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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SECTION PENDING
BACKGROUND

The Si View Community Center and Pool was constructed in 1938 as part of the King County parks system. In 2003, the Si View Metropolitan Park District was formed to create a separate taxing district to support the much needed repairs and operational funding for the community center and pool. After the MPD was formed, its first comprehensive planning effort resulted in the preparation and adoption of the 2006-2011 parks plan. The 2006-2011 Comprehensive Plan has been the District’s guiding policy document for the past decade. That plan was a critical tool in directing the District’s growth and development in areas of capital projects, programs, facilities and parks.

The 2006-2011 Comprehensive Plan included a recommended capital improvement program with a list of proposed facility improvements and development projects to be implemented as funding became available. The capital improvement program (CIP) component included Si View Park’s master plan and field improvements, Si View Pool renovations and upgrades, Si View Community Center upgrades, renovations and remodeling, as well as sewer connections for all Si View facilities.
Since the adoption of the previous parks plan, Si View MPD has successfully accomplished a number of capital improvements to enhance the provision of parks, trails and recreation in the District. The historic Si View Community Center had a series of repairs completed in 2012 that included its aging exterior, pool windows, roof and siding replacement, rain gutter repairs and the addition of building insulation. In 2013, significant improvement were made to the Si View Park with the addition of two new playgrounds, sports field upgrades, new restrooms, new basketball court, new picnic shelter and picnic areas, a ½-mile paved perimeter trail, as well as parking and landscaping improvements.

The Tollgate Farm Park development project provided parking, restrooms, a playground, picnic area and a perimeter trail connecting to the trail along North Bend Boulevard (SR 202). This project was completed in the summer of 2015.

The completion of the Si View Community Center remodel project occurred in the summer of 2015. The capital facility improvement included flooring replacement, plumbing and electrical upgrades, fire suppression code compliance, interior layout reconfigurations, kitchen improvements, ADA compliance for doorways and restrooms, improved storage/maintenance design, and restoration of gym woodwork. The Si View Pool received a makeover in the winter of 2016 to ensure the preservation of the integrity of the pool lining. All Community Center and Annex windows were replaced in 2016 with grant funding.

Si View MPD received a grant to support the preservation of the historic farmhouse at Tollgate Farm through the installation of weatherproofing with new siding and windows anticipated for completion in 2016. Another Tollgate Farm Park project involves the design and installation of interpretive signage to highlight the cultural and natural history of the park. Installation of the eight storyboard signs was completed in late 2016.

In preparation for this comprehensive plan update, the District conducted a Community Interest and Opinion Survey during the summer of 2012 to help establish priorities for the future development of parks and recreation facilities, programs and services within the community.
PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The Si View Metropolitan Park District began development of this update to its District Comprehensive Plan in 2016 to provide a logical blueprint for the management and growth of the District’s park and recreation system. As a five-year guide and strategic plan for enhancing park and recreation amenities for the community, the District Comprehensive Plan establishes a path forward for enabling and enhancing high quality, community-driven parks, trails, open spaces and recreational opportunities.

This District Comprehensive Plan was developed with the input and direction of local recreation leaders, stakeholders and residents, and the process included public meetings and a community survey as baseline data to inform the plan. With its second comprehensive plan, the Si View Metropolitan Park District is reviewing and updating its existing policies, practices and projects. The current plan outlines a framework for the improvement and growth of District recreation facilities, amenities and parks to address the specific needs of the community. This framework clarifies funding, program objectives, development or resource goals, and sets a long-range vision for the District with clear action items and strategies for implementation for the next 6 to 10 years. The Plan considers the park and recreation needs of residents across the district. It inventories and evaluates the existing parks, assesses the needs for acquisition, site development and operations, and includes capital project phasing. The Plan is intended to be updated periodically to remain current with local interests and maintain eligibility for state-based grants.

PLANNING PROCESS

The District Comprehensive Plan is a reflection of the community’s interests and needs for park and recreational facilities, trails and programming. The planning process was aimed to encourage and enable public engagement in the choices, priorities and future direction of the District’s park and recreation system. The Plan project team conducted a variety of public outreach activities to solicit feedback and comments, in concert with a review of the recreation system inventory, level of service review and the current and future needs assessment.

Current community interests surfaced through a series of public outreach efforts that included phone surveys, open house meetings, stakeholder discussions, online engagement, website content and District Board meetings. An assessment of the park inventory became the basis for determining the current performance of the system. An overarching needs analysis was conducted for recreation programs and facilities, parks and trails to assess current demands and project future demand accounting for population growth. To guide the implementation of the goals of the Plan, a capital facilities plan was developed with a set
of strategies that identified costs and potential funding sources. Together, this process is represented in this planning document, which will be reviewed by the public and District Board members. Once adopted, the Plan directs park and recreation service delivery for the next 6 to 10 years.

OTHER RELATED PLANS

City of Snoqualmie 2012 Open Space, Parks and Recreation Plan

The Snoqualmie parks plan recognized the value of a connected trail network and recommend that existing trails be expanded and connected. The parks plan recommended creating an integrated trail system that connects with other transportation modes and requiring new development to make trail connections and create linkages. Related to future trail connections and enhancement the plan also targeted the acquisition of additional shoreline access as a priority. To reach their park and trail system goals, the City desires to cooperate with other providers to develop a coordinated level of service for provision of parks and open spaces. Another specific goal to collaborate with Meadowbrook Farm Preservation Association identifies the value of promoting wildlife (elk) viewing areas and utilizing volunteers to assist with stewardship of habitat and urban forest restoration. The Snoqualmie parks plan expresses the intent to create partnerships with county, neighboring communities, school district and Si View MPD to ensure provision of a balanced mix of parks and recreation facilities and pursue joint use agreements with Si View MPD, the Snoqualmie Valley YMCA and Snoqualmie Valley School District. The promotion of the preservation and development of an urban (community) forest resource through tree plantings, preservation and maintenance in public and private lands was also highlighted in the plan.

North Bend Comprehensive Plan: Parks Element 2015 Update

With 21% of the land within its city limits and urban growth boundary in public lands as parks, recreation and open space, North Bend recognizes that local outdoor recreation opportunities are outstanding. The update to the North Bend Parks Element focuses on outdoor park and recreation needs and opportunities and credits the Si View MPD as largely addressing the indoor recreation facility and programming needs. The planning or service area for this Parks Element is the city limits of North Bend and its Urban Growth Area (UGA). The needs assessment for North Bend to meet its adopted level of service for park and recreation facilities as well as passive parks indicated that park acreage needs have been met. A number of trail projects have been placed on the 6-year parks Capital Facilities Plan in response to community surveys indicating their importance. The Parks Element policies reaffirm the need to continue to coordinate and collaborate with Si View MPD to ensure adequate provision of recreation opportunities.
Snoqualmie Corridor Recreation Plan
Washington State Department of Natural Resources

The approximate 53,500-acre planning area for this state agency’s recreation corridor plan comprises ten management blocks in the east and west regions outside of the Si View MPD. These lands contribute to the forested landscape along a 24-mile stretch of I-90 between exit 18 and 42. These managed lands include the iconic Mount Si Natural Resource Conservation Area (NRCA), a very popular hiking and climbing venue. DNR-managed lands contain both developed recreation facilities and support dispersed recreation (such as birding, hunting, fishing, rock climbing and geocaching). The plan acknowledges that neighboring communities have economic ties to the DNR-managed lands that provide outdoor recreation opportunities.

Existing developed recreation facilities and trails in the Snoqualmie DNR planning area include six trail heads, two day-use areas, approximately 100 miles of non-motorized trails and another 20 miles of non-motorized trails under construction (summer 2014). The purpose of the plan is to guide the next 10-15 years of recreation and public access management and development. The plan points to the intent to create a network of developed facilities and trails that provide more recreation opportunities in the planning area as well as restoring areas where impacts have occurred from too much recreational use. Implementation across the ten management units is prioritized into three phases. Implementation of individual projects will be contingent on acquiring adequate funding.

2016 King County Open Space Plan:
Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas

The King County Open Space Plan provides a framework guiding King County in the acquisition, planning, development, stewardship, maintenance and management of its system of parks, regional trails, and open space. Specific updated policy direction in the plan recognizes that regional trail corridors provide recreational opportunities as well as non-motorized transportation options and that future development will focus on filling gaps in the system, providing connections to regional destinations and providing equal access for all.

One objective in the plan targets improving coordination among King County agencies involved in expanding and stewarding King County’s open space system. King County manages more than 4,300 acres of parks and natural areas in the Snoqualmie basin.

To meet the plan’s goal for improving the regional trail system and regional mobility, the King County Parks’ CIP lists regional trail corridor acquisition targets for the Snoqualmie Valley Trail include $600,000 in 2016 and $2,000,000 in 2017. The CIP also lists projects for trail head development and access across the King County regional trail system for the years from 2016-2018, totaling $3M. The Capital Improvement Program states that King County should provide regional leadership and coordination for the planning, design, implementation and
maintenance of the countywide Regional Trails System to ensure regional trail connections between jurisdictions and linkages with other local trails.

**Meadowbrook Farm Master Plan 2013 Update**

The master plan for the 453-acre Meadowbrook Farm open space was updated in 2013 to guide long-term investment and improvements for the historically significant property owned jointly by the cities of North Bend and Snoqualmie. Through an interlocal agreement among the City of North Bend, the City of Snoqualmie, and the Meadowbrook Farm Preservation Association, the Meadowbrook Farm Preservation Association is responsible for the management and operation of the property consistent with the master plan. The master plan reinforced the mission of the Farm as a historic prairie landscape with scenic and agricultural assets that can provide educational and recreational value. The plan also identified the Farm as a potentially valuable local asset that could generate revenues for its operations and promote economic activity for both cities.

Programmed uses that are integrated into the site include: trails and recreation; community gatherings and special events; education and interpretation of natural and cultural history; meadow/prairie maintenance; limited agriculture; and wildlife habitat preservation and enhancement. The plan recognizes various levels of public use with trails guiding access to dispersed recreation and more intense activity concentrated near the interpretive center. Si View Metropolitan Park District manages the programming of activities at the interpretive center building and event field.

**Meadowbrook Farm Business Plan**

The September 2015 presentation of the business plan conclusions for Meadowbrook Farm (by Beckwith Consulting) indicated that the Farm needs to be more aggressive with its marketing and should develop additional revenue-generating facilities such as a 72-person picnic shelter and a commercial kitchen to enhance the ability to attract more events and activities. The business plan conclusions encourage additional marketing and promotion but advise that additional improvement are necessary to make the Farm more competitive in attracting weddings, events and other rental income-producing reservations. The business plan presentation suggested that continual reliance on volunteer labor for daily and annual maintenance needs would not be sustainable. Additional facilities that can generate enough revenue to support annual maintenance and operations was recommended. The business plan presentation recognized that the Farm’s marketing and promotional requirements are more efficiently and effectively provided through a local existing organization, such as the Si View MPD or other parks department. The business plan assessment concluded that Farm operations would never be completely self-sufficient from supportive subsidies. A comparison with public
parks programming and operations noted that even a very aggressive rental and fee-based system recovers 75-85% of operation costs without factoring in costs of maintenance and development of facilities. The conclusion suggested that the Farm will always need to rely on subsidizing support from local government, grants, and private donations to finance its complete maintenance and development.

CONTENTS OF THE PLAN

The remainder of the Comprehensive Plan is organized as follows:

- Chapter 2: Community Profile – provides an overview of the District and its demographics.
- Chapter 3: Community Engagement – highlights the methods used to engage the greater Si View community in the development of the Plan.
- Chapter 4: Inventory & Recreational Opportunities – describes the existing parks and recreation system in the District.
- Chapters 5: Needs Assessment – discusses survey results and recreation trend data and provides context to the identification of potential system enhancements.
- Chapter 6: Goals & Objectives – provides a policy framework for the parks and recreation system grouped by major functional or program area.
- Chapter 7: Capital Planning – details a 10-year program for addressing park and recreation facility enhancement or expansion projects.
- Chapter 8: Action Strategies – describes a range of strategies to consider in the implementation of the Plan.
- Appendices: Provides technical or supporting information to the planning effort.
The Si View Metropolitan Park District, located in the scenic Upper Snoqualmie Valley, was formed in 2003 to preserve the historic Si View Park and provide opportunities to enhance the quality of life through park and recreation facilities and programs. The District covers approximately 17,310 acres or 27 square miles that consists of unincorporated King County (Fire District No. 38) and the City of North Bend. The Upper Snoqualmie Valley is characterized by the Cascade Mountains to the east that contains county, state and local wilderness areas, federal lands and private ski areas that offer an array of recreation opportunities to both residents and visitors. The District is located on the I-90 highway corridor that connects Seattle with Cle Elum through the Snoqualmie Pass.

The Si View Community Center, Pool and Park are the main focus of the District and the only such regional recreational facilities serving as a social, cultural and educational hub in the community. In 2005, the District expanded its recreation programs to other locations including Meadowbrook Farm and the Mt Si Senior Center. Currently, the District provides programming at the Grange and the North Bend Train Depot buildings as well. The Si View MPD is governed by five Commissioners who serve staggered six-year terms.
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The Si View MPD encompasses the City of North Bend, as well as surrounding rural areas. The residents of the district are predominately white, well-educated and higher-income. The District is home to many youth and families and a relatively high percentage of adults 55 years of age and older. Residents of the Si View MPD are generally employed, working in management and business fields, and have high household incomes.

Demographic data is not available for the precise boundary of the Si View Metropolitan Park District. This profile approximates data for the District by combining census tracts 326.01, 326.02, 327.02, 327.03, 327.04, and 328.00 including the City of North Bend, but excluding the City of Snoqualmie.

### Figure 1. Population Characteristics: Si View MPD, North Bend, King County, Washington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Si View MPD</th>
<th>North Bend</th>
<th>Snoqualmie</th>
<th>King County</th>
<th>Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2016)</td>
<td>25,410</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>13,110</td>
<td>2,105,100</td>
<td>7,183,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2010)</td>
<td>23,371</td>
<td>5,731</td>
<td>10,670</td>
<td>1,931,249</td>
<td>6,724,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2000)</td>
<td>23,378</td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>1,737,034</td>
<td>5,894,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change (2000-16)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>703.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons w/ Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>7,886</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td>808,729</td>
<td>2,645,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with children</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
<td>$82,791</td>
<td>$73,571</td>
<td>$130,060</td>
<td>$73,035</td>
<td>$60,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Size</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population &lt; 5 years of age</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population &lt; 18 years of age</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 18 - 64 years of age</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population &gt; 65 years of age</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population

The Si View Metropolitan Park District was home to approximately 23,375 residents in both the 2000 and 2010 Census. Upon reviewing the known population growth of the City of North Bend between 2010 and 2016 based on OFM figures and reviewing the Snoqualmie Valley School District’s Demographic Trends and Enrollment Projections (2014) that address current and projected growth rates, the current population and projected population for the Si View MPD were estimated.

The Si View MPD area is expected to grow at a modest pace of approximately 1.3% per year on average over the coming 20 years – to 28,740 persons in 2025; 30,590 persons in 2030; and 32,440 persons in 2035.

Figure 2. Population Change – 2010 – 2035 (projected), Si View Metropolitan Park District
Age Group Distribution

The Si View MPD has a younger overall population (median age 36.1) than North Bend (38.7), King County (37.1), Washington (37.3), and the nation (37.2). The District has a higher percentage of youth under 18 than King County (25% compared to 21%), lower percentages of people age 20 to 44 (29% compared to 38%), and similar percentages of adults over 55 (23% compared to 23%). Si View’s population has aged since 2000, when the median age was 32.1.

The District’s largest “20-year” population group is comprised of 40 to 59 year-olds, representing 37.2% of the population in 2010. This differs from King County, where the largest group is 25 to 44 year olds (31.5%).

The following breakdown is used to separate the population into age-sensitive user groups.

- **Under 5 years:** This group represents users of preschool and tot programs and facilities, and as trails and open space users, are often in strollers. These individuals are the future participants in youth activities.

- **5 to 14 years:** This group represents current youth program participants.

- **15 to 24 years:** This group represents teen/young adult program participants moving out of the youth programs and into adult programs. Members of this age group are often seasonal employment seekers.

- **25 to 34 years:** This group represents involvement in adult programming with characteristics of beginning long-term relationships and establishing families.

- **35 to 54 years:** This group represents users of a wide range of adult programming and park facilities. Their characteristics extend from having children using preschool and youth programs to becoming empty nesters.

- **55 years plus:** This group represents users of older adult programming exhibiting the characteristics of approaching retirement or already retired and typically enjoying grandchildren. This group generally also ranges from very healthy, active seniors to more physically inactive seniors.

Figure 3 illustrates the age distribution characteristics of these cohorts and provides a comparison to 2000 Census data.
Race and Ethnicity

In 2010, over 92% of Si View residents identified as White. In the same year, the District was 1.5% Asian and less than 1% African American, Native American, or Pacific Islander. Approximately 1.6% of residents identified as some other race and 3.2% as two or more races. Four percent of residents identify as Hispanic or Latino. The racial and ethnic makeup of the District has remained relatively unchanged since 2000.

According to the 2014 American Community Survey, approximately 8.5% of the District’s population speaks a language other than English at home, compared to 18% across the state of Washington. Approximately 72% of this group also speaks English very well.

Household Characteristics

The 2014 average household size in the Si View District was 2.6 people, slightly higher than the county (2.44), state (2.55) and national (2.51) average. Average household size has increased since 2000, when it was 2.34 people. The average family size in the District is larger, at 2.97 people. Of the 7,886 households in the District, 35% have children under 18.

