9.1	3.2	5.9
North Rose Hill Woodlands Park	21.1	3.8	17.3
Subtotal	**30.2**	**7.0**	**23.2**

Additionally, the 2010 PROS Plan noted the inclusion of school lands into the level of service calculations for neighborhood and community parks. As a result of the recent annexation, the amount of school lands available within the City has been updated to reflect the City's larger boundary. The previous plan assigned 50% of the available recreational lands at primary (elementary) schools to the neighborhood park

classification and 100% of the available lands at secondary (middle and high schools) to the community park classification. This Plan maintains this allocation method, and these sites were included in the walkshed-based gap analysis. However, due to the somewhat restricted access to school properties, the City should continue to assess parkland access and distribution to ensure that residents are well-served with available parkland.

Figure 11: Public School Land Allocations

School	Recreational Land Acres	Allocation to Inventory
Alexander Graham Bell Elementary School	2.5	1.2
Benjamin Franklin Elementary School	1.1	0.6
Carl Sandberg Elementary	5.5	2.7
Helen Keller Elementary School	3.7	1.8
Henry David Thoreau Elementary	2.7	1.3
John Muir Elementary	3.6	1.8
Juanita Elementary School	3.9	2.0
Lakeview Elementary School	3.5	1.7
Mark Twain Elementary School	4.6	2.3
Peter Kirk Elementary School	3.6	1.8
Robert Frost Elementary School	0.0	0.0
Rose Hill Elementary School	3.4	1.7
	Subtotal	**19.1**
Finn Hill Middle School	15.5	15.5
Kamiakin Middle School	15.9	15.9
Kirkland Middle School	9.4	9.4
Emerson High School	2.0	2.0
Juanita High School	16.9	16.9
Lake Washington High School	17.4	17.4
International Community School	10.3	10.3
	Subtotal	**87.4**

Current Level of Service

At approximately 819 acres, the current, overall level of service for the City of Kirkland is 9.95 acres per 1,000 people, which includes acreage of public school recreational lands, private homeowner association parks and private open space tracts.

Figure 12. Current Levels of Service by Park Type

Type	*Existing Guideline*	*Current Inventory**	*Current Level of Service*	*Current Surplus / (Deficit)*
Community Park	2.095 ac/1000	207.92	2.54 ac/000	**36.70**
Neighborhood Park	2.06 ac/1000	107.57	1.25 ac/000	**(60.80)**
Waterfront Parks	--- ac/1000	76.76	0.94 ac/000	**---**
Natural Parks & Open Space	5.7 ac/1000	426.52	5.22 ac/000	**(39.34)**
	9.855 ac/1000	**818.77**	**9.95 ac/000**	

* NOTE: Current Inventory column includes private parks, inventory realocations and recreation areas of public schools (50% for elementary; 100% for secondary)

Attachment A

Figure 13. Current Levels of Service by Recreation Facility

Type	*Existing Guideline*	*Current Inventory*	*Current Level of Service*	*Current Surplus / (Deficit)*
Baseball Fields	1 fields/5000 people	25	1 per 3,270	**8**
Softball Fields	1 fields/10000 people	10	1 per 8,173	**1**
Soccer / Football / Lacrosse	1 fields/7500 people	9	1 per 9,081	**(2)**
Tennis Courts	1 courts/2000 people	33	1 per 2,477	**(8)**
Skate Parks	1 per 20000 people	1	1 per 81,730	**(3)**
Outdoor Pools	1 per 35000 people	1	1 per 81,730	**(2)**
Indoor Pools	1 per 20000 people	1	1 per 81,730	**(3)**

Using the service guidelines from the previously adopted plan, figures 12 and 13 illustrate the current level of service for recreation lands and facilities, along with current surpluses or deficits to those existing service oals. No guidelines were previously adopted for waterfront parks. It should be noted that the above tables include not only City owned and managed facilities, but also school district lands and facilities, private parks and private open space tracts. Even with the inclusion of privately-held parks and open space tracts, the City has a combined acreage deficit of nearly 80 acres - most of which is within the neighborhood park classification.

