



Population-Based Level of Service

Introduction

Benchmarking is intended to help an agency understand how they “stack up” or compare to agencies of similar size, nature, and scope. Today, the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) compiles data from municipalities and parks and recreation agencies across the country annually via their Park Metrics database. This comparison’s results are two-fold: 1) they provide an overview of Si View’s inventory and supply and 2) they show how the supply relates to agencies of similar size and scope.

All metric standards represent the *median* statistic based on the NRPA’s park and recreation agency performance benchmarking tool. It should also be noted that this process is self-selected, meaning park and recreation agencies choose to participate *and* upload their own information. For each benchmark category, the median metric is presented. For the purposes of this benchmark, metrics for all agencies (industry median), agencies with a budget between \$5-\$10 million, all agencies categorized as a special district, and all agencies located in the Pacific Northwest region are listed to provide additional lenses to view benchmark metrics.

Park Land and Trails

Si View’s level of service (LOS) for the number of residents per park aligns with industry averages, but levels of service for park land acres and trail miles exceed industry averages (even without adding in other service providers’ inventories) (**Table 1**). When adding in other service provider’s inventories, Si View’s LOS nearly doubles. In terms of trail mileage, Si View itself manages a lower number of trail miles compared to benchmark agencies, but nearly 30 miles are available when adding in other service providers within District boundaries. Of note, an additional 7 acres of park land are land banked as of the development of this report and will be developed into additional public park space at a future date. Additionally, there is an Edgewick Trail connection being developed as well.

Metric	Si View	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
Residents per Park	2,600*	2,400	2,600	2,200	1,600
Acres of Park Land per 1,000 Residents	39.4**	10.6	9.1	11.6	13.2
Miles of Trail	8.3***	16	19	14	20

*Would decrease to 827 if including other service provider park sites within District boundaries.

**Would increase to 74.7 if including other service provider park sites within District boundaries.

***Would increase to 28.6 if including other service provider trail miles within District boundaries.

Table 1: Si View Park Land and Trails Benchmark

Outdoor Facilities

The percentages in **Table 2** represent the percentage of agencies that offer a given type of outdoor facility/amenity based on the benchmark characteristic. The numbers in **Table 3** represent the related population-based LOS metric (i.e., 1 facility/amenity for every X number of people). Of note, the facilities included in the following tables are defined by NRPA definitions.

In terms of outdoor facility provision, Si View aligns well with other agencies of similar size and scope. Translating facility provision to population-based LOS metrics, Si View is above average when incorporating other service providers’ inventories within District boundaries. It should be noted that a





Master Plan for South Fork Landing is being developed as of this report’s development which will eventually have implications for facility LOS. The future development of the 7 acres of land banked property will also have implications for facility LOS.

Metric	Si View*	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
18-Hole Courses	-	29%	28%	35%	24%
9-Hole Courses	-	14%	11%	23%	8%
Basketball Courts (Standalone)	Yes	84%	86%	79%	78%
Community Gardens	-	52%	53%	52%	61%
Diamond Fields (Total)	Yes	85%	91%	84%	84%
Disc Golf Courses	Yes	20%	20%	27%	24%
Dog Parks	Yes	68%	73%	62%	65%
Driving Range Stations	-	28%	25%	42%	22%
Fitness Zones/Exercise Stations	Yes	22%	26%	25%	22%
Ice Rink	-	19%	21%	30%	14%
Inclusive Playgrounds	-	22%	26%	26%	22%
Multiuse Courts (Basketball, Volleyball, etc.)	-	42%	48%	37%	47%
Multiuse Courts (Tennis/Pickleball)	Yes	37%	41%	43%	39%
Outdoor Restrooms	Yes	28%	33%	32%	37%
Overlay Fields	Yes	10%	8%	14%	12%
Pickleball Courts	Yes	42%	50%	53%	36%
Playgrounds (Aged 5-12)	Yes	26%	30%	29%	31%
Playgrounds or Play Structures	Yes	93%	95%	92%	96%
Racquetball, Handball, or Squash Courts	-	9%	11%	5%	2%
Rectangular Fields (Total)	Yes	83%	90%	83%	73%
Shelters	Yes	**	**	**	**
Spraygrounds/Splashpads	-	**	**	**	**

*Includes other service provider inventories within District boundaries such as city parks, King County parks, state parks, and schools (with public access).