King County’s Household Growth Targets anticipated that the City of North Bend, and its surrounding growth areas, would grow by 636 households between 2000 and 2022. As of 2014, the North Bend alone had grown by 435 households. As a result, it is likely that the Si View District will outpace King County’s anticipated housing growth targets for the 2000-2022 time frame.
### Income & Poverty

According to the 2014 American Community Survey, the median household income in the Si View District was $82,791. This figure is about $9,750 (13%) higher than the median household income for King County residents and $22,500 (37%) higher than Washington households. Residents of rural areas within the District tend to be wealthier than residents of North Bend, where the median income was $73,571 in 2014.

At the lower end of the household income scale, approximately one in eight (12%) District households earn less than $25,000 annually, which is lower than households of King County (16%) the State of Washington (19.4%) and the United States (23%). Over 20% of North Bend households earn less than $25,000 per year. Notably, forty percent of Si View District households earn over $100,000 per year, a rate that is significantly higher than in North Bend (34.5%), the County (36%), the State (26%) and national (22%) figures.

According to 2014 American Community Survey, 9.4% of Si View residents are living below the poverty level. The poverty threshold was an income of $23,850 for a family of four. The percentage of District residents in poverty is lower than rates in North Bend (16.2%), the County (11.8%), the state (13.5%) and nation (14.5%). A review of subgroups shows that poverty affects 15% of children under 18 and 7% of those 65 and older, which is also lower than statewide and national figures.

### Employment & Education

The 2014 work force population (16 years and over) within the Si View MPD is 16,318 (78%). Of this population, seventy-two percent is in the labor force and 3.5% percent is unemployed. One quarter (28.2%) of the District's working age population is not in the workforce. This is lower than percentages in North Bend (30.5%), King County (30%) and Washington (35%).

The primary occupation of the working population in the Si View District is management, business, science and arts occupations at 42%; followed by sales and office occupations at 23% and service occupations at 17% of the workforce.

Si View MPD residents have slightly higher levels of education attainment as those in King County and the State of Washington. According to the 2014 American Community Survey, 93% of District residents over 25 years of age have a high school degree or higher, compared to 90% statewide. Approximately 37% of District residents over age 25 had earned a Bachelor's degree or higher, as compared to 47% in King County and 32% statewide.

### Persons with Disabilities

The 2014 American Community Survey reported 9.3% (1,919 persons) of people who live within the census tracts that make up the Si View MPD have a disability that interferes with life activities. This is lower than county and state averages (9.6% and 12.4%, respectively).
Of District youth 5 to 17 with a disability (2.3%), the majority has cognitive difficulties. Among residents 65 and older, the percentage rises of people with disabilities rises to 23%, or 520 persons, which is ten percent lower than rates found in the general senior population of King County (34.5%).

HEALTH STATUS

Information on the health of Si View MPD residents is not readily available. However, King County residents rank as some of the healthiest residents in Washington (5th out of 39 counties), according to the County Health Rankings. Approximately 22% of King County adults are overweight or obese, compared to 27% of Washington adults.

Approximately 15% of King County adults age 20 and older report getting no leisure-time physical activity – the lowest rate for any Washington county. The statewide average is 18%. This may be due, in part, to the large number of places to participate in physical activity, including parks and public or private community centers, gyms or other recreational facilities. In King County, 98% of residents have access to adequate physical activity opportunities, which is higher than the 89% average for all Washington residents.

According to the County Health Rankings, King County also ranks well compared to all Washington counties for health outcomes, including length and quality of life, and health factors (such as health behaviors, clinical care, social and economic factors, and the physical environment).

CITY OF SNOQUALMIE

The City of Snoqualmie is immediately adjacent to the Si View Metropolitan Park District. The city was home to 10,670 people in 2010, a nearly ten-fold increase over its 2000 population. Much of this growth was due to City annexations and the development of the Snoqualmie Ridge mixed-use communities over the past ten years. The Puget Sound Regional Council anticipates that Snoqualmie will grow by an additional 2,200 residents by 2025, at which point the total population will plateau.

Snoqualmie’s population is relatively young when compared to the Si View MPD, King County and the Washington State. The median age of residents is 33.7 years old and 35% of the city’s population is under the age of 18. Sixty percent of the City’s 3,882 households have children under 18 (2014).

Residents of Snoqualmie are predominately white (83%). However the city is more diverse than the Si View MPD area. The city has a significant Asian community (9.3%); approximately 4% of residents identify as two or more races and 5.3% identify as Hispanic or Latino.

According to the 2014 American
Community Survey, virtually all city residents over the age of 25 have graduated from high school (98.3%) and six in ten have completed a Bachelor’s degree or higher.

Residents are also well-employed – just under 80% of population over 16 is in the labor force, and only 3.7% are unemployed. The majority of workers are employed in management, business, science, and arts professions (62%); another 23% are employed in service and office occupations. Residents generally have high incomes – over 70% of households earn more than $100,000 annually, a rate that is significantly higher than the 40% of households in the Si View District with comparable incomes. Only 1% of residents live in poverty.

From the winter 2015 issue of the National Association of Realtors (NAR) magazine, the direct link between how communities are built and grow is tied to health and quality of life. More walkable and bike-able environments with better access to nature and parks have become essential for personal well-being and needs to be integrated into community planning. The NAR articles identify walkable communities as a prescription for better health.

Even the U.S. Surgeon General sounded a call to action challenging communities become more walkable to allow more Americans to increase their physical activity through walking. The Center for Disease Control and its Healthy Community Design Initiative focuses on walkability and the need to better integrate into transportation planning.

The NAR magazine issue also reported on the value of bicycle-friendly communities and the direct tie to healthy and sustainable living. Access to healthy, locally-grown food choices is reported with the value of community gardens and urban food hubs for healthy diets, as well as connection to community engagement.

Realtors have long been aware that housing near a good system of parks and trails will hold strong appeal to buyers. The winter NAR issue illustrates the recognition that community design for healthy living goes beyond the single house location. People want choices, and these healthy community design traits of walking, biking, trails and parks all play an important role in housing prices, sales and re-sales.
Community engagement and feedback played an important role in establishing a clear planning framework that reflects current community priorities. Most residents care deeply about the future of Si View’s parks, pool and recreation programs and appreciated the opportunity to offer feedback in the development of this Plan. A variety of public outreach methods were used, including:

- Two mixed-mode phone and online community surveys
- Two community meetings
- Six stakeholder discussions
- Website content & email blasts
- mySidewalk online engagement
- Park Commission sessions

Throughout this planning process, the public provided information and expressed opinions about their needs and priorities for parks, trails and recreation facilities and programs in the Si View community. This feedback played a crucial role in updating policy statements and prioritizing the capital facilities project list contained within this Plan.
TELEPHONE SURVEYS

Si View Metro Parks contracted for the administration of two community surveys to inform the development of this Plan. The purpose of the surveys was to gather input to help determine park, trail and recreation priorities of the community. One survey was targeted to residents who live within the boundary of the MPD, and the second survey was specific to residents of Snoqualmie. In collaboration with staff, the project team designed unique surveys for each subgroup to assess recreational needs, preferences and priorities.

Both surveys were conducted using a mixed-mode sample design that combined telephone and online data collection. For the Si View MPD survey, a total of 404 adult (18+) residents living within the District boundary were interviewed between May 9-27, 2016 (112 via telephone and 292 online). For the Snoqualmie survey, a total of 186 adult (18+) residents living in the City of Snoqualmie were interviewed between June 6-20, 2016 (59 via telephone and 127 online).

Survey respondents were asked about:

- Performance and quality of programs and parks
- Usage of the Si View pool and recreation programs
- Opinions about the need for a new pool
- Overall satisfaction with the value of services being delivered by the District
- Priorities for future park and recreation services and facilities
- Willingness to support public funding of expanded recreational opportunities

Major survey findings are noted below, and a more detailed discussion of results can be found in the needs assessment (Chapter 5). The summaries of both surveys are provided in the appendix.

Major Findings from District Survey

Residents living within the Si View District boundary are very satisfied with parks and recreation programs of the District.

Si View parks and facilities are well-used by these respondents, and in the last year:

- 9 in 10 respondents had visited at least one facility;
- Half visited at least three of the four facilities listed;
- Majorities reported visiting each of three facilities listed at least once;
- 6 in 10 visited more than one facility and made a minimum of four visits.

The District gets “excellent” to “good” performance grades across a range of functions

- Asked to give a letter grade to 10 separate functions, facilities, and programs, majorities gave an “A” or “B” to 8 of 10 functions.
- The combined overall “grade point average” was 3.16 on the 4-point scale.
- The range of “grade point averages” was 3.50 for cleanliness and maintenance; to 2.78 for adult programs.
The highest grades were given by the most frequent users, majorities of whom gave an “A” or “B” to every function.

The District is seen as a good steward of tax dollars
- 91% rated it as “excellent”, “good” or “satisfactory” when asked to rate the value they received from the District for their tax dollars.

There is interest in a long list of priorities for future development
- When presented with a list of 20 potential “park and recreation services,” majorities of respondents rated 11 of them as “top” or “high” priorities for the District.
- When asked to pick just one (and then a second one), four items stood out:
  - Family aquatics center with pool (26% named it #1 or #2);
  - Park with riverfront access (24%);
  - Walking and biking trails (22%);
  - Natural areas and wildlife habitats (20%).

There is a broad inclination to support improvement proposals
- Respondents were reminded that improvements and facilities are supported by tax dollars and asked whether they supported or opposed 9 specific improvements “under active consideration” by SVMPD.
- For all but one of the proposals (synthetic turf at Twin Falls Middle School), most respondents said they were inclined to “support” or “strongly support” each proposal.
- While most proposals were met with majority support, prudence suggests that most of that support should be considered latent.

Three proposals had “strong support” that outweighed opposition:
- Develop walking and biking trails that link parks and greenspace;
- Acquire parkland for passive recreation such as trail walking, picnicking;
- Develop a new family aquatic center and pool.

Major Findings from Snoqualmie Survey

Si View Parks facilities and programs are well-used by residents of Snoqualmie, especially young parents.

Approximately 3 in 10 Snoqualmie households report using Si View Pool and District recreation programs
- 32% of respondents have used the pool in the past year
- 30% of respondents have accessed recreation programs in the past year
- Households with children were more likely to use both the pool and programs:
  - For the pool, 48% of parents with children at home used the pool vs. 9% usage by non-parents
  - For programs, 39% of parents with children at home used recreation programs vs. 16% usage by non-parents

44% of respondents had used the pool or a SVMPD recreation program in the last year, Including 14% who had used them at least four times.
7 in 10 Snoqualmie residents thought new pool needed in region

- Respondents who were most likely to think a new pool is needed include:
  - Heavy users of the pool and recreation programs (89%);
  - Parents with children at home (83%);
  - Respondents age 35-50 (84%).

For respondents who said a new pool is needed, they preferred, by a 4:1 margin, a collaboration between the City and the SVMPD versus having the City of Snoqualmie become part of the District.

66% of respondents said they would use Si View facilities “about the same as they do now” if they were charged a non-resident fee to use those facilities.

- Of those who said they would use the facilities less than they do now include:
  - 47% do not currently use the facilities;
  - 35% use them 1-3 times a year; and
  - 17% use them more than 4 times a year.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

The project team aimed to get feedback from local residents and program users at two public meetings during the course of the project, which were held at the Si View Community Center. Recreation program guide announcements, newspaper articles, social media and email announcements were used to publicize the events and encourage participation. Summary responses from each of the meetings are provided in Appendix C.

Community Open House Meeting #1 (September 14, 2016)

Community members were invited to an open house on Wednesday, September 14, 2016 from 6:00 - 8:00 p.m. at Si View Community Center. As the first public session for the Plan update, the project team prepared informational displays covering major themes for parks and recreation, in addition to survey findings. These display stations included Project Overview, Survey Summary, Recreation Programming, Trails, Parks & Outdoor Recreation and Investment Priorities. Attendees were encouraged to talk with staff, record their comments and complete a written comment card. District staff, District Board members and project team staff engaged with participants to explore current issues, needs and interests related to park, trail and recreation opportunities and needs.

Park Commission & Public Presentation (December 7, 2016)

< TBD - to present highlights of the new Plan and seek feedback from the Commission and public >
STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSIONS

Interviews with internal and external stakeholders were conducted to more broadly assess the opportunities for program enhancements, partnerships and coordination. Stakeholders were identified by District staff based on their past coordination with the District and their involvement or interest in the future of the Si View community’s park, recreation, water access or trail facilities. The stakeholder meetings were held between May and August 2016, and the following organizations provided insight to the Plan:

- City of North Bend
- City of Snoqualmie
- Snoqualmie Valley School District
- King County
- Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust
- Washington Department of Natural Resources
- Group session including representatives from Mount Si Lacrosse Club, Snoqualmie Valley Little League, American Whitewater and Snoqualmie Valley Youth Soccer Association (via email)
- Si View MPD staff

Stakeholder comments were often specific to the particular perspective or interest of the stakeholder group. Overall, comments were very favorable with regard to existing District facilities, programs and recreation opportunities, in addition to the recent improvements to the Si View Park and community center. Stakeholders were quick to offer suggestions for potential partnerships and many saw the importance in the District’s role as a partner to cities and local organizations. Suggested projects ranged from coordinating the development of trail connections to Mt Si and Little Si, water access improvements, field improvements and partnership with the school district, and identifying opportunities to expand community information and marketing about recreation programs and opportunities to help promote the greater Snoqualmie Valley as a destination. Specific recommendations are incorporated in the Needs Assessment chapter, and stakeholder discussion summaries are provided in Appendix D.

PARK COMMISSION MEETINGS

The Park Commission provided feedback on the Plan during two regularly scheduled public sessions. The first session occurred on May 4, 2016 immediately after the plan update project was initiated. The Commission discussed the update and provided their perspectives on a vision for the District, parks and programs, specific challenges, opportunities and potential community partnerships. The second session was held on January _____ to review and discuss the draft Plan and provide direction on proposed goals and capital improvements.
OTHER OUTREACH

In addition to the direct outreach opportunities noted above, the Si View community was informed about the planning process through a variety of media. The following venues were used to inform residents about the project, as well as opportunities to participate and offer comments.

- Recreation activity and program guide
- District website
- Facebook
- mySidewalk online platform

A project webpage was posted on the District's website to provide background information, meeting announcements and project materials such as meeting notes, displays and summary reports. The page was updated periodically to keep residents informed of progress and alerted to opportunities for involvement during the process.

In addition to the District’s social media feeds via Facebook, the project team utilized the mySidewalk platform (mysidewalk.com) as an integrated, on-going online community discussion. The tool allowed for integration with the traditional public meetings, and it enabled residents to submit ideas, offer feedback and answer questions about key issues and topics. The mySidewalk site was also linked to the District's social media accounts and website. Appendix E includes content from the online discussions from the mySidewalk tool.
How can Si View Metro Parks meet your family’s recreation needs? We want to hear from you!

The Si View Metropolitan Parks District (SVMPD) is creating a new Parks District System Plan that will reflect community interests and establish long-term goals and priorities for land acquisition, facility development, recreation programming, and parks management.

The Parks District System Plan will guide the District’s efforts and establish a road map for providing high quality, community driven parks, trails, natural areas and recreation amenities across the district. The Plan will include a vision for the District’s park and recreation system, goals and objectives, capital improvements and investment program, and implementation strategies for parks, natural areas, and trails.

Community input is important to make sure goals and priorities are consistent with community needs and interests. Opportunities for community involvement will ensure the Plan will serve the recreational needs of our growing community over the coming 5 to 10 years.

Please visit again for updates on the Plan and more information about opportunities to be involved. 

**Investing for the Future - What are Your Priorities?**

#Government, #Parks, # Livability in Issaquah, WA, Snoqualmie, WA, North Bend, WA, What future activity is most needed in or by Si View Metro Parks? Mark your highest and second highest priority.
Si View Metropolitan Park District is situated in the Upper Snoqualmie Valley where an array of public lands provide outdoor recreational opportunities within parks and open spaces. Federal, state, county, city and other public and private agencies own significant lands that include multipurpose trail corridors, athletic fields, playgrounds, community centers, waterfront access, picnic facilities, historic sites and wildlife conservancies. While the Si View MPD owns only two of these outdoor recreation sites, the combination of outdoor recreation facilities in the Upper Snoqualmie Valley support the quality of life for residents in the District and the region.
Si View Metropolitan Park District

Si View Community Park (with community center & pool)
400 SE Orchard Drive, North Bend

This 10.7-acre park property includes the historic community center and pool facility that serves the Upper Snoqualmie Valley. Developed facilities include the community center with its pool, gymnasium and program rooms, park administrative offices, staff and public parking lots, youth baseball field, and open field for soccer. Improvements in the park since the 2006 comprehensive park plan added two new playgrounds, new outdoor restroom and concession building, a picnic shelter, a basketball court, a ½-mile perimeter trail and upgrades to existing amenities. Picnic tables, park benches, trash receptacles, drinking fountains, bike racks, outdoor lighting and dog waste bag dispensers support park uses. Trees and other landscaping are supplemented with an irrigation system. The area north of the new parking lot supports community activities. The District provides a range of recreation programs and activities at the community park, center and pool.
Shamrock Park
Orchard Drive & Healy Avenue, North Bend

This small ½-acre park has frontage along the South Fork of the Snoqualmie River, across the street from the Si View Community Center. The mini-park is undeveloped and contains mown grass areas with a few trees and riverbank vegetation. Shamrock Park includes a small parcel directly across the River.
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City of North Bend

E.J. Roberts Park
NE 6th Street and Thrasher Avenue N., North Bend

Located in the Silver Creek neighborhood, east of downtown North Bend, this 4.9-acre neighborhood park includes playgrounds, two tennis courts, a basketball court, paved pathways, shade trees and landscaping. Parking and restrooms are also provided.

