

**From:** Jay Arnold [<mailto:jay@jayarnold.org>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 20, 2012 12:07 PM  
**To:** Houghton Council  
**Cc:** Paul Stewart  
**Subject:** follow-up on questions about parks levy

Thank you for your consideration of Kirkland Proposition #2, the parks levy that will be on the ballot in November. At your last meeting, you had a number of questions where I owe you a follow-up. Answers are below.

In addition, I will be at your September 24<sup>th</sup> meeting for any further questions.

Jay

Co-Chair, YES! for Great Kirkland Parks

<http://YesForGreatKirklandParks.org>

(425) 985-3517 cell

## **Questions from the Houghton Community Council**

### **Does the levy specifically allocate capital vs. maintenance?**

The levy raises \$2.35 million per year. For the first seven years, the levy allocates \$1.255 million per year for capital and renovation projects. (Details are in the attached fact sheet from the city.) Several projects are identified that would be funded:

- Docks & Shoreline Renovations (\$800,000)
- City-School District Playfields Partnership (\$1 million)
- Juanita Beach Boat & Bathhouse Replacement (\$1.2 million)
- Edith Moulton Park Renovation (\$1 million)
- Waverly Beach Park Renovation (\$500,000)
- Interim Development of the Cross Kirkland Corridor (\$1.6 million)

- Establish an opportunity fund for parkland and open space acquisition (\$2.5 million)

These projects reflect the consensus of the Parks Funding Exploratory Committee (PFEC), a citizen group that included representatives from throughout the city. The PFEC met from September 2011 through May 2012 to examine parks needs, now and in the future. The levy package and above projects reflects their recommendation and priorities.

The levy also allocates \$1.095 million per year for parks maintenance and operations. This restores maintenance levels after budget cuts to parks, provides lifeguards at Houghton, Waverly, and Juanita beaches, and continues the Green Kirkland Partnership. It also adds maintenance of O.O. Denny Park and the Cross Kirkland Corridor.

Beyond the first seven years, specific projects are not prioritized. In total, city has over \$94 million in unfunded parks capital projects in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The PFEC recognized an ongoing need and studied several potential projects, but did not have consensus on next set of priorities. The city would have flexibility on allocation depending on maintenance needs, renovation needs, or other development or acquisition opportunities, but funds can only be used for parks purposes.

### **What's going to happen for future projects?**

Future decisions will be made based on recommendations from the Park Board. The Parks Board criteria for prioritizing projects (attached) includes health & safety issues, fiscal values and leveraging of funds, feasibility and project readiness, city residents served, and geographic distribution.

The Parks Board, which is made up of 8 citizens appointed from throughout the city, makes its recommendations in an open, public meeting, with opportunity for public review and comment. Both the Parks Board and City Council hold public hearings as part of the budget process.

### **What other jurisdictions have permanent levies?**

According to the King County Assessor's office, the following cities have passed ballot measures with permanent levies:

- In 2007, Redmond passed a permanent 35 cent levy for fire, police, and school safety.
- In 2007, Redmond also passed a permanent 5 cent permanent levy for parks.
- In 2010, Black Diamond passed a permanent 27 cents levy for fire, police, and EMS service.
- In 2010, Shoreline passed a permanent 28 cent levy for public safety, parks and recreation, and community services.

In addition, cities and counties have passed companion levies associated with park bonds. An example was the 2002 parks ballot measures where Kirkland had two propositions on the ballot: one was the parks bond, and a second for a permanent levy covered the additional maintenance cost of newly acquired parks.

### **What did the 2002 ballot measures cost?**

In 2002, Kirkland voters approved a \$8.4 million 20-year parks bond and a permanent maintenance levy for newly acquired parks (raising about \$670,000 per year). In 2011, the costs for those measures were:

- 2002 parks bond: 7.9 cents per \$1000 of assessed value. This bond would be retired in 2022.
- companion maintenance levy : 6.0 cents per \$1000 of assessed value

### **Can the permanent levy be changed or rescinded in the future?**

Money raised by the levy is required to be used for parks purposes. However, the City Council could reduce the levy rate or rescind the levy in the future.



## CRITERIA FOR RANKING PARKS CIP PROJECTS

	Criteria	None 0 Points	Low 1 Point	Moderate 2 Points	High 3 Points
1	Responds to an Urgent Need or Opportunity, Conforms to Legal, Contractual or Government Mandate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No need or urgency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspected need with no substantiation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspected need based upon visual inspection, public comment</li> <li>Suspected threat of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report or other documentation has been prepared</li> <li>Confirmed threat of development</li> <li>Fills important gap in park system</li> <li>Significant public comment—survey, petition, public hearing</li> <li>Legal, contractual, gov't mandate</li> </ul>
2	Health and Safety Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No known issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspected health or safety issue with no substantiation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspected need based upon visual inspection, or public comment</li> <li>visible deterioration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented evidence of unsanitary condition, health and safety code violations, injury</li> </ul>
3	Fiscal Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leveraging of funds through partnerships, grants, bonds or volunteers is unlikely</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leveraging of funds somewhat likely through partnerships, grants, bonds and volunteers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leveraging of at <i>least</i> 1/2 project funding available from other sources;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leveraging of <i>more</i> than 50 percent of project costs from other sources</li> </ul>
4	Conforms to Park Open Space Plan or Other Adopted Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not in any plan document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified in Comprehensive or Functional plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helps meet level of service objectives</li> </ul>
5	Feasibility, including Public Support and Project Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project simply an idea</li> <li>No public input</li> <li>No other supporting information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some public involvement such as letters, workshops</li> <li>Professional report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schematic or conceptual level approval</li> <li>Property identified</li> <li>High public support</li> <li>Completed appraisal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction documents complete</li> <li>Option or right of first refusal, willing seller</li> </ul>
6	Implications of Deferring Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact</li> <li>No imminent threat of development;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Temporary repair measures available without significant liability or added future cost</li> <li>Indications of possible development</li> <li>Program quality limited or reduced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of possible structural failure</li> <li>Confirmed private development sale possible</li> <li>Program participation limited or reduced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Imminent possible structural failure, facility closure, or other similar factor</li> <li>Program cancellation</li> <li>Unable to meet level of service</li> <li>Imminent sale for private development</li> </ul>

7	Benefits to Other New Capital Projects or an existing Park/Facility/Service, or Service Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No association with or impacts to other projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal benefit to existing or other projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate benefit such as relieving overuse at another facility</li> <li>Corrects minor problem at adjacent facility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant benefit such as providing added capacity to a facility</li> <li>Corrects major problem at adjoining facility</li> </ul>
8	Number of City Residents Served	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No residents served</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only one neighborhood served</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More than one City neighborhood served</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will serve a City-wide population</li> </ul>
9	Maintenance and Operations Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires substantial new M &amp; O, no current budgetary commitment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources/capacity available without additional budget commitment</li> <li>Requires new resources which are available or likely available in budget</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has minimal or no impact on existing M &amp; O resources</li> <li>Resources already allocated or planned for project in budget</li> <li>M &amp; O requirements absorbed with existing resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial reduction in M&amp;O.</li> </ul>
10	Geographic Distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duplicates service, significant number of resources available in area, level of service overlap</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate number of Parks are nearby, minimal level of service overlap</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parks nearby, no level of service overlap, and gaps in service identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Underserved area. No facilities within service area.</li> </ul>