**Not recorded/tracked by NRPA Park Metrics.

Table 2: Si View Outdoor Facilities Prevalence Benchmark





Metric	Si View LOS*	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
18-Hole Courses	-	96,400	68,200	58,300	56,300
9-Hole Courses	-	121,800	63,500	73,600	-
Basketball Courts (Standalone)	6,100	8,000	7,900	5,600	8,100
Community Gardens	-	34,100	46,900	34,400	27,600
Diamond Fields (Total)	1,100	4,100	4,000	3,600	5,000
Disc Golf Courses	9,100	76,800	54,100	61,400	64,700
Dog Parks	6,100	46,900	50,500	36,300	31,600
Driving Range Stations	-	24,400	33,600	3,900	34,000
Fitness Zones/Exercise Stations	18,200	39,200	37,400	27,900	40,600
Ice Rink	-	19,700	20,100	21,800	55,800
Inclusive Playgrounds	-	30,200	31,700	11,400	20,300
Multiuse Courts (Basketball, Volleyball, etc.)	-	19,600	24,100	17,500	10,100
Multiuse Courts (Tennis/Pickleball)	9,100	15,700	17,000	11,700	11,900
Outdoor Restrooms	1,700	5,600	6,000	4,800	3,200
Overlay Fields	9,100	18,100	18,600	17,500	19,900
Pickleball Courts	3,000	12,600	13,100	9,700	13,100
Playgrounds (Aged 5-12)	1,700	4,800	4,500	2,800	3,500
Playgrounds or Play Structures	1,700	3,800	3,800	2,700	2,900
Racquetball, Handball, or Squash Courts	-	47,800	40,600	42,400	-
Rectangular Fields (Total)	1,400	5,000	4,300	3,700	6,800
Shelters	3,600	**	**	**	**
Spraygrounds/Splashpads	-	**	**	**	**

*Includes other service provider inventories within District boundaries such as city parks, King County parks, state parks, and schools (with public access).

**Not recorded/tracked by NRPA Park Metrics.

Table 3: Si View Outdoor Facilities Population-Based LOS Benchmark

Indoor Facilities

The percentages in **Table 4** represent the percentage of agencies that offer a given type of indoor facility/amenity based on the benchmark characteristic. The numbers in **Table 5** represent the related population-based LOS metric (i.e., 1 facility/amenity for every X number of people). Of note, the facilities included in the following tables are defined by NRPA definitions.

In terms of indoor facility provision, Si View offers many different recreation experiences; however, indoor facilities are small in size (context not captured/represented in this benchmarking analysis). Additionally, a true nature center does not exist within the system; instead, Si View manages a barn and historic farmhouse at Tollgate Farm Park along with an interpretive center at Meadowbrook Farm Park.



These more unique amenities highlight the system’s natural and cultural facilities, a metric not captured by NRPA Park Metrics.

Metric	Si View*	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
Aquatics Centers	Yes	30%	40%	35%	30%
Arenas	-	9%	11%	9%	6%
Community Centers (does not include gyms)	Yes	59%	71%	59%	53%
Indoor Ice Rinks	-	12%	14%	17%	12%
Nature Centers	Yes**	33%	30%	38%	20%
Performance Amphitheaters	-	40%	45%	35%	37%
Public Restrooms within Facility	Yes	14%	15%	24%	20%
Recreation Centers (including gyms)	Yes	62%	70%	68%	53%
Senior Centers	Yes	40%	45%	29%	41%
Stadiums	-	19%	20%	14%	24%
Teen Centers	-	12%	14%	11%	12%

*Includes other service provider inventories within District boundaries such as city parks, King County parks, state parks, and schools (with public access).

**The Tollgate Farm Park barn and farmhouse along with the Meadowbrook Farm Park interpretive center are classified as “nature centers” for the sake of this exercise.