Gardiner-Weeks Memorial Park
411 Main Avenue S., North Bend

Located along the South Fork of the Snoqualmie River, this 3.3-acre neighborhood park contains the Snoqualmie Valley Historical Museum and the Mount Si Senior Center. Park facilities include a gazebo, picnic tables and a paved path. A dense canopy of tree cover provides shade along the 200-feet of river frontage.

Riverfront Park
315 Bendigo Blvd S., North Bend

Riverfront Park is a 4-acre undeveloped property with frontage along the South Fork of the Snoqualmie River. Located across Bendigo Blvd from the Gardiner-Weeks Memorial Park, the site offers a multi-use trail (along the dike that follows the river) and access to fishing and swimming. The forested areas in the riparian corridor are valued for wildlife habitat and stream protection.
Torguson Park
750 E. North Bend Way, North Bend

The 17.3-acre park includes the North Bend Athletic Complex with six ball fields (supporting soccer option), a new picnic shelter and playground, BMX dirt bike track, an 8,100 square foot skate park, a climbing rock, restrooms, picnic tables, memorial bench, flagpole, landscaping and a parking lot. The site is owned by City of North Bend and has been maintained by the Si View MPD since January 2016.

William Henry Taylor Park
205 E. McClellan, North Bend

The North Bend Railroad Depot, built in 1988, sits on this 1-acre park with its lawn area, landscaping, benches and picnic tables. The Tanner Trail runs east-west through the park. Depot facilities include a ticket office, meeting rooms and restrooms. The Si View MPD manages the programming for the activities in the depot building.

Tanner Trail

A railway / trail corridor (also mapped as the North Bend Rail Trail) that begins at the Railroad Depot in William Henry Taylor Park and runs southeast to the Tanner Road/Tanner Mill site where it intersects with the Snoqualmie Valley Trail. Portions of the trail are paved (from East Park Street to Main Avenue North and the remainder trail surface is gravel.)
**Tannerwood Neighborhood Park**  
1700 Tannerwood Way SE, North Bend  
A newly developed small one-acre park with a paved pathway, grass lawn areas, trees, and landscape boulders.

**Si View Neighborhood Park**  
939 Mountain View Blvd SE, North Bend  
Located in the Si View subdivision, 13 acres of park land offer amenities including river access, playgrounds, benches, picnic tables, paved pathways, a multi-purpose sports court, open lawns and shade trees. The five separate areas comprising the park are connected through paved trails.

**Meadowbrook Farm**  
1711 Boalch Avenue, North Bend  
A 460-acre historic site that was purchased in phases by the cities of North Bend and Snoqualmie using King County Conservation Futures funds, Meadowbrook Farm is controlled by the Meadowbrook Farm Preservation Association. Si View MPD manages the interpretive center’s programming for educational programming and special events. The site contains a 2,400 square foot interpretive building built in 2004, a paved parking lot, trail connections to natural areas (gravel) and a paved path along Route 202, open fields, natural/wetland forest patches, and a Marie Louie art installation. The property regularly experiences herds of visiting elk. A master plan for Meadowbrook Farms was adopted in 1999.
Tollgate Farm Park
1300 West North Bend Way, North Bend

Part of the 410-acre historic farm, Tollgate Farm Park includes the 100-year old farmhouse, central meadows, looped and perimeter trails and recently completed park improvements added to the northwest end of the meadow area. The developed park area with its vehicle entrance from W North Bend Way contains paved parking lot, restrooms, drinking fountain, playground, park benches, picnic tables, kiosk, trash receptacles, dog waste bag dispenser, shade trees, landscape plantings and an open grass lawn. The trail loops provide over a mile of walking distance and connect the developed park area to the historic farmhouse. A trail connection beneath Route 202 (North Bend Blvd) provides access to the other preserved farm fields northeast of the road. The central meadow is currently designated as hayfield with cow pasture in the south meadow, closer to the farmhouse. The farmhouse has been stabilized with roof improvements. The building exterior and foundation have been rehabilitated in 2016 with grant funding. Future interior renovation for facility use as community space is planned with additional grant funding.
City of Snoqualmie

Snoqualmie Parks

The City of Snoqualmie manages 34 parks (over 107 acres) ranging from small pocket park at 0.2 acres to several community and sports parks with multiple recreation amenities for park users. The City also operates the 160-acre Three Forks Natural Area adjacent to their 20-acre Centennial Fields Park. Amenities within the City’s park system include sports fields, basketball courts, playgrounds, restrooms, parking, swings, picnic facilities, paved paths and trail connections, natural areas, off-leash dog parks and a bike park.

Snoqualmie Trails

A number of trails connect park facilities and neighborhoods in the City of Snoqualmie. These trails extend from a half mile to four miles in length and may be paved or soft surface. The trail list below does not include trail connections into Snoqualmie Ridge.

- Centennial Trail (½ mile)
- Silent Creek Trail (1 mile)
- Deep Creek Trail (2 miles)
- Fisher Creek Trail (¾ mile)
- Business Loop Trail (1 ¼ mile)
- Whitaker Park Trail (½ mile)
- Meadowbrook Trail (¾ mile)
- Deer Park Trail (3 ¼ mile)
- Snoqualmie Parkway Trail (4 miles)
Snoqualmie Point
37580 Winery Road, Snoqualmie
The Point was purchased in 1999 in a cooperative effort between the City of Snoqualmie, Mountains to Sound Greenway, DNR, USFS and the Greenway Trust. The 10-acre park is perched above the Valley and looks across the River to Cascade Range, Mount Si and Mount Baker. The park is connected to the Rattlesnake Mountain Scenic Area through the Rattlesnake Mountain Trail.

King County
Snoqualmie Valley Trail
Extending along the former railroad right-of-way from North Bend to Duvall, The Snoqualmie Valley Trail (SVT) provides 31.5 miles of walking and bicycling recreation on its gravel surface. Part of the King County Regional Trails System, the SVT connects to the Pacific Crest Trail and to the cross-state John Wayne Pioneer Trail in Iron Horse State Park. The SVT links to key local destinations including Meadowbrook Farm, Tollgate Farm, Tanner Landing, Three Forks Natural Area, and Torguson Park.

Three Forks Natural Area
8394 North Ford Road SE, Snoqualmie
King County owns this 418-acre natural area at the confluence of the North, Middle and South Forks of the Snoqualmie River. Approximately 158 acres of the open space, located within the city limits of Snoqualmie, was
transferred to the City to maintain while remaining as open space. The Three Forks area contains an off-leash dog area, fishing access, trails and wildlife habitat.

Middle Fork Snoqualmie Park Natural Area
SE Middle Fork Rd. and SE 116th St., North Bend

Located five miles east of North Bend, this 600-acre natural area offers low impact recreational, interpretive and educational opportunities. The site is managed to protect, maintain and enhance wildlife habitat and corridors and preserve scenic areas. A gravel trail from the north side of Middle Fork Road provides river access for kayakers.

Tanner Landing Park
Mount Si Road

Along the Middle Fork of the Snoqualmie River, King County Parks manages this natural area that provides riverfront for kayak and raft access with an entry drive adjacent to the Snoqualmie Valley Trail. Restoration activities have been ongoing to improve riparian habitat and remove invasive plant species. Amenities include a parking area, access to the SVT, an off-leash dog area, informal soft-surface trails to the river and through the fields, a picnic table, trash receptacles and a dog waste bag dispenser.
City of Seattle

Cedar River Watershed

As a major part of their municipal water supply, the City of Seattle owns the upper 90,546 acres of the Cedar River watershed, located south and east of North Bend and abutting the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest. Recreational opportunities are primarily centered at Rattlesnake Lake with swimming, fishing and hiking as day-use activities. The Cedar River Trail starts near the southwestern boundary of the watershed, and the Snoqualmie Valley Trail starts near the lake. The John Wayne Trail begins at Rattlesnake Lake before crossing eastward to the Idaho border. The Cedar River Watershed Education Center is located just above Rattlesnake Lake and contains an exhibit hall, heritage library, learning laboratories and meeting rooms. Much of the remainder of the watershed area is off-limits to recreation activities.

Preston-Snoqualmie Trail

A paved trail that runs for 6.5 miles within the Mountains to Sound Greenway extending from 300th Ave. SE and SE High Point Way (in Preston) to SE David Powell Rd. near the Snoqualmie River (at the Snoqualmie Falls Overlook). The trail ends at a location with a densely framed view across Snoqualmie Falls and the River to the Salish Lodge. The Preston-Snoqualmie Trail is one of the first rail-to-trails built in the cascade foothills and follows a historic railway that had connected North Bend and Issaquah.
State of Washington

Mount Si Natural Resources Conservation Area

Owned by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), this 8,890-acre conservation area contains the popular 4-mile long Mount Si Trail and 2.5 mile Little Si Trail that each provide summit views across the Snoqualmie Valley. The trails are heavily used on summer weekends and trail head parking lots are often over capacity.

Ollalie State Park

A day-use park with 520 acres of natural area, Ollalie offers hiking, fishing, rock climbing, mountain biking and horseback riding. A one-mile hike leads to Twin Falls viewpoints.

John Wayne Pioneer Trail (Iron Horse State Park)

The John Wayne Pioneer Trail, a cross-state trail following an abandoned railroad right-of-way, travels 253 miles from Rattlesnake Lake near North Bend to the Idaho border. As a non-motorized trail with a crushed stone surface, JWT supports mountain biking, horseback riding and hiking uses. JWT connects to the Snoqualmie Valley Trail at Rattlesnake Lake and to the Pacific Crest Trail.
Rattlesnake Mountain Scenic Area
The Rattlesnake Mountain Scenic Area along Interstate 90 offers a mountain ridge trail with views of Mount Si, the upper Snoqualmie Valley and the Cascades and their foothills. The majority of these protected lands are co-owned and managed by the Washington Department of Natural Resources and King County Parks following a series of purchases coordinated between the County and the State. Approximately 1,800 acres, purchased in 1993, are under a management plan prioritizing ecological protection and allowing low-impact recreation. Another 1,100 acres on the western edge were purchased in 1997 as working forest. The remaining protected land is owned by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The south end of Rattlesnake Mountain connects to the Cedar River Watershed, owned and managed by City of Seattle for one of its municipal water sources. The 11-mile Rattlesnake Mountain Trail, reaching a high point elevation of 3,500 feet, links Rattlesnake Lake to Snoqualmie Point.

U.S. Forest Service
Mount Baker-Snoqualmie Nat’l Forest
The extensive federal forest lands reach for more than 140 miles along the western slopes of the Cascade Mountains from the Canadian border to the northern boundary of Mt Rainier National Park. Some of these forest lands border the Upper Snoqualmie Valley. Commercial ski entities lease property from the USFS at Snoqualmie Pass to operate their winter ski recreation areas.
OTHER RECREATION OFFERINGS & PROVIDERS

Puget Sound Energy

Snoqualmie Falls Park
6501 Railroad Avenue SE

A popular scenic attraction owned by Puget Sound Energy, the Falls have a 270-foot drop. The two-acre park has an observation deck, walking trails, restrooms, picnic tables, parking and a gift shop.

Snoqualmie Valley School District

The School District encompassing 400 square miles in eastern King County provides a number of sites with outdoor recreation amenities that may be available for public use outside of school hours and in the summer season. These school sites have playgrounds, tennis courts, and ball fields. In North Bend, the Twin Falls Middle School sports fields are shared with youth sports organizations for programmed play outside of school team sports. Located on Middle Fork Road these fields behind the middle school provide a sand-based turf baseball, football and soccer field as well as a running track.
Mountains to Sound Greenway

The Mountains to Sound Greenway originated with the vision to connect and protect open space from the shores of Puget Sound over the Cascade Mountains to the Kittitas Valley Foothills. Incorporating both public and private lands to include continuous trail connections the greenway system incorporates Meadowbrook Farm, Tollgate Farm, Rattlesnake Mountain, Mount Si and USFS lands east of North Bend in addition to other county and state sites to the west.

Privately Owned Dikes

Both the Middle and South Fork of the Snoqualmie River have sections where the river banks are diked intermittently on private properties. Along some reaches of the rivers the public informally uses these private dike alignments for river-related recreation. If private land owners should become amenable, these dike alignments could provide future river access and recreation opportunities.
Si View Park and Community Center provide the Valley community with a variety of active and passive recreational amenities. These are places where people can spend time with friends and family, exercise and play, learn and explore, and engage as a community. Through its facilities and programs, the District actively supports the mental, physical and emotional health of local residents and aims to ensure its park and recreation system meets the needs of the whole community.

RECREATION TRENDS

National Perspectives

National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA)

In 2013, the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) issued its first report using PRORAGIS, a geographic information system, to establish industry trends. The 2013 report gathered data from 383 park and recreation agencies across the country and compared changes over the last three years. According to the report, park and recreation agencies typically provide management of park and open space
lands and operate recreational facilities and programs. Within these areas of responsibility, some growth occurred from 2010 to 2012 among the agencies participating in the survey, including conducting major special events, maintaining public jurisdiction areas and administering community gardens.

The NRPA report indicated that public park and recreation service providers continue to suffer from reduced funding levels. Agencies receiving higher funding levels generally experienced greater reductions, while smaller agencies (in smaller communities) were more stable over the last three years. Recreation programming experienced a significant drop in attendance from 2010 to 2011. While a slight rebound had begun in 2012, the NRPA 2013 report indicates that program offerings have declined in every major category since 2010.

Another revealing trend was the effect of PE during school years on physical activities during school and post-school years. Participation in physical exercise during grade and high school influenced degree of engagement in team sports, outdoor recreation and fitness activities both during school years and after age 18. Those who did not have PE, only 15% also participated in team sports and outdoor recreation. 80% of adults ages 18+ who had PE in school were active compared to 61% of adults who didn’t have PE in school.

The report surveyed spending on wearable devices for fitness tracking. Fitness trackers that sync with smartphones/tablets/computers increased from 8.4% of participants...
in 2014 to 12.9% in 2015. The interest in purchasing and using wearable technology in the future increased by 3.2% over the last year among active individuals.

The 2016 Outdoor Participation Report

According to 2016 Outdoor Participation Report, published by the Outdoor Foundation in Boulder, Colorado, participation in outdoor recreation, team sports and indoor fitness activities vary by an individual’s age. Gender also plays a role in determining behaviors and participation trends. Recent trend highlights include the following:

- Participation rates drop for both males and females from ages 16 to 20. These rates climb back up slightly for females into their early 20's and males late 20's before gradually declining throughout life.
- Indoor fitness becomes the preferred activity among young women ages 16 to 20 and remains the most popular form of activity. Males, however, favor outdoor activities until they are age 66 and older.
- Almost one-quarter of all outdoor enthusiasts participated in outdoor activities at least twice per week.
- Running, including jogging and trail running, was the most popular activity among Americans when measured by number of participants and by number of total annual outings.
- Walking for fitness is the most popular crossover activity.
- The biggest motivator for outdoor participation was getting exercise.

Figure 5. 3-Year Change in Outdoor Recreation Participation of Youth (6-24). (2016 Outdoor Foundation)
The 2015 State of the Industry Report

Recreation Management magazine’s 2015 State of the Industry Report listed the top 10 program options most commonly planned for addition over the next three years, along with the frequency (in parentheses) noted by survey participants:

- Mind body / balance programs (25.2%)
- Fitness programs (24.9%)
- Educational programs (24.3%)
- Day camps & summer camps (22.8%)
- Environmental education (21.5%)
- Teen programming (20.4%)
- Adult sports teams (19.4%)
- Active older adult programs (19.4%)
- Holidays & other special events (19.1%)
- Nutrition & diet counseling (17.4%)

For most programming types, community centers are the ones most likely to be planning to add such programs. There are a few exceptions. Parks are most likely to be planning to add environmental education, sports tournaments or races, individual sports activities and water sports.

The same report indicated park systems that are planning to add features to their...
facilities in the next three years list their top five planned amenities as:

- Playgrounds
- Shelters such as picnic areas and gazebos
- Park restroom structures
- Outdoor sports courts for basketball, tennis, etc.
- Bike trails

**National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (2012)**

The National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) is a comprehensive survey that has been collecting data and producing reports about the recreation activities, environmental attitudes and natural resource values of Americans since the 1980s. The NSRE core focus is on outdoor activity participation and personal demographics. The most recent 2012 NSRE reports the total number of people participating in outdoor activities between 2000 and 2007 grew by 4.4% while the number of days of participation increased by approximately 25 percent. Walking for pleasure grew by 14% and continues to lead as the top favorite outdoor activity.

Nature-based activities, those associated with wildlife and natural settings, showed a discernible growth in the number of people (an increase in 3.1% participation rate) and the number of days of participation. American's participation in nature-based outdoor recreation is increasing with viewing, photographing, or otherwise observing nature clearly measured as the fastest growing type of nature-based recreation activity.

**State & Regional Perspectives**

**Washington State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) 2013**

The SCORP is a five-year statewide recreation plan published by the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office. The Washington Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning (SCORP) document guides decision-makers in better understanding statewide recreation issues and is required to help maintain Washington’s eligibility for federal Land and Water Conservation Fund dollars. The SCORP is designed to determine outdoor recreation issues and opportunities and helps explore local park and recreation planning strategies. It includes valuable data on current trends in recreation participation and demand in Washington. Findings from the Washington State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) were evaluated to help inform planning and funding considerations for future park and recreational facilities.