Today, the City is meeting its goals for community parks, baseball fields and softball fields. The City has a current deficit for neighborhood parks, natural parks and several facility types including soccer/football fields, tennis courts, skateparks and pools. As was previously noted, the largest apparent current deficit is with regard to neighborhood parks and available sport fields.

Proposed Revisions to Service Guidelines

The use of numeric guidelines is a limited tool to assess how well the City is delivering park and recreation services, since the numeric values alone neglect any recognition for the quality of the facilities or their distribution (i.e., the ease to which residents have reasonable, proximate access to park sites). This Plan re-emphasizes the importance of distribution guidelines as noted in the Goals Chapter (Chapter 3) as a means to provide parklands and facilities within reasonable distance for residents.

While public ownership of a broad range of recreation lands is crucial to the well-being of the City, the simple use of an overall acreage standard does not match with the citizen input received during this planning process. Residents were particularly interested in the availability of trails and active use parks (neighborhood and community parks) within a reasonable distance from their homes. To more appropriately measure and target toward that desire, the service guidelines, and the resulting service snapshot, were re-evaluated and re-aligned during the development of this Plan.

This Plan proposes an increase in the acreage guideline for community parks to 2.25 acres per 1,000 people, primarily to emphasize the relative importance of this park classification. Community parks are often the 'work horse' parks of a park system in that they provide the land base to accommodate a range of mixed recreational uses,

park infrastructure (i.e., parking, restroom, etc) and the potential for sport fields. One consideration is the future use of the Taylor Fields site. At the present, the site is partially developed with baseball fields; however, the City should negotiate with King County for the re-use of this site as a community park.

This Plan also proposes a change to the neighborhood park guideline and recommends a reduced goal of 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. Although the need for additional and more well distributed neighborhood parks was noted from the community outreach, the existing guideline of 2.06 acres per 1,000 creates a significant acreage deficit. This deficit is only slightly diminished by the proposed acquisitions noted in the needs chapters. This Plan recommends a reduction to this guideline to better align the goal for the provision of neighborhood park with the potential for the City to secure additional parkland for this use as the City grows and redevelops. Although the guideline is reduced, an acreage deficit remains; however, the City's primary focus should be toward the acquisition of new neighborhood park sites to fill the documented gaps in distribution as described earlier in this Plan.

This Plan also proposes the elimination of numeric guidelines for natural parks and open space. While numerical planning standards are common for helping to determine a desirable number of neighborhood parks per thousand residents, they do not translate easily to natural parks because the uniqueness of the land base itself. Additionally, approximately 92 acres of sensitive or protected lands have been set aside as privately held open space tracts via the platting and land development process. The inclusion of future, protected sensitive or critical areas as part of the broader greenspace network further clouds the relevance of a numeric standard for natural parks and open space. While it is still important for the City to protect sensitive lands to set them aside as part of a greenspace system, priority should be focused toward either the acquisition of or negotiation for additional, adjacent natural park lands to ensure the protection of unique or special habitat areas and sufficient land is available to accommodate future trail connections.

The following table illustrates the effect of the proposed standards.

Figure 14. Proposed Levels of Service by Park Type

Type	*Proposed Guideline*	*Current Inventory**	*Projected Additions*	*Projected 2035 Surplus / (Deficit)*
Community Park	2.25 ac/1000	207.92	25	**21.42**
Neighborhood Park	1.5 ac/1000	107.57	27	**(6.43)**
Waterfront Parks	--- ac/1000	76.76		**---**
Natural Parks & Open Space	--- ac/1000	426.52		**---**
	3.75 ac/1000	**818.77**	**52**	

* NOTE: Current Inventory column includes private parks, inventory realocations and recreation areas of public schools (50% for elementary; 100% for secondary)

This Plan proposes a reduction to the guidelines for skateparks and tennis courts to better align the existing demand for these facilities to the likely development of new facilities city-wide. The proposed skatepark goal is 1 facility per 40,000 people, and the proposed tennis court goal is 1 court per 3,000 people. This Plan also proposes the elimination of the guidelines for outdoor pools with the expectation that the City would prioritize and focus capital dollars toward the construction of new indoor,

all-season aquatic facilities, rather than constructing a new outdoor pool that has a 3-month operating season.