Table 4: Si View Indoor Facilities Prevalence Benchmark



Metric	Si View LOS*	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
Aquatics Centers	18,200	58,500	57,000	47,000	57,200
Arenas	-	95,700	82,100	42,400	-
Community Centers (does not include gyms)	18,200	31,600	44,600	30,200	37,300
Indoor Ice Rinks	-	59,300	53,800	58,300	108,500
Nature Centers	9,100**	133,800	76,700	82,100	110,800
Performance Amphitheatres	-	69,600	48,000	63,000	40,600
Public Restrooms within Facility	2,600	15,500	28,400	18,700	9,500
Recreation Centers (including gyms)	18,200	32,800	36,900	24,400	40,600
Senior Centers	18,200	62,200	58,300	60,500	58,700
Stadiums	-	103,200	59,000	66,000	68,000
Teen Centers	-	58,700	52,500	57,000	50,000

*Includes other service provider inventories within District boundaries such as city parks, King County parks, state parks, and schools (with public access).

**The Tollgate Farm Park barn and farmhouse along with the Meadowbrook Farm Park interpretive center are classified as “nature centers” for the sake of this exercise.

Table 5: Si View Indoor Facilities Population-Based LOS Benchmark





General Programming

Si View’s recreation portfolio is diverse and there are not many program areas tracked by NRPA Park Metrics that are not provided. The percentages in **Table 6** represent the percentage of agencies that offer this type of recreation programming based on the benchmark characteristic.

Metric	Si View	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
Aquatics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	68%	73%	68%	61%
Cultural Crafts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	63%	58%	72%	55%
eSports/eGaming	<input type="checkbox"/>	26%	28%	22%	14%
Fitness Enhancement Classes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	82%	86%	84%	73%
Golf	<input type="checkbox"/>	49%	53%	60%	52%
Health and Wellness Education	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	80%	87%	86%	70%
Individual Sports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	76%	79%	81%	84%
Martial Arts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	56%	61%	63%	48%
Natural and Cultural History	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	66%	72%	68%	70%
Performing Arts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	62%	70%	71%	59%
Racquet Sports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	73%	78%	75%	73%
Running/Cycling Races	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	53%	50%	63%	45%
Safety Training	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	70%	73%	77%	59%
Social Recreation Events	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	88%	94%	88%	77%
Team Sports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	86%	90%	88%	89%
Themed Special Events	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	89%	90%	92%	80%
Trips and Tours	<input type="checkbox"/>	62%	66%	74%	48%
Visual Arts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	63%	66%	74%	61%

Table 6: Si View General Programming Benchmark





Targeted Programs

Continuing with Si View’s diverse recreation offerings, many targeted (or specialized) programming is available as well. Of note, the Mt. Si Senior Center provides the robust focus on senior programs and services. Of note, Si View offers recreation programs for people with disabilities; however, the specific focus of adaptive programming or therapeutic recreation is not a core program area.

Metric	Si View	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
After School Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	52%	51%	66%	51%
Before School Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19%	16%	43%	21%
Full Daycare	<input type="checkbox"/>	7%	4%	12%	19%
Preschool	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34%	36%	64%	50%
Programs for People with Disabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	66%	71%	80%	61%
Specific Senior Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	78%	85%	84%	69%
Specific Teen Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	67%	70%	78%	64%
STEM Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	57%	51%	69%	51%
Summer Camp	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	83%	89%	92%	75%

Table 7: Si View Targeted Programming Benchmark

Staffing

Si View’s staffing level is below other agencies of similar size and scope in terms of total full-time equivalents (FTEs) available, but higher in terms of FTEs per 10,000 residents. This statistic reinforces Si View’s high LOS in terms of park land, trail miles, facilities, and programming for the population served, but its low LOS in terms of overall staffing to maintain the vast system.

Metric	Si View	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs)	31	58	65	84	45
FTEs per 10,000 Residents	17	8.9	10.0	14.5	13.6

Table 8: Si View Staffing Benchmark

Budget Metrics

Si View operates on a \$6.5 million budget annually. This figure increases to nearly \$14 million when accounting for capital improvement planning, debt service, and fund balances carried forth from year to year. The \$6.5 million budget aligns with benchmark agencies of similar size and scope and translates into a comparable per acre spending metric. However, similar to the high FTE per 10,000 resident metric, Si View has a high operating expenditure per capita and per FTE comparatively. This again represents how Si View is a bit of an outlier as the residential population is relatively small, but there are a lot of recreation opportunities available to them (this statistic would be different if incorporating the non-resident use of the park system, a metric not captured in this report). Of note, special districts and agencies located in the pacific northwest often have higher revenue per capita metrics than other types of agencies and locations, respectively; Si View fits this trend.