The 2013 Washington SCORP confirms that outdoor recreation is still an integral part of life for most Washington residents, 90% participate in the most popular category of activities, which includes walking and hiking, demonstrating the pervasiveness of outdoor recreation in Washington's culture. Significant increases in rates of participation in outdoor recreation activities since 2006 indicate the importance of the state and local communities to continue their investment in outdoor recreation facilities and opportunities.
The 2013 SCORP Recommendations encourage local park and recreation service providers to:

- Recognize a return to nature-based activities.
- Understand that the top constraints to participation are social factors (not facilities or opportunities).
- Capitalize on the social benefits of outdoor recreation.
- Focus on increasing and/or improving recreation facilities and opportunities that support active recreation.
- Continue to offer diverse outdoor recreation activities and opportunities.
- Take advantage of current technology by using a map-based information system to provide an inventory of supply.
- Recognize recreation types in which supply may not be meeting demand.
- Focus on the capacity of facilities.
- Consider the implications of changing demographics when making recreation decisions.
- Prioritize regional funding allocations.
- Foster collaboration and cooperation among user groups.
- Understand that access issues encompass an array of physical and psychological issues.
- Increase priority of wetlands.
management as a recreation asset. Based on scientific research and a comprehensive planning process, these recommendations are intended to contribute knowledge and guidance to the future development of outdoor recreation in Washington for the benefit of both residents and the natural environment.

From the 2013 SCorp, the broadest recommendation for all areas across Washington is to continue the investment in outdoor recreation facilities and opportunities as the foundation for fulfilling the needs and expectations for the benefit of both residents and the natural environment.

Washington State’s Recreational Sports Needs

The Washington State 2014 Governor’s Blue Ribbon Parks and Outdoor Recreation Task Force reported that leadership and commitment were needed to gain from initiatives that provided three outstanding qualities that make the State of Washington a great place to live. While the Task Force had a statewide focus, its conclusions, stated below, apply to every local community.

- **Healthier people** – Experiencing and recreating in the outdoors contributes to both mental and physical health for everyone from our children to returning veterans and aging Baby Boomers.

- **Stronger communities** – Communities that invest in parks, trails and other outdoor spaces offer the quality of life that helps every resident thrive, and gives them a competitive edge in the quest for business creation, recruitment, and retention.

- **A thriving economy** – An entire business spectrum rests on the quality of our parks, public lands, and recreational opportunities. Outdoor recreation creates jobs, and is a star attraction for the recruitment of new businesses and a talented workforce. The economic contribution to Washington from outdoor recreation is significant, estimated at $22.5 billion annually by the Outdoor Industry Association.
COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Survey of Public Demand

To ensure a high level of public value and continually assess its service provision, Si View Metropolitan Park District conducts periodic surveys of its community. The surveys provide an overview of residents' evaluation of Si View MPD's performance on various functions, facilities and programs. The surveys also explore the most favored public priorities for future park and recreation services and facilities. Additionally, the surveys indicate the overall satisfaction with the value being delivered by Si View MPD to taxpayers. Results from the community surveys conducted in 2012 and 2016 offer general guidance for public support and priorities for parks and recreation.

The summary of the results of the 2012 Si View MPD Community Interest & Opinion Survey provides a past benchmark for comparison to the most recent 2016 community survey. Highlights from those 2012 survey results include:

- Sixty-five percent (65%) of households indicated the overall physical condition of all Si View parks and facilities visited was either "excellent" (13%) or "good" (52%).
- Eighty-five percent (85%) of households either strongly agree (54%) or agree (31%) that improving physical health and fitness is a benefit being provided by parks, trails and recreation facilities.
- The benefits provided by parks, trails and recreation facilities that are most important to households include: improving physical health and fitness (67%), making the Snoqualmie Valley a more desirable place (38%), and preserving open space and the environment (38%).
- Seventy-seven percent (77%) of households indicated the need for walking and biking trails, while 70% have a need for natural areas/wildlife habitats. Other parks and recreation facilities for which households have a need include: large community parks (66%), indoor performance/outdoor fair or festival space (62%), and indoor fitness and exercise facilities (60%).
- The parks and recreation facilities that are most important to households include: walking and biking trails (46%), combo indoor/outdoor swimming pool/water park outdoor swimming pool/water park (31%), natural areas/wildlife habitats (29%), indoor fitness and exercise facilities (26%), and indoor performance/outdoor fair or festival space (23%).
- Fifty-eight percent (58%) of households indicated the need for community special events, while 54% have a need for adult fitness and wellness programs.
- Fifty-two percent (52%) of households use county and state parks for parks and recreation programs and services. Other organizations include: neighboring community parks/facilities (45%), Si View MPD (38%), private or public schools (35%) private clubs (tennis, health and fitness) (21%), youth sports leagues (20%), and churches (20%).
Eighty-two percent (82%) of households are either very supportive (61%) or somewhat supportive (21%) of developing connecting walking and biking trails.

The more recent Si View MPD Community Priorities Survey was conducted in May 2016 through a combination of telephone interviews and an on-line questionnaire. Every household in the district in which at least one person was registered to vote was contacted and invited to participate in the survey. A total of 404 telephone interviews and 292 on-line questionnaires were completed.

Eighty-three percent (83%) of survey respondents rated the cleanliness and maintenance of Si View facilities as "excellent" (58%) or "good" (25%).

In general, the survey indicated that Si View MPD parks and facilities were well-used and highly appreciated by District residents. The survey respondents indicate broad support for expanding, improving and developing future recreation opportunities and listed top priorities as trails that link parks and greenspace, parkland acquisition for passive recreation (particularly with riverfront access) and a new family aquatic center/pool.

In one survey question, participants were asked to indicate what the priority should be for development of that type of facility for Si View MPD. The answers were ranked according to “top”, “high”, “low” or “not a priority” as shown in the chart to the right. The top three priorities were trails, playgrounds and natural areas followed closely by an aquatic center.

A follow-up question in the survey asked which of those facilities should be the highest priority to Si View MPD. The top priority shifted somewhat to reveal the aquatic center as the top priority. The second and third priorities for Si View MPD were ranked as a riverfront access park and walking and biking trails, as shown on the following chart.
Figure 8. Priority Development Projects using 2-Tier Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Top Priority</th>
<th>Next Highest Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family aquatics center/pool</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverfront access park</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking &amp; biking trails</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas/wildlife habitats</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen recreation centers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water spray parks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community parks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer, football &amp; lacrosse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor exercise facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain bike park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/softball</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelters/areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis, pickle ball courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym space/indoor court</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A list of nine (9) improvements and facilities under active consideration by Si View MPD were ranked in the survey. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for any of these projects that would be funded by tax dollars. For all but one of the proposals (synthetic turf at Twin Falls Middle School), most respondents said they were inclined to “support” or “strongly support” each proposal. Trails and an aquatic center were again a favorable facility for Si View’s park and recreation facility priorities. The full list is depicted in the following chart.
Finally, survey participants indicated their rating of the value of Si View MPD for their tax dollars. The value of Si View MPD was rated as “satisfactory” or better by 91% of respondents; 25% indicated an “excellent” rating; and 39% of respondents rated the value as “good”. The survey results indicate that there is a reservoir of trust for overall value of Si View MPD and likely support for plans for future development.
Stakeholder Sessions

City of North Bend (interview summary)

In general, the City of North Bend has a close working relationship with Si View MPD and views their work performance very highly. North Bend recognizes that the District maintenance crews are specialists in park operations and provide more efficient work. North Bend perceives active recreation as a way to stimulate local economy. The City recently re-formed their Economic Development Commission. The City’s vision is that “North Bend is a premier outdoor recreation town in the greater Puget Sound region.” The vision is to grow areas in the downtown that complement outdoor recreation (i.e., beer/wine venues or retail for gear/equipment).

The importance is high for trails interconnecting from park to park and the completion of gaps to provide for full circuits or loops around town. The city trails plan envisions more pedestrian and bike access to venues outside the city. A footbridge across the Middle Fork to link NE 8th Avenue to the trails at Little Si could create a 4-5 mile loop, tying into the Snoqualmie Valley Trail.

The City supports the transfer of Tanner Landing to Si View MPD. Future site improvements could include enhanced river access, an 18-hole disc golf course and signage. With gravel or a ramp, the site could be a better take-out spot for river users. Additional parking may be needed as well. There is a need for an indoor swimming pool; if Snoqualmie were part of the MPD boundary, it could broaden the base of residents helping to finance it. The City’s Parks Element also noted the need for a splash pad/park, in addition to a pool facility.

City of Snoqualmie (interview summary)

The City is not part of the Si View MPD and has shown reluctance to join, since they have adequate funding for their existing facilities. Snoqualmie residents have an existing YMCA community center, which is currently at capacity. Future recreation needs include a pool, open gym, outdoor volleyball and adult leagues. Snoqualmie has fields (9-12) that accommodate lacrosse, soccer, softball and baseball and recognizes the need for more fields but not the need for adding field lighting. The City’s future plans are targeting a skate park. The City is open to creating site improvement partnerships with nearby jurisdictions for development and maintenance of lands where it retains ownership.

A regional aquatics facility is of interest to serve Snoqualmie, Fall City, Carnation and unincorporated King County.

The City is planning for a river walk along its river frontage and has spent $2.5 million over the years in studies. The City is interested in moving the project forward and can fund approximately one block of river walk in the near term.

The Meadowbrook Farm Board was appointed by Snoqualmie and North
Bend. The City thinks the MPD could play a larger role in the development and management of that site. Snoqualmie’s interests for that site include recreational tourism (including mud runs, penny farthing rides, events), as well as farm-to-table activities and a working farm. The City would like to see the MPD be the steward of the site, and it would be willing to invest $250,000 annually initially to see more use at the site.

Snoqualmie Valley School District (interview summary)
The Snoqualmie Valley School District works collaboratively with the MPD to allow use of school facilities for recreation programming. The School District also works with a soccer league and a little league for needed field improvements. Overall, indoor gym space is experiencing an increase in usage, and it will be harder to accommodate all user requests by the School District.

There is a need for a full sized pool for high school teams. The School District could be a consistent user and renter of a pool, but they are not interested in owning, building or operating a pool. The School District currently rents time at an outdoor facility for use by the school teams. That arrangement is working and is okay for the five months that access to water is needed for the teams.

Mountains to Sounds Greenway Trust (interview summary)
Across the regional land managers and various trail/conservation organizations involved in the Mountain to Sounds Greenway (MTSG), there is a goal to better integrate projects and coordinate for recreation planning in the Valley. The potential economic benefits of a state-wide trail have not been fully captured by the local communities. A connected network that links local, state and federal trails throughout the Snoqualmie Valley is needed. The Snoqualmie Valley Trail needs to be better utilized. MTSG has engaged a consultant to develop trail standards that could be adopted for local trails, as well to help trail users connect across the various trails. Another opportunity focuses on regional branding of the Valley as its own destination. A role for the Si View MPD can be to help unify the four different cities to a shared vision for creating a trail network and promoting outdoor recreation economic activity.

The context for outdoor recreation planning in the Valley is to really engage people in downtown economic development for all four cities and to find solutions to address neighbor concerns about activity and usage. The solutions being discussed to address these include the following:

- Create a connected network – find ways to link federal, state, county and local trails throughout the Snoqualmie Valley;
- Address congestion and active transportation options – look into ideas such as a trail head shuttle service, connecting trails to parking areas in the downtowns, improve bike access; and,
Better utilize the Snoqualmie Valley Trail (SVT) – build upon the Trail Towns concept to link and harness the potential of trails connected to towns along the route.

King County staff mentioned that MTSG is leading a branding effort for the Valley, which is intended to help with identity and branding for all the cities in the Valley.

**King County** (interview summary)

King County has been working with the Mountains to Sound Greenway and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) with the goal to connect outdoor recreation opportunities in the Valley. King County would be open to coordination on projects with the Si View MPD.

King County is coordinating with DNR staff to address trail access and parking for the two most popular trails in the state. Rattlesnake Ledge and Mt Si both have a high demand for parking. DNR is interested in adding parking along the Middle Fork on King County land to support this demand. The County role will be to acquire land to close the gaps for building trail connections. The County is currently looking at options to secure additional land at the old mill site and Weyerhaeuser to fill some gaps and link to the Snoqualmie Valley Trail.

If the Si View MPD moved more into outdoor recreation programming (i.e., outdoor education and camps) and wanted to use King County facilities, the County would be ready to partner and has set up granting programs to support cities and districts in providing those services. King County also offers a Youth Sports Facilities Grant which provides funding to many agencies in King County.

**Si View MPD Board** (discussion summary)

District staff leaders and Commissioners expressed the public value of the community center and pool as an intergenerational core to activities and events in the Snoqualmie Valley. However, they also noted that the actual Si View MPD does not always gain recognition for many of the other services that it provides, such as farmers market, facility management and events. Other specific points raised are as follows.

**Indoor Recreation**

- The pool is a critical indoor recreation infrastructure for the Snoqualmie Valley and provides a multitude of lessons, water safety training and fitness programming. As fitness trends develop, pool management tries to be flexible about offered classes and scheduled swim times.
- An indoor playground at the community center was a suggested improvement to provide for an all-weather play space (now provided by Sno-Valley Indoor Playground).
- Increasing attendance at teen night suggests the potential for expanding teen-specific amenities and more programming to engage the community youth.
- General recognition was made for the value of continuing to diversify recreational programming to engage active lifestyles for all generations and abilities.
Outdoor Recreation

- "Trail Town Plan" is a framework to link local amenities to include trail development and signage ideas.
- Two main gaps exist for trails: Snoqualmie Trail near Snoqualmie Falls and Snoqualmie Trail at the former Weyerhaeuser mill.
- Build a pump track at Torguson.
- Youth, teens and diversified recreation platform is needed.
- Green infrastructure and linkages are a new opportunity.
- Regional Outdoor Plan (further promoting resources to non-local residents): There are willing partners to help (County, Mountains to Sound Greenway, City), which translates to exposure and partnerships for the District to facilitate and promote outdoor recreation and greenspaces. The MPD could be a leverage partner that can provide assets to Valley residents and foster relationships.

MPD Boundary

- The SVMPD Board sees the role of the District as a non-partisan regional bridge. Acting as a bridge, it could be possible for the District to provide capital for park improvements, especially if the City of Snoqualmie were part of the District.

Public Open House Input

September Open House (summary)
Community members were invited to an open house on September 14, 2016 at the Si View Community Center. District staff, Board members and project team staff engaged with participants to explore proposed recommendations and general needs and interests for park and recreation in the greater Snoqualmie Valley.

Suggestions from open house participants ranged from addressing critical trail gaps and specific improvements or new amenities at existing parks to the pursuit of new park and trail facilities. An emphasis on future park and trail considerations were to secure adequate funding to do the various acquisitions, developments and improvements being proposed. Expanding indoor recreational amenities and programs for both youth and adults was suggested. Public comments also mentioned the need and value of linking the promotion of outdoor recreation with local economic vitality.

In response to an open house question about the leadership role of the Si View MPD, public input felt the District could take a leadership for:

- Adding new linkages to land-based trails for better connectivity;
- Adding more riverfront access and connecting it to trail systems;
- Expanding park development and park facility improvements within the MPD boundary; and,
- Enabling more water-based recreational opportunities and water trail access.

In general, participants understood the context of the Snoqualmie Valley with its access to outdoor recreation opportunities and recommended capturing the value more overtly, while expanding the connections and infrastructure for outdoor recreation.
PARK INVESTMENTS

Between the District-owned and City of North Bend parks, residents of the Valley have good access to well-cared for park facilities. The following represents some design opportunities or site management considerations that were noted as part of the site assessments for key park properties.

Si View Park

Si View Park is the District's flagship park. It offers a variety of recreation opportunities, including the community center and pool. Design opportunities or site management considerations include the following.

- Consider adding benches in shaded areas adjacent to playgrounds.
- Plan for eventual replacement of short-lived trees (e.g., Callery pear trees in parking lot) with longer-lived canopy trees.
- Evaluate areas where paved path intersects with parking to ensure compliance with ADA regulations regarding detectible warning strips.
- Check function of irrigation heads in planter areas near parking lot.
- Consider replacing the five missing bollards in parking area with large boulders to prevent vehicle encroachment in paved pedestrian areas.
- Repair broken lamp fixture on lighting bollard at east end of parking lot.
- Expand mulched areas at base of trees as they grow to continue healthy and protected shade tree growth.

Torguson Park

This site is owned by the City of North Bend, but it has been managed by the Si View MPD since January 2016. Design opportunities or site management considerations include the following.

- The playground is contained within concrete curb that creates a barrier to ADA-accessibility. Add a ramp or raise level of fall safety surfacing to the height of curb.
- The existing BMX track could be expanded to accommodate more skills and activities. The elimination of Field #5 (whose outfield overlaps other outfield in "quad") would allow for creation of a more functional bike pump track to accommodate a variety of users.
- The skateboard bowl facility is aging and would benefit from renovation, upgraded features, expansion and lighting.
- Consider adding shade trees or shade structure near skateboard facility.
- Consider adding an enhanced trail head facility for access to the Snoqualmie Valley Trail corridor, or the northeast corner of site could be developed into an improved soccer field. A perimeter trail loop could provide more walking opportunities for park visitors, if feasible.
- ADA compliance: Restrooms are not accessible – additional compacted gravel could be added to eliminate the step up to concrete building pad. The ball field quad is not accessible.
- Additional trash cans at the skateboard facility have been suggested by users, particularly on busy weekends.
Ballfield bleachers do not meet current International Building code requirements that dictate safety railings for any tiered seating higher than two-tiers.

**Tollgate Farm Park**

This site also is owned by the City of North Bend, and it is managed by the Si View MPD. Design opportunities or site management considerations include the following.

- The historic farmhouse is being stabilized and gradually restored in phases through grant support. Consider how to integrate prospective adaptable re-uses into developed park and trail that leads under bridge and across SR 202.
- Consider if an additional trail head to the Snoqualmie Valley Trail could enhance park uses and outdoor recreation connections.
- Add universal ADA parking signs at designated spaces.
- New landscape planting beds need attention – new shrubs will need replacement; weed growth becoming pervasive.