The following table illustrates the revised guidelines for recreation facilities.

Figure 15. Proposed Levels of Service by Recreation Facility

Type	*Proposed Guideline*	*Inventory*	*Projected Additions*	*Projected 2035 Surplus / (Deficit)*
Baseball Fields	1 fields/5000 people	25		**6**
Softball Fields	1 fields/10000 people	10		**0**
Soccer / Football / Lacrosse	1 fields/7500 people	9		**(4)**
Tennis Courts	1 courts/3000 people	33		**1**
Skate Parks	1 per 40000 people	1		**(1)**
Outdoor Pools	--- per 35000 people	1		**---**
Indoor Pools*	1 per 40000 people	1	1	**(1)**

* NOTE: For the purpose of this study, it is assumed that the existing Juanita High School Pool will be closed. A new facility would be a replacement

The proposed capital projects noted in the next chapter help ameliorate some of the projected acreage needs to meet the proposed guidelines.

Investment per Person Standard

This Plan proposes a new standard for determining the level of service for its park system. Known as "Investment per Person", this standard ensures that each person receives access to a constant amount of parks and recreational facilities as the community grows. The City provides this value by capital investment in parks and recreation facilities that are most appropriate for each site and which respond to changing needs and priorities as Kirkland grows and the demographics and needs of the population change. This standard allows the City flexibility in determining the precise mix of facilities that the City builds to meet the needs of its current and future residents.

In determining Kirkland's park "Investment per Person", the following formula is used:

Replacement Value of Parks & Recreation Inventory / Population = Capital Investment per Person

The following table indicates Kirkland's Capital Investment per Person Standard.

Figure 16. Proposed Investment per Person Standard

Replacement Value of Inventory	*Population*	*Investment per Person*
$ - Pending -		**$ - Pending -**

Data used to develop the Investment per Person standard can be found in Appendix G.

all-season aquatic facilities, rather than constructing a new outdoor pool that has a 3-month operating season.

The following table illustrates the revised guidelines for recreation facilities.

Figure 15. Proposed Levels of Service by Recreation Facility

Type	*Proposed Guideline*	*Inventory*	*Projected Additions*	*Projected 2035 Surplus / (Deficit)*
Baseball Fields	1 fields/5000 people	25		**6**
Softball Fields	1 fields/10000 people	10		**0**
Soccer / Football / Lacrosse	1 fields/7500 people	9		**(4)**
Tennis Courts	1 courts/3000 people	33		**1**
Skate Parks	1 per 40000 people	1		**(1)**
Outdoor Pools	--- per 35000 people	1		**---**
Indoor Pools*	1 per 40000 people	1	1	**(1)**

* NOTE: For the purpose of this study, it is assumed that the existing Juanita High School Pool will be closed. A new facility would be a replacement

The proposed capital projects noted in the next chapter help ameliorate some of the projected acreage needs to meet the proposed guidelines.

Investment per Person Standard

This Plan proposes a new standard for determining the level of service for its park system. Known as "Investment per Person", this standard ensures that each person receives access to a constant amount of parks and recreational facilities as the community grows. The City provides this value by capital investment in parks and recreation facilities that are most appropriate for each site and which respond to changing needs and priorities as Kirkland grows and the demographics and needs of the population change. This standard allows the City flexibility in determining the precise mix of facilities that the City builds to meet the needs of its current and future residents.

In determining Kirkland's park "Investment per Person", the following formula is used:

Replacement Value of Parks & Recreation Inventory / Population = Capital Investment per Person

The following table indicates Kirkland's Capital Investment per Person Standard.

Figure 16. Proposed Investment per Person Standard

Replacement Value of Inventory	*Population*	*Investment per Person*
$ - Pending -		**$ - Pending -**

Data used to develop the Investment per Person standard can be found in Appendix G.