Metric	Si View	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
Annual Operating Expenditures	\$6.6M	\$6.5M	\$7.3M	\$10.7M	\$9.8M
Operating Expenditures per Capita	\$360	\$99	\$112	\$180	\$150
Operating Expenditures per Acre (Park and Non-Park Sites)	\$9,100	\$8,300	\$9,000	\$17,400	\$10,600
Operating Expenditures per FTE	\$211K	\$111K	\$107K	\$118K	\$147K
Revenues per Capita	\$119	\$23	\$26	\$65	\$43
Revenue as a Percentage of Operating Expenditures (Cost Recovery)	33%	25%	27%	35%	26%

Table 9: Si View Budget Metrics Benchmark

Distribution of Operating Expenditures

Si View’s distribution of operating expenditures aligns well with agencies of similar size and scope when excluding “other” expenses, but not when including them. “Other” expenses largely relate to debt service expenditures for Tollgate Farm Park. (Table 10).

Metric	Si View	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
Personnel Services	47%	54%	55%	51%	56%
Operating Expenses	21%	38%	36%	39%	33%
Capital Expense (Not In CIP)	11%	6%	7%	7%	7%
Other	22%	2%	2%	2%	4%

Table 10: Si View Distribution of Operating Expenditures Benchmark

Sources of Operating Expenditures

In terms of sources for operating expenditures, Si View generates more income compared to agencies of similar size and scope; however, Si View reinvests earned income and relies on it for operational budget support (Table 11). Additionally, it is common for parks and recreation agencies to have multiple dedicated funding sources as demonstrated by benchmark statistics.

Metric	Si View	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
General Fund Tax Support	61%	62%	59%	36%	55%
Earned/Generated Income	38%	21%	22%	29%	24%
Special Taxes/Levies (Voter Approved)	-	8%	10%	23%	10%
Special Taxes/Levies (Not Voter Approved)	.1%	5%	5%	4%	5%
Grants	-	2%	2%	2%	2%
Sponsorships	-	1%	1%	1%	1%
Other	.9%	1%	2%	5%	3%

Table 11: Si View Sources of Operating Expenditures Benchmark





Capital Budget

The median statistic for capital improvement spending is \$12 million over a five-year period for all agencies, but that number increases for agencies with larger operating budgets and those located in the Pacific Northwest. Based on capital expenses from 2020-2024, Si View expended approximately \$23 million on improving the park system, an amount that aligns with industry benchmarks for agencies of similar size and scope.

Metric	Si View	Industry Median	\$5M-\$10M Budget	Special Districts	Pacific Northwest
Five-Year Capital Budget Spending	\$23M	\$12M	\$15.1M	\$12M	\$24.5M

Table 12: Si View Capital Budget Benchmark

Discussion and Implications

Parks and Trails

Si View is located in an area that is fortunate to have a multitude of public recreation resources available. The City of North Bend, City of Snoqualmie, King County, City of Seattle, federal agencies, and non-profit agencies all provide parks and recreation facilities and park land in and around District boundaries. Given this relationship, it is recommended to develop and identify a desired level of service for Si View *given* the entire area’s service provision. It is also recommended Si View looks at the percentage of park land, parks (in general), and trail miles provided in relation to other providers to understand the relationship and contribution of each entity. Then, relative ratio goals can be established as appropriate.

Facility Spaces and Programming

Based on Park Metrics benchmarking alone, Si View provides a high LOS for facilities and programs; however, when diving deeper into facility provision, more context is necessary. Si View’s available indoor recreation space is limited and existing programming is constrained by facility sizes. The Si View Community Center and Pool provides four-season recreation activities, but the pool is undersized and general program space is limited. In terms of programmatic enhancements, Si View does not necessarily need to add programming based on benchmark data alone. Instead, continuing to focus on accessibility, therapeutic recreation, and adaptive services for existing programming is warranted.

Staffing

Based on industry benchmarks, Si View is understaffed for what it provides. Of note, Si View’s staffing counts include a large number of programmatic staff meaning there is most likely a lower number of maintenance staff available to maintain the vast park system. When examining operational expenditures, Si View distributes its budget well in terms of what similar agencies do; however, there is a large debt service amount required annually which may be hard to compare to other agencies.