**Meadowbrook Farm**

Meadowbrook Farm is controlled by the Meadowbrook Farm Preservation Association, and the Si View MPD manages the interpretive center’s programming for educational programming and special events. Design opportunities or site management considerations include the following.

- The interpretive building currently hosts some rental programming. An expansion of the building facility to include outdoor gathering spaces and more connections of the interior space into its surrounding landscape could expand the amenities being offered for programming and rental.
- The trail system currently provides access to a variety of meadows, forest and the Dike Road Fields. Future connections are planned for linking to the Snoqualmie Valley Trail. Future improved access to the lands on the west side of SR 202 could provide additional outdoor recreation and environmental education value.
- A unified management plan could provide efficiency benefits for overall landscape care of the property.
- The sign for designated handicapped parking is mounted too low and should be at least 60" above ground to be ADA compliant.

**Tanner Landing**

This site is owned by King County and has potential to be improved for water access and other uses. Design opportunities or site management considerations include the following.

- Formalized access to the Snoqualmie Valley Trail with ADA-compliant connections could enhance park and trail compatibility.
- The site offers good picnicking potential with river access and natural areas to support informal outings and other compatible passive recreation uses.
Restoration planting should continue to expand riparian forest and its ecological value, while converting more open field to native forest.

Twin Falls Middle School Sports Fields

The turf grass condition at this school site is much deteriorated and not supportive of safe sport play activities. Based on pervasive weed growth and amount of bare exposed areas, the School District should consider a complete renovation and re-installment of the fields in concert with a better turf management program that includes timely fertilization and irrigation. Also, non-school use would benefit from outdoor restroom facilities to support programmed field uses.

Overall Considerations

General Parks

Based on the site visit conducted at Si View Park, the overall grounds maintenance practices show a high level of professional care. Details like mulched rings protecting tree trunks, general weed control, overall cleanliness and grass field conditions indicate attention to details and commitment of resources to “taking care of what you have”.

Other Parks & Facilities

Si View MPD is managing properties under other ownership. This situation may create coordination challenges between operations and maintenance and capital repairs/improvements. Close cooperation should continue to ensure smooth transitions from project planning design and installation to the management of that facility’s physical and landscape features.

Wayfinding & Signage

North Bend and Snoqualmie have implemented a good system of wayfinding signage for the visitor to navigate in finding the desired outdoor recreation amenities. A similar consideration for wayfinding would be helpful to and within the specific park facilities to help users find the amenities that offer desired outdoor recreation or indoor programming.

Regional Trail Connections

Capturing the value of the Snoqualmie Valley Trail and its connections across the landscape provides added outdoor recreation opportunities for the community. This direction should continue to expand linkages to both outdoor recreation facilities as well as other destinations that relate to bike/pedestrian travel.

Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance

A few barriers were revealed in the park facilities inventory that should be given attention to ensure compliance with ADA requirements. Where Si View manages but does not own certain facilities, coordination will be needed to encourage capital repairs or improvements that address existing architectural barriers.
Parkland Distribution & Access

Community and neighborhood parks form the basic foundation of a healthy park and recreation system, providing opportunities for residents of all ages to exercise, reflect, and spend time with friends and family outdoors. Continuing to invest in and improve these park spaces, either directly or in partnership with neighboring jurisdictions, will ensure they continue to serve the recreational needs of the Valley community for generations to come.

Through thoughtful planning, the Si View MPD, City of North Bend and City of Snoqualmie have secured new park sites over the years, and a strong core system of parks and open spaces exist today. However, the continued and projected growth of the Valley will place further pressure on access to new lands for parks or water access sites. Understanding the known gaps in the broader park system will provide a foundation for strategic planning to ensure that tomorrow’s residents have access to a distributed system of parks and trails to stay healthy and active.

Parkland Gap Analysis

To better understand where potential acquisition efforts should be directed, this Plan assesses the current distribution of parks throughout the District through a gap analysis. The gap analysis reviews the locations and types of existing facilities, transportation/access barriers and other factors as a means to identify preliminary acquisition target areas. In reviewing parkland distribution and assessing opportunities to fill identified gaps, primary and secondary service areas were used as follows:

- Community parks: ½-mile primary & 1-mile secondary service areas
- Neighborhood parks: ¼-mile primary & ½-mile secondary service areas

Map 2 on the following page illustrates the application of this approach from existing, publicly-owned neighborhood and community parks. The map shows that the central portion of North Bend is well served with reasonable access to public parkland. The majority of park needs in the urbanized area of North Bend exist near the edges. Areas north and east of Tannerwood Park, south and west of Riverfront Park, east of Tollgate Park and west of Opstad School are notable gap areas.

The greatest documented land need is for additional community park sites to provide the land base for a blend of passive and active recreation opportunities, such as sport fields, picnicking and walking. Secondarily, new neighborhood parks are needed to improve overall distribution and equity throughout the urbanized area of the District, while promoting recreation within walking distance of residential areas. Map 3 illustrates potential acquisition target areas.

While the targeted acquisition areas do not identify a specific parcel(s) for consideration, the area encompasses a broader region in which an acquisition would be ideally suited. These acquisition targets represent a long-term vision for improving parkland distribution. In
addition, the District should coordinate with North Bend to proactively acquire neighborhood and community park sites in newly incorporated areas, should the City’s urban growth boundary and city limits expand in the future. Such acquisitions would help ensure the District and/or the City can adequately provide parks in future neighborhoods.
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This map is intended for planning and informational purposes and may not have been prepared for, or be suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. The proposed park gaps areas are intended to illustrate general deficiencies, which will be assessed further upon future studies and negotiations with property owners for access and use.
**TRAIL SYSTEM**

**Trail Planning – Needs, Values, Benefits**

A recent National Association of Realtors article considers a new trend: Trail-Oriented Development. According to the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, Trail-Oriented Development (TrOD) is a planning tool that combines the active transportation benefits of a trail with the revitalization potential associated with well-designed and well-managed urban parks to help create more livable communities. TrOD aims to provide a network of local business and housing choices within a web of safe and enticing trails.

The Si View MPD is located at the hub of numerous outdoor recreation opportunities and public lands that provide extraordinary trails and trail-related activities. The District is surrounded by federal, state, county, local and non-profit conserved lands allowing various levels of public access and outdoor recreation. While the variety and number of resources are exceptional, most of them are isolated or disjointed from the community and from each other. This limited connectivity across the system of public lands and outdoor recreation venues creates traffic congestion and a sense of separation from support amenities within the Snoqualmie Valley community.

Tourism and recreation-related revenues from trails and greenways can generate job growth, retail sales, increased demand for services, as well as restaurant and lodging uses. The economic benefits of trails have been identified as important community assets, and towns are being promoted through their trail systems as an important strategy for economic growth and vitality. Some states have initiated “Trail Town” programs to help with marketing and the development of trail-related goods and services. While some trail town programs are centered along long distance trails across many regions, the trail town concept could be applied to the Upper Snoqualmie Valley, and is currently being pursued under the leadership of the Mountains to Sound Greenway, to help capture the economic benefits from existing trail-based recreation within the local community.

Building from the trail system planning initiated by the City of North Bend, Map 4 illustrates potential trail linkages to expand the system and enhance trail connectivity.

Several specific connections were cited by stakeholders and/or open house participants that could provide valuable links between popular trails and create enhanced outdoor recreation opportunities. An interest was expressed in a short connector from the Snoqualmie Valley Trail to Little Si Trail ideally staying within the King County right-of-way. The Department of Natural Resources may be considering the feasibility of a future connector trails between Mt Si and Little Si and between Mt Si and Mt Teneriffe trails. Current congestion and parking problems at popular trail heads have stimulated the desire to make more connections within DNR lands to allow for some dissipation of traffic problems.
Water trail development along the Snoqualmie River is a future target. The Sky-to-Sound Water Trail (currently in planning phase) was mentioned as being used as a prototype.

**Trail Towns: Capturing Trail-based Tourism - A project of Allegheny Trail Alliance**

Trail towns are destinations along long-distance trails that can provide goods and services within easy access of trail users. A trail town encourages trail users to visit and welcomes them with warm hospitality. Trails users find their trail experiences are more enjoyable with the support services and local amenities that enhance their travels and add uniqueness to their experiences. Basic elements of a trail town strategy include:

- **Enticing trail users to get off the trail and into your town**
- **Welcoming trail users to your town by making information about the community readily available at the trail**
- **Making a strong and safe connection between your town and the trail**
- **Educating local businesses on the economic benefits of meeting trail tourists’ needs**
- **Recruiting new businesses or expanding existing ones to fill gaps in the goods or services that trail users need**
- **Promoting the “trail-friendly” character of the town**
- **Working with neighboring communities to promote the entire trail corridor as a tourist destination**
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RECREATION PROGRAMS & FACILITIES

Community Feedback

Survey respondents highly rated the performance of the District across a number of functions, including recreation programs and facilities. Overall, 83% of respondents rated as "excellent" or "good" the cleanliness and maintenance of facilities. Community programs and the community center and pool also rated very highly (80% and 70%, respectively). Figure 11 illustrates the District’s performance ratings.

Regarding planning for future park and recreation services, survey respondents were strongly in favor of a new family aquatics center and pool (67% of respondents identified this as either “top” or “high” priority), and this facility was ranked as the top priority in a forced ranking across a variety of improvement options. Teen recreation centers (63%), indoor exercise facilities (59%) and gym space / indoor courts (48%) also ranked highly as “top” or "high" priority improvements.

Figure 11. District Performance Ratings by Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean and well-maintained facilities</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community programs</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Facilities</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center &amp; Pool</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic programs</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for youth</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Facilities</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Facilities</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for teens</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult programs</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPA: 3.50 3.44 3.42 3.25 3.15 3.14 3.06 3.01 2.86 2.78
Other comments from the survey, stakeholder sessions and the community open house included:

- New swimming pool / aquatic center
- Expand summer camp programs at Meadowbrook Farm. A school year program there would be great.
- Playground/outdoor fitness area for teens and young adults
- More adult staff for youth programs
- More indoor recreation programming, such as more weekend programming and therapeutic pool classes

Community Center & Pool

The Si View Community Center and Pool is a full service, multi-purpose, high demand facility that is used for recreation, aquatics, community programs and events, and rentals. The center offers the following amenities:

- Recreation pool;
- Gymnasium with full court basketball and an elevated stage;
- Main classroom with an art sink and A/V equipment;
- Social room for dance classes and birthday parties; and,
- Commercial grade kitchen.

Recently renovated, the center accommodates many of the District’s recreation programs; however, a significant demand for indoor facilities, especially the pool, remains. The District should continue to explore the feasibility of building a new regional aquatics facility and partner with nearby jurisdictions and school district.

School District Facilities

The Snoqualmie Valley School District is a partner in the provision of the District’s park and recreation services in terms of access to athletic fields and indoor recreation facilities. For years, Si View MPD has enjoyed a cooperative relationship with the School District in the use of their indoor facilities for a variety of organized recreation and sport activities. The use of school district facilities has enabled the District to provide a much higher level of service than would otherwise have been possible, given the limitations of its gymnasium space and sports fields for programming. However, the School District noted increasing usage and demand for its indoor facilities making it harder to coordinate for open slots and also instituted an online calendar two years ago to help with scheduling. Going forward, Si View MPD should explore other options for indoor gymnasium space for programs or consider adjusting its program offerings toward high demand classes for what may become reduced access to School District gymnasiums in the future.

Recreation Programs

Si View MPD’s recreation services are a major community asset and support the physical, mental and social health of community members. The District currently offers a variety of programming, including wellness, sports, aquatics, cultural arts, day camps and a variety of other programs and special events for all ages. The Recreation Division, as a whole, generates approximately $1.2 million in program and rental revenue annually.
generated from over 150,000 customer visits. Figure 12 illustrates a three-year snapshot of program participation by program area.

Figure 12. Participation by Program Area per Year

To continue to provide responsive and focused programs, the District should continue to:

- Enhance the diversity of programs offered, focusing on programs that are in high demand or serve a range of users;
- Meet the needs of diverse users; and,
- Monitor local and regional recreation trends to ensure community needs and interests are addressed by available programming.

Given limited resources and the availability of recreational providers in the region, the District should continue to improve its partnership with the Snoqualmie Valley School District and explore relationships with private fitness clubs and the local entrepreneurs (i.e., contractors) to provide recreation services. The District also should continue to promote and coordinate recreational opportunities provided by its partners to help connect residents with options to learn and recreate.
Aquatics
The District has a strong aquatics program, with an emphasis on lessons and water exercise. The Si View Pool is a year-round public pool, which attracts visitors from across the Snoqualmie Valley, and the Aquatics program averages approximately 50,000 participants per year. The Aquatics program offers open and lap swim, along with youth and adult swim lessons, lifeguard training and water aerobics.

The District’s Aquatics program generally does not meet the community’s needs due to the capacity of the pool itself. While the District should continue its focus toward swim lessons and water safety, its is limited in its ability to respond to and provide for additional aquatics programs in demand, such as water exercise.

The strength and continuity of aquatics programming should also be weighed against the physical needs of the pool and its infrastructure. The pool is an aging facility that is rapidly nearing the end of its useful life. Due to the age of this pool, the District should continue to monitor the performance of the mechanical systems, decking and pool lining, as well as explore the feasibility of building a new regional aquatics facility.

Athletics
The District currently provides a number of youth sports, including basketball, soccer, baseball, track, wrestling and martial arts. While not the primary provider of youth sports in the Valley, the District supports youth athletics with specialized sport camps and programs focused on skill-building.

The District also supports three local youth athletic organizations. With the demand for youth sport fields continuing to grow, it is not unusual for youth sports organizations to build and operate their own fields on their own property or on leased undeveloped public land.

- Snoqualmie Valley Little League has about 400-450 participants, ranging in age from 4 - 13. There are about 15 teams at the 5 year old group to 3 - 5 teams at the 12 year old group. By way of reference, Falls Little League has about 650 kids, and SVLL believes it will be at this level in the future.

- Snoqualmie Valley Youth Soccer Association serves the Snoqualmie Valley area of east King County, including the towns of North Bend, Fall City, Snoqualmie, Carnation and Duvall.

- Mt Si Lacrosse is a K-12 club for boys and girls. In all, there are about 410 participants in the club. The spring season is February to May, and the fall season is September to November.

In addition to local practice and game play, the youth leagues have voiced interest in hosting seasonal tournaments, but access to quality fields are a constraint, as is the limited supply of local hotel rooms. Tournaments may present the potential to generate income for the league and local area. Generally, parents and teams stay between 4-6 nights for tournaments, which in turn promote local economic development through lodging and food services revenue.
To meet local needs, the District should continue to coordinate with local youth leagues and plan for field renovation and expansion projects to support extended and all-weather play. The District should also continue to provide youth sport camps and clinics and increase its focus on the development of outdoor adventure sports (skateboarding, climbing, archery, fencing, Ultimate Frisbee, BMX, parkour, etc.).

The District also provides a limited suite of adult sport opportunities. These include basketball, volleyball and softball. Since adult sports can often generate significant revenue, there may need to be an increased emphasis in this area in the future, as scheduling allows at the Si View Community Center or local school gymnasiums. The District may also want to develop more individual, league or outdoor adventure sports for adults, potentially in partnership with other groups or organizations, and designate certain facilities or time periods for adult sports.

Special Events
The District has a major focus on special events and either hosts or partners for a variety of special events throughout the year. These events are well attended, and for each of the past three years, events have attracted over 24,000 attendees annually. Si View MPD’s special events and programs include:

- Festival at Mt Si
- Harvest Festival
- Theater in the Park
- Holiday Bazaar
- Sno Valley Idol Junior
- Summer Concerts

Special events should continue to be a core program and primary area of emphasis for the District in the future. Special events draw communities together, are popular with local residents and attract visitors from outside the community. However, due to the time and resource requirements of special events, the overall growth in the number of events should be limited in the future. This will ensure the District can adequately invest in its overall recreational offerings and ensure high-quality special events. Other community groups should be encouraged to be the primary funders and organizers of as many community-wide events as possible. If the District decides to offer more events, it should seek to share costs with private sponsors and look to develop a series of seasonal activities.

Youth & Teen Programs
Youth and teen programs promote the health, growth, and safety of the region’s children. The District considers youth programs – including before and after school and summer programs - to be a high priority for its recreation services. Program offerings are varied and include summer camps, after school programs and teen activities.
The District should continue to expand and diversify its popular youth programs to meet the growing need for engaging, affordable, safe options for children. However, many of the District’s recreation programs are not aimed specifically at teens. Programs are generally either aimed at youth (up to 12 years of age) or are adult focused and open to anyone over 15. Teens, ages 13 through 19, may benefit from additional recreational programs designed for their specific interests and needs.

To complement existing opportunities provided by the Snoqualmie YMCA and local sport organizations, the District should continue to explore how to expand teen programming and assess the need for a teen center or "hang-out" space. Also, expanding into additional individual athletics, fitness or alternative sports programs, such as skate, parkour, bouldering and mountain biking classes, could appeal to teens and take advantage of proposed alternative sports amenities.
The goals and objectives described in the following section define the park and recreation services that the Si View Metropolitan Park District aims to achieve based on the needs within the local community and the trends developing in the Snoqualmie Valley.

These goals and objectives follow from the foundation established from the previous 2006-2011 Comprehensive Plan and the feedback from the community, stakeholders and staff during this planning update process. The District's mission statement provides the overarching direction for the District, while the goals and objectives focus the efforts towards tangible parks and recreation achievements.

Mission Statement

“The mission of the Si View Metropolitan Park District is to work in partnership with the community to preserve historic Si View Park and provide opportunities to enhance the quality of life through the facilitation of recreation programs and parks in the Snoqualmie Valley.”

The Plan goals are in alignment with the National Recreation and Parks Association’s Three Pillars, which are foundational concepts adopted by the national organization in 2012. These core
values (below) are crucial to improving the quality of life for all Americans by inspiring the protection of natural resources, increasing opportunities for physical activity and healthy eating, and empowering citizens to improve the livability of their communities.

- **Conservation** – Public parks are critical to preserving our communities’ natural resources and wildlife habitats, which offer significant social and economic benefits. Local park and recreation agencies are leaders in protecting our open space, connecting children to nature and providing education and programs that engage communities in conservation.

- **Health and Wellness** – Park and recreation departments lead the nation in improving the overall health and wellness of citizens, and fighting obesity. From fitness programs, to well-maintained, accessible, walking paths and trails, to nutrition programs for underserved youth and adults, our work is at the forefront of providing solutions to these challenges.

- **Social Equity** – We believe universal access to public parks and recreation is fundamental to all, not just a privilege for a few. Every day, our members work hard to ensure all people have access to resources and programs that connect citizens, and in turn, make our communities more livable and desirable.

**ROLE OF SI VIEW DISTRICT**

The demand for quality park and recreation services continues to grow in the Snoqualmie Valley. The District provides professional leadership that extends beyond its original designations and provides benefits to neighboring cities and neighborhoods. For each of the listed goals below, a leadership or facilitation role has been suggested to assign the degree of involvement and commitment to be pursued by the District’s professional staff and Board members. Leadership roles dictate a primary responsibility for action by the District, while facilitation suggests more of a partnership and coordination responsibility for the District.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & COMMUNICATION

Goal 1: Encourage meaningful public involvement in park and recreation planning and inform residents through District communications. (Leadership role)

1.1 Support the Park Commission as the forum for public discussion of parks and recreation issues and conduct joint sessions as necessary with the City of North Bend and the City of Snoqualmie city councils to improve coordination and discuss policy matters of mutual interest.

1.2 Involve residents and stakeholders in system-wide planning, park site facility design and recreation program development and continue to use a diverse set of communication and informational materials to solicit community input, facilitate project understanding and build public support.

1.3 Support volunteer park improvement and stewardship projects from a variety of individuals, service clubs, faith organizations and businesses to promote community involvement in parks and recreation facilities.

1.4 Continue to promote and distribute information about recreational activities, education programs, community services and events, and volunteer activities sponsored by the District and partner agencies and organizations.

1.5 Continue to promote the accomplishments and successes of the District.
RECREATION SERVICES

Goal 2. Recreation Programs: Provide a variety of recreational services and programs that promote the health and well-being of residents of all ages and abilities. (Leadership role)

2.1 Maintain existing level of aquatic and fitness recreational facilities and programming. Si View Park, Pool and Community Center already provide exceptional community value that contributes to the quality of life in the Snoqualmie Valley. Programming should continue to monitor and evaluate the best mix of programs for its range of users.

2.2 Monitor and account for cost recovery goals by recreation service units.

2.3 Consider evolving trends and changes in demographics to meet the needs of diverse users, including under-served residents who may have limited access to recreation.

2.4 Develop teen and young adult programming and facilities to meet the diverse active recreational needs often missed through traditional recreation facilities.

2.5 Enhance programming opportunities for regional outdoor recreation through existing and new partnerships (school district, cities, non-profits, fitness clubs, private recreation businesses, etc.) that help connect people to programs through shared marketing, facilities, coordination and activities.
Goal 3. Events: Foster community interaction and enhance the quality of life of Valley residents through the promotion of events and festivals. (Facilitation role)

3.1 Encourage the development and expansion of sporting events, seasonal activity highlights, environmental activities, historical celebrations, holiday festivals and other planned happenings to include more connections between parks, trails and Valley towns.

3.2 Consider cross-marketing different activities and linking compatible events to appeal to broader audiences, such as a running/jogging/walking “race” with different lengths for a range of abilities combined with a harvest/local food fair and historic craft demonstration.

3.3 Pursue and participate in outreach and promotion that reaches beyond the Valley to enhance the potential tourism benefits to the local economy.

Goal 4. Recreation Facilities: Maintain and enhance the District’s facilities to provide recreational opportunities, community services and opportunities for residents to connect, learn and play. (Leadership role)

4.1 Continue to manage the community center to provide a diverse array of recreational programs, services and experiences for the Valley community.

4.2 Maintain the aquatics facilities at Si View Pool.

4.3 Pursue opportunities to develop a second indoor aquatic facility serving the Valley, potentially in partnership with other organizations or agencies. Consider financial feasibility and long term operations needs prior to construction of any new facility.
PARK PLANNING & DESIGN

Goal 5. Maintain existing parks and amenities at levels that meet or exceed the public's desire for safety, cleanliness and utility. Develop new parks and facilities to meet the current and future needs of Snoqualmie Valley residents. (Leadership role)

5.1 Design and maintain District parks and facilities to offer universal accessibility for residents of all physical capabilities, skill levels and age.

5.2 Incorporate sustainable development and low impact design practices into the design, planning and rehabilitation of new and existing facilities.

5.3 Continue to promote the cultural and historic resources of the District.

5.4 Utilize parkland, facilities and programs to promote environmental education and encourage park visitors to become stewards of the Snoqualmie Valley's natural resource.

5.6 Work cooperatively with the City of North Bend to execute the goals and priorities of that city’s Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan.

5.5 Pursue opportunities to provide or enhance public access (e.g. trails, viewpoints, wildlife viewing areas, and water access) to support passive recreation and environmental education.

5.6 Work cooperatively with the City of North Bend to execute the goals and priorities of that city’s Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan.

5.7 Partner to preserve high resource value, significant or connected natural resource areas through acquisition or other protection (e.g., conservation easements) as they become available.
5.8 Continue active partnerships with the Snoqualmie Valley School District and other recreation providers and explore opportunities for greater joint use of facilities.

5.9 Continue and enhance partnerships with local sports organizations to provide sports programs for youth and adults.

5.10 Monitor the condition, investment needs and usage rates of various field facilities to plan for long-term maintenance and capital needs.

5.11 Explore options to acquire additional field space to meet capacity needs.

5.12 Consider local needs, recreational trends, and availability of similar facilities within the City and region when planning for specialized recreational facilities.

5.13 Provide facilities for alternative or emerging sport needs, such as skateboarding, BMX, mountain biking, pump tracks, disc golf, climbing and parkour, to offer the Valley community a more diverse range of recreational experiences.
TRAIL NETWORK

Goal 6. Actively encourage the collaboration of local jurisdictions, King County, and state and federal land managers to help address the gaps in trails and public lands for a more coordinated and connected system. (Facilitation role)

6.1 Coordinate with and take an active role in supporting the Trails Town efforts led by the Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust.

6.2 Coordinate and partner with public agencies, local utilities and private landowners to secure trail easements and access to open space for trail connections.

6.3 Work with the City of North Bend to facilitate and enable the trail projects on its 6-year Parks Capital Facilities Plan in support of community need and importance.

6.4 Work with the City of Snoqualmie to help create an integrated trail system that connects with other transportation modes and encourage new development to make trail connections and create linkages. (The City desires to cooperate with other providers to develop a coordinated level of service for provision of parks and open spaces.)

6.5 Communicate regularly with DNR regarding their Snoqualmie Corridor Recreation Plan that acknowledged how Valley communities have economic ties to the DNR-managed lands that provide outdoor recreation opportunities and the value of a network of developed facilities and trails to provide more integrated recreation opportunities.

6.6 Coordinate with King County whose Open Space Plan states that the County should provide regional leadership and coordination for the planning, design, implementation and maintenance of the countywide Regional Trails System to ensure regional trail connections between jurisdictions and linkages with other local trails.
ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

Goal 7. Administration: Provide leadership and management of parks, facilities and recreation programs throughout the District. (Leadership role)

7.1 Provide guidance, direction and transparency to the Park Commission on policy and plans for development, management and operation of the District.

7.2 Assess the effectiveness of the organization on a regular basis and make structural changes and improvements as appropriate.

7.3 Update this Comprehensive Plan periodically to ensure park and recreation facilities and services meet current and future needs.

7.4 Develop and maintain a business plan or strategic plan to help focus the direction of the District and support funding requests.

7.5 Stay current with the progress of and advancements in parks, recreation, maintenance and operations best practices and applicable legal requirements.

7.6 Enhance the implementation of capital improvement projects for park and trail facilities.
Goal 8. Staff Resources: Grow the professional staffing of the District to meet requested services and leadership roles. (Leadership role)

8.1 Assess the District’s staffing needs on a regular basis and hire adequate staff to manage the park and recreation system.

8.2 Promote professional development opportunities that strengthen the core skills and commitment from staff, Board members and key volunteers, to include trainings, materials and/or affiliation with the National Recreation & Park Association (NRPA) and the Washington Recreation & Park Association (WRPA).

8.3 Use part-time, seasonal, and contract employees for select functions to meet peak demands and respond to specialized or urgent needs.
Goal 9. Funding: Use traditional and new funding sources to adequately and cost-effectively maintain and enhance the quality of the District's park and recreation system. (Leadership role)

9.1 Ensure the financial integrity of the District by seeking efficiencies in expenditures while sustaining quality services.

9.2 Pursue alternative funding options for the maintenance, expansion and development of parks and programs, such as through private donation, sponsorships, underwriting partnerships, state and federal grant sources, among others.

9.3 Utilize voter-approved initiatives, such as bonds and levies, to finance future improvements.

9.4 Continue to create active partnerships with county, neighboring communities and the school district for the provision of a balanced mix of parks and recreation facilities and pursue joint use agreements.

9.5 Update program and rental fees on a periodic basis to reflect market rates.
The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) puts into chronological order the project intent and strategic actions adopted by the District to guide the implementation of this Plan. It assigns proposed time frames and estimated costs for specific projects group by project type. A summary of proposed project categories and scopes is described below.

The projects were selected based on the need to implement long-standing plans for improvements and work toward meeting the goal to better connect and create access to park and recreation facilities. The following table summarizes the aggregate capital estimates from the CFP by park types for the next ten years. A full CFP follows.

Figure 13. Capital Facilities Plan Expenditures Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Park Site</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023+</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Si View Community Park</td>
<td>Si View Community Park Pool Deck Rehab Project - Unfunded</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Si View Community Park</td>
<td>Si View Community Park Pool Metal Door Replacement - Unfunded</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$34,933</td>
<td>$34,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM/CC</td>
<td>New Carpet, Flooring, Annex Office</td>
<td>AM/CC New Carpet, Flooring, Annex Office</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Community Center, Junior Center</td>
<td>CC Community Center, Junior Center</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPK</td>
<td>Playground Surface Pour In Place</td>
<td>NPK Playground Surface Pour In Place</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Parking Lot Bollards</td>
<td>CN Parking Lot Bollards</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>White House Renovation Purchase</td>
<td>AN White House Renovation Purchase</td>
<td>A Local/Capital</td>
<td>$79,500</td>
<td>$79,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>King County Roads Property</td>
<td>AN King County Roads Property</td>
<td>A Local/Capital</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPK</td>
<td>Si View Park Connection to Henry Taylor (Train Depot)</td>
<td>NPK Si View Park Connection to Henry Taylor (Train Depot)</td>
<td>D Local/Capital</td>
<td>$75,500</td>
<td>$75,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Si View Community Park</td>
<td>Si View Community Park Pool Bathroom re-tile &amp; electrical</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Administration Office</td>
<td>AM Administration Office</td>
<td>A R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM/CC</td>
<td>North Annex Relays</td>
<td>AM/CC North Annex Relays</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>Tollgate Farm Park</td>
<td>Tollgate Farm Park Trail from Tollgate Park to SVT</td>
<td>D Local/Capital</td>
<td>$114,000</td>
<td>$114,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>Tollgate Farm Park</td>
<td>Tollgate Farm Park Trail from Tollgate Park to SVT</td>
<td>D Local/Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPK</td>
<td>Community Project Collaboration</td>
<td>NPK Community Project Collaboration</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>L. Fork West Bank Levee Trail &amp; Bridge (City of NB)</td>
<td>HB L. Fork West Bank Levee Trail &amp; Bridge (City of NB)</td>
<td>D Local/Capital</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPK</td>
<td>Battlein Mountain Annex</td>
<td>NPK Battlein Mountain Annex</td>
<td>D Local/Capital</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPK</td>
<td>Future Development</td>
<td>NPK Future Development</td>
<td>D Local/Capital</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>Future Trail Acquisition &amp; Development Project Collaborations</td>
<td>HB Future Trail Acquisition &amp; Development Project Collaborations</td>
<td>A/D Local/Capital</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>Tanner Landing / Delightwater Master Plan (City of NB &amp; King County)</td>
<td>HB Tanner Landing / Delightwater Master Plan (City of NB &amp; King County)</td>
<td>P Local</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>Minor Repairs &amp; Renovations</td>
<td>Systemwide Minor Repairs &amp; Renovations</td>
<td>R Local/Capital</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Systemwide Planning</td>
<td>P Local</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Systemwide Planning</td>
<td>P Local/Grants</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Systemwide Planning</td>
<td>P Local/Grants</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPK</td>
<td>Maintenance Equipment</td>
<td>NPK Maintenance Equipment</td>
<td>A Equipment</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPK</td>
<td>General Equipment Parks</td>
<td>NPK General Equipment Parks</td>
<td>A Equipment</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>District Vehicle - Truck or Van</td>
<td>AN District Vehicle - Truck or Van</td>
<td>A Equipment</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPK</td>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>NPK Tractor</td>
<td>A Equipment</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPK</td>
<td>Grounds Vehicle/Gator/Bobcat</td>
<td>NPK Grounds Vehicle/Gator/Bobcat</td>
<td>A Equipment</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sum:** $2,901,833

**NOTE:** Planning projects assume one or more collaborating partners who share the cost of planning process.

Si View District would be the coordinating project manager for the planning process.
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A number of strategies exist to improve park and recreation service delivery for the Si View MPD; however, clear decisions must be made in an environment of competing interests and limited resources. A strong community will is necessary to bring many of the projects listed in this Plan to life, and the Si View community has demonstrated over the last decade its willingness to support parks and recreation efforts, pool and facility maintenance and a high quality of life.

The recommendations for park and recreation services noted in this Plan may trigger the need for funding beyond current allocations and for additional staffing, operations and maintenance responsibilities. Additional resources will be needed to leverage, supplement and support the implementation of proposed policies, programs and projects. The following implementation strategies are presented to offer near-term direction to realize these projects and as a means to continue dialogue between the District, its community partners and nearby cities.

Given that the operating and capital budgets for the District are limited, the implementation measures identified below look primarily to non-General Fund options. Additionally, a review of potential implementation tools is attached as
Appendix F and includes local financing, federal and state grant and conservation programs, acquisition methods and others.

ACTION STRATEGIES

Partner Coordination & Collaboration

Specific projects and goals identified in this Plan demand a high degree of coordination and collaboration with the cities of North Bend and Snoqualmie and other regional agencies serving the Valley.

In coordination with North Bend and other partners, the District should continue to explore opportunities to expand public access and ownership along the major rivers for trails and water access sites. This could include coordinated outreach to and negotiations with landowners with river frontage. Also, the District should encourage North Bend, Snoqualmie and King County to utilize this Plan and other adopted plans in the review of development applications with consideration toward potential parkland acquisition areas, planned trail corridors and the need for easement or set-aside requests to facilitate trails or water access sites.

Si View MPD’s relationship with the City of North Bend remains strong, and the District's ability to assume site maintenance for Tollgate Farm and Torguson Park has benefitted the Valley community through improved maintenance and site enhancements. The District should continue to sustain the relationship with the City and look for opportunities to support or lead the development of parks and trails that meet the shared goals of both agencies, including continued improvements to Tollgate Farm Park and Torguson Park.

Si View MPD should also explore a stronger role in the development and management of Meadowbrook Farm and engage the cities of Snoqualmie and North Bend in discussions about capital and maintenance contributions to expand the site's potential for recreational and cultural tourism.

The District should discuss and update its interlocal agreement with the Snoqualmie Valley School District to re-evaluate the potential to coordinate with SVSD for extended use of indoor gymnasium space for recreation programs. The interlocal also should explore the potential for shared facility development and usage commitments for a new aquatic center serving the Valley community. Si View MPD should continue to facilitate discussions with local youth sport leagues and staff from the School District, Snoqualmie and North Bend for the purposes of sport field coordination and evaluating options for expanding field capacity in the Valley.

Being at the center of an active lifestyles community, Si View MPD should explore partnership opportunities with regional health care providers and services, such as the Snoqualmie Valley Hospital and the King County Health Department, to promote wellness activities, healthy
living and communications about the benefits of parks and recreation. For example, this group could more directly cross-market services and help expand communications about local wellness options, and they could sponsor a series of organized trail walks around the upper Valley as a means to expand public awareness of local trail opportunities and encourage residents to stay fit. In its own report, the Snoqualmie Valley Hospital District’s Community Health Needs Assessment noted the need to encourage greater physical activity as an emerging health issue for the community. As an example, other communities in Washington have been successful with funding requests to regional hospitals for the development and printing of community walking guides that highlight the health benefits of walking and include trails maps and descriptions. Separately, the District should continue to be an active partner in regional coordination and planning with Mountains to Sound Greenway and support future branding efforts to promote the Valley and its outdoor recreation assets.

**Volunteer & Community-based Action**

Volunteers and community groups already contribute to the improvement of park and recreation services for Si View MPD. Volunteer projects include community service projects such as planting, brush clearing and painting, as well as support special events and aquatics and youth programming. The District should continue to promote and update its website with a revolving list of potential small works or volunteer-appropriate projects, while also reaching out to area schools to encourage student projects. While supporting organized groups and community-minded individuals continues to add value to the Si View MPD parks and recreation system, volunteer coordination requires a substantial amount of staff time, and additional resources may be necessary to more fully take advantage of the community’s willingness to support park and recreation efforts.

**Public-Private Partnerships**

Public-private partnerships are increasingly necessary for local agencies to leverage their limited resources in providing park and recreation services to the community. Corporate sponsorships, health organization grants, conservation stewardship programs and non-profit organizations are just a few examples of partnerships where collaboration provides value to both partners. The District has existing partners and should continue to explore additional and expanded partnerships to help implement these Plan recommendations.

**Local Funding**

The Si View community has shown strong resolve in its support for parks and recreation services over the past decade. In 2003, voters supported the formation of the District as a means to care for and continue to operate the Si View Pool. In 2010, voters approved an $1.6 million bond to support the rehabilitation of Si View Park and improvements to Tollgate Farm.
According to the District budget, Si View MPD maintains reserve debt capacity for general obligation bonds and voter approved debt. The ongoing community conversation regarding the need for a new aquatic facility to serve the upper Valley warrants a review of debt implications for such a large capital project, along with polling of voter support for the project. Also, with the expiration of bond debt service, the District should reassess its capital needs for further enhancements to park and recreation facilities and focused support for trail corridor acquisition and development to fill known network gaps.

**King County Conservation Futures**

The county currently assesses the maximum allowable excise of $0.0625 per $1,000 assessed value to fund the Conservation Futures program and provides cities a venue to access these funds through a competitive, local grant process. While the District cannot directly pursue Conservation Futures funding from the County, it has a record of partnering and should continue to support grant application submittals for support in financing the acquisition of additional natural areas to expand riverfront and trail access in the Valley. Most recently, the City of North Bend submitted an application to help with the costs for the Rattlesnake Mountain Scenic & Raging River State Forest acquisition.

**Grants & Appropriations**

Several state and federal grant programs are available on a competitive basis, including Washington Recreation and Conservation Office grants, LWCF and MAP-21. Pursuing grants is not a panacea for park system funding, since grants are both competitive and often require a significant percentage of local funds to match the request to the granting agency, which depending on the grant program can be as much as 50% of the total project budget. Si View MPD should continue to leverage its local resources to the greatest extent by pursuing grants independently and in cooperation with other local partners.

Appropriations from state or federal sources, though rare, can supplement projects with partial funding. State and federal funding allocations are particularly relevant on regional transportation or trail projects, and the likelihood for appropriations could be increased if multiple partners are collaborating on projects.

**Other Implementation Tools**

Appendix F identifies other implementation tools, such as grants and acquisition tactics, that the District could utilize to further the implementation of the projects noted in the CFP.
Note: Cross tabulations and detailed numerical data regarding survey responses can be provided by Si View Metro Parks.
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INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the results of a sample survey of residents in the Si View Metropolitan Park District (SVMPD) to assess residents’ evaluation of the Park District and their priorities for future development of recreation facilities in the Snoqualmie Valley.

A total of 404 adult heads of household were interviewed May 9-27, 2016: 112 by telephone and 292 via on-line questionnaire. Every household in the district in which at least one person is registered to vote was contacted either by telephone or mail and invited to participate in this survey.

The survey was designed to assess:

- Residents’ evaluation of SVMPD’s performance on various functions, facilities, and programs;
- Priorities for future park and recreation services and facilities;
- Level of potential support/opposition to various improvements under consideration by SVMPD;
- Overall satisfaction with the value to taxpayers being delivered by SVMPD.

Demographic information was collected so as to compare and contrast answers.

The survey was designed and administered by Elway Research, Inc. The questionnaire was developed in collaboration with District staff and consultants from Conservation Technix, Inc.

The report includes Key Findings, followed by annotated graphs summarizing the results to each question. The full questionnaire and a complete set of cross-tabulation tables are presented under separate cover.
METHODS

SAMPLE: 404 Heads of Household in the Si View Metropolitan Park District.

TECHNIQUE: Mixed Mode
112 Telephone Survey with Live Interviewers
22% via cell phone;
292 via on-line survey.

FIELD DATES: May 9-27, 2016

SAMPLE FRAME: All households within the District in which at least one person was registered to vote (N=5664). Households for which we had telephone numbers (n=3034) were included in the telephone sample; those for which telephone numbers were not available (n=2630) were included in the online sample.

MARGIN OF ERROR: ±5% at the 95% level of confidence. That is, in theory, had all similarly qualified residents been interviewed, there is a 95% chance the results would be within ±5% of the results in this survey.

DATA COLLECTION: TELEPHONE: Calls were made during weekday evenings and weekend days by trained, professional interviewers under supervision. Up to six attempts were made to contact each number in the sample. Questionnaires were edited for completeness and 10% of each interviewer’s calls were re-called for verification.

ON-LINE: Invitation letters were mailed to households asking residents to log on to the survey website to complete the questionnaire. A reminder postcard was mailed one week later and a second postcard one week after that.

Virtually every household in the District was either called or received a letter of invitation to participate in the survey.

It must be kept in mind that survey research cannot predict the future. Although great care and the most rigorous methods available were employed in the design, execution and analysis of this survey, these results can be interpreted only as representing the answers given by these respondents to these questions at the time they were interviewed.
Mixed-Mode Survey Method

This survey was conducted using a mixed-mode sample design that combined land-line and cell phone telephone with on-line data collection.

The most recent count indicates 5,664 voter households in the Si View Metropolitan Park District. We obtained telephone numbers for 3,034 households, including cell phone numbers, and mailing addresses for the remaining 2,630.

All 3,034 telephone numbers were called up to 6 times each or until someone answered and either agreed or refused to be interviewed. The 2,630 households for which we had no telephone number were mailed a letter from the District Executive Director asking a designated adult\(^1\) in the household to log on to our survey website and complete the questionnaire on-line. They were sent a thank you/reminder postcard one week after the initial mailing and a second reminder a week later.

The telephone survey resulted in 112 interviews, for a completion rate\(^2\) of 4%, and a cooperation rate\(^3\) of 20%.

The on-line survey resulted in 292 completed questionnaires for a completion rate of 11%.

The data from both modes were combined into a single data set. The combined data were statistically weighted by gender to align the sample with the most recent census data. This was necessary because 65% of the interviews were completed with women.

Research literature indicates that telephone respondents tend to give more positive responses than on-line respondents, particularly to rating scale items where on-line respondents are typically less likely to give the highest rating than are telephone respondents. In this survey, results were somewhat mixed. Telephone respondents gave the Department higher overall grades for all 10 of the functions included in the survey, and were more likely to give a "A" grade in 7 of the 10. On the other hand, on-line respondents were more likely to rate potential improvements as a "top priority" 18 of 20 times.

Because of this mode differential, it is often argued that the inclusion of an on-line survey in addition to the telephone sample produces a more representative result than either a telephone or web sample alone would have produced. In this case, compared to the telephone sample, the on-line sample was younger, more likely to be renters and less likely to have children.

\(^1\) Instructions were that the survey be completed by the adult (18+) in the household with the most recent birthday. This is a common practice to randomize respondents.
\(^2\) The completion rate is the percentage of completed interviews by the total number of telephone numbers dialed. It includes numbers where no one answered the call.
\(^3\) The cooperation rate is the percentage of completed interviews by the number of qualified respondents contacted.
Interpreting the Findings

This survey makes extensive use of scale items to measure public opinion. There are a number of ways to interpret the results from scale items. A common practice is to combine "strongly support" and "support" into "total support" and then do the same for the "oppose" side of the scale. In the realpolitik of public debate, however, it is likely that those with the strongest opinion will have the loudest voices. In this case, those who said they “definitely” support a proposal are more likely to act on that position, and more likely to engage in the debate, than those who said “probably.”

Moreover, there is a known tendency on the part of survey respondents to answer positively. Most respondents tend to want to be helpful and polite. It is therefore practical to treat "probably support" answers as considerably less reliable than "strongly support." Think of it as latent support. Those who said they "probably support" a proposal are positive inclined, but not convinced and not likely to act.

Because of this positivity bias, it is useful to consider "oppose" and "strongly oppose" responses to be reliable estimates of active opposition. If people naturally tend to give positive answers in surveys, then those who say they are opposed are likely to be genuinely opposed.

For purposes of situation assessment and strategy development, then, examining the "strong support" versus the "opposed" provides a prudent (some would say realistic) assessment of public thinking.
RESPONDENT PROFILE

In interpreting these findings, it is important to keep in mind the characteristics of the people actually interviewed. This table presents a profile of the respondents in the survey. The results have been statistically adjusted by gender to align with the population. The "Combined" column displays the weighted sample profile used in this report.

NOTE: Here and throughout this report, percentages may not add to 100%, due to rounding.

Sample Profile by Survey Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
<th>COMBINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARK USE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSEHOLD:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with children</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with no children</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with children</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with no children</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoAns</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked how many times in the last year someone from their household had visited each of four SVMPD facilities. The results were combined into a relative use scale with a range of 0 to 12. The scale is relative because the answers were ranges, not exact numbers of visits. Thus, for example, there are a number of different combinations of visits that could result in a score of 4-7 (Moderate). The purpose of this index is to compare respondents in relation to one another. The scale was collapsed to four equivalent-size categories:

NONE: No one had visited any of the 4 facilities;
LIGHT: 1 to 5 visits;
MODERATE: 4 to 14 visits; at least 2 facilities;
HEAVY 9 to 20+ visits; at least 3 facilities.
SUMMARY

*Si View parks and facilities are well-used by these respondents.*

In the last year:
- 9 in 10 respondents had visited at least 1 facility;
- Half visited at least 3 of the 4 facilities listed;
- Majorities reported visiting each of 3 facilities listed at least once;
- 6 in 10 visited more than one facility and made a minimum of 4 visits.

*District gets "excellent" to "good" performance grades across a range of functions.*
- Asked to give a letter grade to 10 separate functions, facilities, and programs, majorities gave an "A" or "B" to 8 of them.
- The combined overall "grade point average" was 3.16 on the 4-point scale.
- The range of "grade point averages" was 3.50 for cleanliness and maintenance; to 2.78 for adult programs.
- The highest grades were given by the most frequent users, majorities of whom gave an "A" or "B" to every function.

*District seen as good steward of tax dollars*
- Asked to rate the value they received from the District for their tax dollars
  - 91% rated it as "satisfactory" or better, including
    - 25% who said "excellent" and
    - 39% who said "good."

*Long list of priorities for future development.*
- Presented a list of 20 potential "park and recreation services," majorities of respondents rated 11 of them as "top" or "high" priorities for the District.
- When asked to pick just one (and then a second one), 4 items stood out:
  - Family aquatics center with pool (26% named it #1 or #2);
  - Park with riverfront access (24%);
  - Walking and biking trails (22%);
  - Natural areas and wildlife habitats (20%).
Broad inclination to support improvement proposals.

- Respondents were reminded that improvements and facilities are supported by tax dollars and asked whether they supported or opposed 9 specific improvements "under active considerations" by SVMPD.

- For all but one of the proposals (synthetic turf at Twin Falls Middle School), most respondents said they were inclined to "support" or "strongly support" each proposal.

- While most proposals were met with majority support, prudence suggests that most of that support should be considered latent.

- Three proposals had "strong support" that outweighed opposition:
  - Develop walking and biking trails that link parks and greenspace;
  - Acquire parkland for passive recreation such as trail walking, picnicking;
  - Develop a new family aquatic center and pool.
FINDINGS

- This section presents the survey findings in the form of annotated graphs.

- Bullet points indicate significant or noteworthy differences among population subgroups.
Majorities of respondents had visited 3 of 4 park facilities at least once in the last year.

- Most popular was Si View Park, with 82% of households having visited in the last year and 49% visiting 5 times or more.
- Even the least-used facility, Si View Pool, was used by 46% of households, with 27% using the pool 5 times or more on the last year.

- For each of the facilities, families with children were the heaviest users:
  - 93% of households with children used Si View Park last year, including 71% who used it at least 5 times.
  - 67% of households with children used the pool last year, including 42% who used it at least 5 times.
  - 79% of households with children visited the Community Center last year; 40% visited at least 5 times.
  - 70% visited Tollgate Farm Park; 23% visited at least 5 times.

Q2: These questions are about parks and recreation. I am going to read the names of some parks and facilities in your area. As I read each one, I would like to know how many times — if at all — anyone from your household visited that facility in the last year: 0 = none; 1 = 1-2 times; 2 = 3-4 times; 3 = 5+ times.
**Park Usage**

**Nearly 9 in 10 had visited at least one facility in the last year**

Q2: These questions are about parks and recreation. I am going to read the names of some parks and facilities in your area. As I read each one, I would like to know how many times – if at all – anyone from your household visited that facility in the last year: 0 = none; 1 = 1-2 times; 2 = 3-4 times; 3 = 5+ times.

- 88% of respondents had visited at least one Si View park facility in the last year.
  - 52% had visited at least 3 of the 4 facilities listed in the survey, and
  - 28% had made at least 9 visits in the last year.
- Most respondents (63%) were moderate to heavy users of Si View facilities, meaning they visited at least 2 different facilities and visited a total of at least 4 times in the last year.

The results from the usage questions were combined into a relative use scale from 0 to 12 (4 facilities x [0 - 3]).

The scale is *relative*, because the response categories were ranges, not exact numbers of visits. Thus, for example, there are a number of different combinations of visits that could result in a score of 4-7 (Moderate).

The purpose of this index is to compare respondents in relation to one another. The scale was collapsed to four user categories:

- **NONE**: No one had visited any of the 4 facilities; 12%
- **LIGHT**: 1 to 5 visits; 26%
- **MODERATE**: 4 to 14 visits; at least 2 facilities; 35%
- **HEAVY**: 9 to 20+ visits; at least 3 facilities; 28%
Majorities graded each SVMPD function as "excellent" or "good"

Q3: Si View Metro Parks performs a number of functions. As I read some of these, I would like you to give them a grade, like they do in school, where A is excellent, B is good, C is satisfactory, D is unsatisfactory and F is poor. The first one is [INSERT LIST]. What grade would you give Si View for that?

- Providing **clean and well-maintained** parks and facilities
- Providing Family Nights, Farmer’s Market, and other **community programs**
- Providing **outdoor recreation** facilities like playground and sport fields
- Managing the operation of Si View **Community Center & Pool**
- Providing **aquatic programs**
- Providing activities for **toddlers & youth**
- Providing **rental facilities** for birthdays, meetings, activities
- Providing **indoor recreation** facilities like gymnasiums, dance and fitness rooms
- Providing activities for **teens**
- Providing **adult recreation programs**

Respondents were asked to give a letter grade "like they do in school" to 10 functions performed by SVMPD.

- For each of the 10 functions, majorities gave an "A" or "B" grade.
  - The overall "grade point average" was 3.16 ("B").
- The highest grades were given by the heaviest users, majorities of whom gave an "A" or "B" to every function. Among heavy users, the range was from
  - 96% giving an "A" or "B" for cleanliness & maintenance, to
  - 58% giving an "A" or "B" for providing activities for teens.
### Priorities for future development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Top</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Not A Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking &amp; biking trails</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural area/wildlife habitats</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community parks</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverfront access park</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family aquatics center/Pool</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen recreation centers</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelters/areas</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor exercise facilities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer, football &amp; lacrosse</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/softball</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym space/indoor court</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rental</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain bike park</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water spray parks</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis, pickle ball courts</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate park</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4: Si View Parks is planning for future park and recreation services. As I read the following list of potential facilities, please indicate what priority you think development of that type of facility should be for Si View Parks: Not a Priority at all; a Low Priority; a High Priority; or a Top Priority.

Respondents were asked to rate 20 potential services and facilities as a “top priority” for SVMPD, a "high priority," "low priority," or "not a priority." (cont.)>
Recreation Priorities

Priorities for future development

The descriptions of the options were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>NOT</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas and wildlife habitats</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community parks</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park with riverfront access, including kayaking, canoeing &amp; swimming</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family aquatics center with pool</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen recreation centers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas and shelters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport fields for soccer, football &amp; lacrosse</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport fields for baseball/softball</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym space/indoor court</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation equipment rental such as bikes, kayaks, paddleboards, and so on</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain bike park</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor water spray parks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis and pickle ball courts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This exercise allows people to indicate the importance of each item in the absence of other considerations. Rating the items one by one allows respondents to assign a "top" or "high" priority to any number of the items. In this case, majorities rated 11 of the 20 items were rated as a "high" or "top" priority.

Four were rated a "top priority" by at least 1 in 4 respondents:
- Natural areas and wildlife habitats (35%);
- Walking and biking trails (34%);
- Family aquatics center with pool (29%); and
- Park with riverfront access (27%).
"Top Priorities"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>NEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family aquatics center/ pool</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverfront access park</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking &amp; biking trails</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas/ wildlife habitats</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen recreation centers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water spray parks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community parks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer, football &amp; lacrosse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor exercise facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain bike park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/softball</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelters/areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock climbing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis, pickle ball courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym space/ indoor court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5: Of the facilities we have talked about, which one do you think should be the highest priority for Si View to develop?

5.1. What should be the next highest priority?

Respondents were asked to name their "highest priority" from the list of 20 projects, and then their "next highest priority." This forces people to choose, thus providing a measure of the desirability of the items in relation to all the other items on the list.

The same 4 items separated themselves from the list, but in different order:

- Family aquatics center with pool (26% named it #1 or #2);
- Park with riverfront access (24%);
- Walking and biking trails (22%);
- Natural areas and wildlife habitats (20%).

The combination of this rating and ranking indicates that these 4 facilities are the highest priorities for respondents. Other facilities certainly have their constituencies, but these 4 rise to the top across the community.
Support for Improvements

Broad inclination to support improvement proposals

![Bar chart showing support levels for various park improvements.]

Q6: Next is a list of improvements and facilities under active consideration by Si View Parks. Each one would be funded by tax dollars. As I read this list, tell me whether you are inclined to Strongly Oppose, Oppose, Support, or Strongly Support that improvement.

Respondents were reminded that improvements and facilities are supported by tax dollars and asked whether they supported or opposed nine specific improvements "under active considerations" by SVMPD. The results are discussed on the following page.
Support for improvements

The real test of support for facilities or improvements is willingness to pay for them. While these questions did not ask directly whether respondents were willing to pay higher taxes to support certain improvements, the implication was clear.

- Majorities expressed support for 8 of the 9 proposals tested.
  - The only exception was synthetic turf at Twin Falls Middle School, which was supported by 46% and opposed by 49%.
  - The strongest support was for connecting trails between parks and greenspace, which was supported by 85%.

While that is encouraging and indicative of residents' willingness to support parks programs, it should be taken with a healthy skepticism. As before, proposals were considered one at a time so true prioritization did not occur.

As noted previously (p.4), it is prudent to consider that responses at the end points of the scale provide more actionable information than "middle-ground" answers when interpreting response to scale items.

As a way to produce a conservative estimate of potential support, we calculated the differential between "strongly support" and "oppose" plus "strongly oppose." Using this method, only 3 of the proposals have a net positive support level:

- Develop walking and biking trails that link parks and greenspace (+29%);
- Acquire parkland for passive recreation such as trail walking, picnicking (+7%);
- Develop a new family aquatic center and pool (+1%).

These are the same three proposals that top the list when total support is considered, but in a different order, owing to the level of opposition to the aquatic center.

To summarize, all but one of the proposals met with majority support. For most proposals, however, the support should be considered latent at this time. That is, respondents are inclined to support, but that support would need to be firmed up and mobilized. Only these three proposals had "strong support" that outweighed opposition. Given that these three proposals are rated positively by more than one measure, it seems safe to conclude that they enjoy solid community support.

- Support for the proposals generally came from respondents with children at home and those who rated SVMPD as an "excellent" value for taxes spent.
  - Those categories were consistently most likely to say they supported each of the 9 proposals.
  - Opposition was primarily related to age, with older respondents more likely than younger ones to say they opposed the proposals.
  - The table on the following page indicates the highest levels of support and opposition to each proposal. The support levels are total support ("Support" plus "Strongly Support").
Support for Improvements

Support for Proposals in Order of Net Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Strong Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strong Oppose</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trails that link parks and greenspace</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire parkland for passive recreation</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family aquatic center/ pool</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown community gathering space</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate Tollgate Farmhouse</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate Meadowbrook Farm</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate Torguson Park</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire parkland for active uses</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic turf at Twin Falls Middle School</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HIGHEST LEVELS OF SUPPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trails Linking Parks</td>
<td>Rate MPD Excellent (95%)</td>
<td>Rises with age: from 4% under 35 to 24% over 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families with Children (92%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive parkland</td>
<td>Rate MPD Excellent (83%)</td>
<td>Over age 65 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families with Children (77%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics Center</td>
<td>Women (82%)</td>
<td>Men (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families with Children (78%)</td>
<td>Over age 50 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate MPD Excellent (71%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gathering Space</td>
<td>Families with Children (81%)</td>
<td>Age 51-64 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate MPD Excellent (81%)</td>
<td>Rate MPD Unsatisf. (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollgate Farmhouse</td>
<td>Rate MPD Excellent (81%)</td>
<td>Age 51-64 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families with Children (74%)</td>
<td>Rate MPD Unsatisf. (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women (74%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowbrook Farm</td>
<td>Rate MPD Excellent (81%)</td>
<td>Over age 50 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families with children (74%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torguson Park</td>
<td>Rate MPD Excellent (75%)</td>
<td>Rises with age: from 23% under 35 to 38% over 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families with Children (72%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Fields</td>
<td>Rate MPD Excellent (74%)</td>
<td>Age 51-64 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families with Children (66%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Turf</td>
<td>Rate MPD Excellent (62%)</td>
<td>Over age 50 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families with Children (57%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7: Finally, as you may know, the Si View Metropolitan Park District is a public agency supported by local tax dollars. Overall, how would you rate the value your household receives from Si View Parks? Would you say the value is...

At the end of the interview, respondents were asked to rate the value they received from Si View Parks for their tax dollars.

- 91% rated the value of SVMPD as "Satisfactory" or better, including
  - 25% who said "Excellent" and
  - 39% who rated the value as "Good"

- As seen on the previous page, these value ratings were strongly related to support for improvements proposals. Those who rated the value as "excellent" were consistently among the most likely to support proposals improvements and new facilities.

- This indicates that there exists a reservoir of trust for the District to draw on as it presents its plans for future development.
DISCUSSION

As it plans for the future of recreation in the Snoqualmie Valley, the Si View Metropolitan Park District will be working with a long list of aspirations and a reservoir of community support.

Si View parks and facilities are well-used and highly appreciated by District residents. Nearly every household had visited at least one facility and most had visited more than one in the last year. The District received high marks for its performance across a range of functions, with the highest marks coming from the most frequent users – those most familiar with the facilities, services and programs.

This high level of usage and performance evaluation extends to perceived community value: 9 in 10 respondents rated the value they received from SVMPD for their tax dollars was "satisfactory" or better, including 2 in 3 who rated the value as "excellent" (25%) or "good" (39%).

The community is broadly in favor of expanding and developing recreation opportunities and generally inclined to fund future development. Majorities of respondents rated 11 of 20 "potential facilities" as "top" or "high" priorities for the district as it plans for future park and recreation services.

Owing to past performance and perceived value, most respondents were inclined to support 8 of 9 proposed improvements – after being reminded that these would need to be paid for with their tax dollars.

Of course, it is easier to express support in a survey than to actually vote for a tax increase. Caution is therefore advised in the interpretation of these results. Nevertheless, these results indicate that the District is in a favorable position to engage with the community about the development of recreational opportunities, services and facilities – including how to fund that development.
APPENDIX B

Snoqualmie Community Survey

Note: Cross tabulations and detailed numerical data regarding survey responses can be provided by Si View Metro Parks.
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Introduction

This report summarizes the results of a sample survey of residents in the City of Snoqualmie to assess their attitudes about development of a new regional swimming pool in the Snoqualmie Valley.

A total of 186 adult heads of household were interviewed June 6-20, 2016: 59 by telephone and 127 via online questionnaire. Every household in the city in which at least one person is registered to vote was contacted either by telephone or mail and invited to participate in this survey.

The survey was designed to assess:

- Snoqualmie Residents’ usage of the Si View Pool and Recreation programs;
- Their opinion about the need for a new swimming pool in the region;
- Opinions about funding options for a new pool.

Demographic information was collected so as to compare and contrast answers.

The survey was designed and administered by Elway Research, Inc. The questionnaire was developed in collaboration with Park Department staff and consultants from Conservation Technix, Inc.

The report includes Key Findings, followed by annotated graphs summarizing the results to each question. The full questionnaire and a complete set of cross-tabulation tables are presented under separate cover.
METHODS

SAMPLE: 186 Heads of Household in the City of Snoqualmie.

TECHNIQUE: Mixed Mode
- 59 Telephone Survey with Live Interviewers
- 22% via cell phone;
- 127 via online survey.

FIELD DATES: June 6-20, 2016

SAMPLE FRAME: All households within the city in which at least one person was registered to vote (N=4929). Households for which we had telephone numbers (n=2778) were included in the telephone sample; those for which telephone numbers were not available (n=2151) were included in the online sample.

MARGIN OF ERROR: ±7% at the 95% level of confidence. That is, in theory, had all similarly qualified residents been interviewed, there is a 95% chance the results would be within ±7% of the results in this survey.

DATA COLLECTION: TELEPHONE: Calls were made during weekday evenings and weekend days by trained, professional interviewers under supervision. Up to six attempts were made to contact each number in the sample. Questionnaires were edited for completeness and 10% of each interviewer’s calls were re-called for verification.

ONLINE: Invitation letters were mailed to households asking residents to log on to the survey website to complete the questionnaire. A reminder postcard was mailed one week later.

Virtually every household in the city was either called or received a letter of invitation to participate in the survey.

It must be kept in mind that survey research cannot predict the future. Although great care and the most rigorous methods available were employed in the design, execution, and analysis of this survey, these results can be interpreted only as representing the answers given by these respondents to these questions at the time they were interviewed.
Mixed-Mode Survey Method

This survey was conducted using a mixed-mode sample design that combined landline and cell phone telephone with online data collection.

The most recent count indicates 4,929 voter households in the City of Snoqualmie. We obtained telephone numbers for 2,778 households, including cell phone numbers, and mailing addresses for the remaining 2,151.

All 2,778 telephone numbers were called up to 6 times each or until someone answered and either agreed or refused to be interviewed. The 2,151 households for which we had no telephone number were mailed a letter from the SVMPD Executive Director asking a designated adult\(^1\) in the household to log on to our survey website and complete the questionnaire online. They were sent a thank you/reminder postcard one week after the initial mailing.

The telephone survey resulted in 59 interviews, for a completion rate\(^2\) of 2%, and a cooperation rate\(^3\) of 18%.

The online survey resulted in 127 completed questionnaires for a completion rate of 6%.

The data from both modes were combined into a single data set. The combined data were statistically weighted by gender to align the sample with the most recent census data. This was necessary because 65% of the interviews were completed with women.

Because of this mode differential, it is often argued that the inclusion of an online survey in addition to the telephone sample produces a more representative result than either a telephone or web sample alone would have produced. In this case, compared to the telephone sample, the online sample was younger, more likely to be renters and less likely to have children.

---

\(^{1}\) Instructions were that the survey be completed by the adult (18+) in the household with the most recent birthday. This is a common practice to randomize respondents.

\(^{2}\) The completion rate is the percentage of completed interviews by the total number of telephone numbers dialed. It includes numbers where no one answered the call.

\(^{3}\) The cooperation rate is the percentage of completed interviews by the number of qualified respondents contacted.
RESPONDENT PROFILE

In interpreting these findings, it is important to keep in mind the characteristics of the people actually interviewed. This table presents a profile of the respondents in the survey. The results have been statistically adjusted by gender to align with the population. The "Combined" column displays the weighted sample profile used in this report.

NOTE: Here and throughout this report, percentages may not add to 100%, due to rounding.

Sample Profile by Survey Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
<th>COMBINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOL USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Last Year</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ times</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM USE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Last Year</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ times</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with children</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with no children</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with children</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with no children</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoAns</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

- This section presents the survey findings in the form of annotated graphs.

- Bullet points indicate significant or noteworthy differences among population subgroups.
Facilities Usage

3+ in 10 Snoqualmie households report using Si View pool, SVMPD recreation programs

Q1: How many times – if at all – anyone from your household used the Si View Pool or Si View managed recreation programs in the last year?

- Households with children present were most likely to use both the pool and recreation programs.

- Most likely to use the pool:
  - Parents with children at home (48%) vs. 9% of non-parents;
  - Respondents between 35-50 (42%).

- Most likely to use recreation programs:
  - Parents with children at home (39%) vs. 16% of non-parents;
  - Respondents between 35-50 (38%).
Facilities Usage

44% used one or the other: the pool or recreation programs

Q2 + Q3: Number of times visited the pool OR used a SVMPD program.

This item is a combination of the number of times the respondent's household had used either the pool or a recreational program in the last year.

- 44% had used the pool or a SVMPD recreation program in the last year, including
  - 14% who had used them at least 4 times.
### Need

#### 7 in 10 thought new pool needed in region

Q3: As you may know, the Si View Pool is owned and operated by the Si View Metro Parks District. The City of Snoqualmie is not part of that Park District, although Snoqualmie residents are able to use the Si View Pool. Do you think there is a need for a new regional swimming pool in the valley?

- Most likely to think a new pool is needed:
  - Heavy users of the pool and recreation programs (89%);
  - Parents with children at home (83%);
  - Respondents age 35-50 (84%).

- Most likely to say a new pool is not needed:
  - Those with no children at home (42%);
  - Those over age 65 (39%);
  - Those under age 35 (39%).
Funding

Strong preference for SVMPD – Snoqualmie collaboration if new pool to be built

- Respondents who said a new pool is needed (n=129) were asked to choose between two potential funding mechanisms.
  - By a 4:1 margin they preferred a collaboration between the City and the SVMPD to having the City become part of the SVMPD.
  - That preference was expressed by at least 69% in every demographic category.
Funding

2/3 would use Si View facilities at same rate if they were charged

Q4: As we have said, all residents of the valley are able to use the Si View Parks facilities. However, only households in Si View Park District pay property taxes to support the district operations and facilities. Your household is not in the Si View Park District. If there were a charge for people outside the Park District to use Si View Pool or recreation programs, would you be...

- 66% of respondents said they would use Si View parks facilities "about the same as they do now" if they were charged a fee to use those facilities. This included:
  - 58% of the heaviest users of SVMPD facilities;
  - 62% of light users.

- Of those who said they would use the facilities less than they do now:
  - 47% do not currently use the facilities;
  - 35% use them 1-3 times a year; and
  - 17% use them more than 4 times a year.
At last

About half willing to purchase discount card

Q5: If there were a fee for non-residents to use Si View Park facilities, would you be inclined to purchase a discount card that would let Snoqualmie residents access Si View District Park facilities at the same rates as residents? Would you say you…

- Among the current heavy users (4+ times/year):
  13% would definitely purchase a card;
  50% probably would;
  18% probably would not; and
  8% definitely would not.
  11% were uncertain.

- Among light users (1-3 times/year):
  24% would definitely purchase a card;
  42% probably would;
  19% probably would not; and
  15% definitely would not.
DISCUSSION

Si View Parks facilities and programs are well-used by residents of Snoqualmie, especially young parents. Nearly half of the parents with children at home had used the Si View pool in the last year and 4 in 10 had used at least one SVMPD recreation program.

Most Snoqualmie residents believe there is a need for a new pool in the region, but are not keen to join the Si View Park District to make that happen. They much prefer a collaboration between SVMPD and the City of Snoqualmie.

Most respondents, about two-thirds, would use the SVMPD facilities at the same rate they are using them now if the District charged non-District residents for access to facilities. About half said they would purchase an out-of-district discount card if there were charges and such a card were available.

These survey findings provide a broad indicator of support and willingness to pay for SVMPD facilities. The results are generally positive. Of course, the District would have to conduct a more extensive analysis to determine the potential financial impact of fees.
Community members were invited to an open house on Wednesday, September 14, 2016 from 6:00 - 8:00 p.m. at the Si View Community Center. The project team prepared informational displays covering the major themes of the Parks and Recreation System Plan. These displays included Project Overview, Parks & Outdoor Recreation, Recreation Programs, Parks & Trails Maps, and Investing in the Future. Attendees were encouraged to talk to project team members, record their comments and complete a written comment card.

District staff and project team staff engaged with participants to explore proposed recommendations and general needs and interests for park and recreation in the greater Snoqualmie Valley.

COMMENTS FROM DISPLAY STATIONS

The following represents a summary of the comments received during the evening meeting.

Written Comments from Chart Pads

- “Further develop park and trail facilities at Meadowbrook Farm”
- “More BMX parks”
- “Trail to Twin Falls Middle School”
- “Swimming pool/aquatic center” (3x)
- “loop bike trails”
- “We need more paved trails”
- “develop mountain biking”
- “More shade for playgrounds”
- “Expand summer camp programs at Meadowbrook Farm. A school year program there would be great.”
- “More bike lanes to keep cyclists off the road where it’s safe”
- “Need more shoreline river access in town”
- “Hiking/biking trails”
- “Trail connections”
- “Riverfront Park”
- “Partner with City to improve Torguson Park”
- “Need more interpretive signs”
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- “Mountain biking trails”
- “playground/outdoor fitness area for teens and young adults”
- “mountain bike trails/skills park”
- “bmx pump track”
- “Riverfront Park”
- “More adult staff for youth programs”
- “Farmers Market parking needs a plan – ask FM visitors what they think about parking challenges? Shuttle to post office during FM hours?”
- “Mtn bike trails connecting into existing systems as well as new trails”

Investing For The Future (tally dot voting)

- 12 - Additional parks and trails (outdoor recreation) infrastructure *
- 10 - Other? **
- 5 - More active sports programming (youth and adults) ***
- 5 - Enhanced identification / connection between outdoor recreation and local economy
- 4 - Promotion of recreational opportunities (expand outreach, marketing, communication)
- 4 - Promotion of “trail town” identity (engage local businesses)
- 3 - More indoor recreation programming ****
- 1 - More recognition of the community value of Si View Metro Parks

* Comment: “adult fitness course”

** Comments: “Secure funding to do the above”, “New Riverfront Park”, “We need more pubs, eateries & hotels to accommodate our visitors”

*** Comments: “Improve Torguson fields”, “more therapeutic pool classes”, “more programs for teens / young adults”, “LARP” (live action role playing)"

**** Comments: “more weekend programming”, “Therapeutic pool classes”

Map Display Comments

- “water access needed” (at Riverfront Park)
- “Park needed” (at 436th near I-90 interchange)
- “loop trail needed”

Several arrows indicating new trail connections that are desirable

- “need connector to continue SVT thru Snoqualmie; Mill Pond Road is not a trail”
- “create loops” (from Rattlesnake Mtn trail to North Bend trails
- “this is too steep to be a bike trail” label on Upland Road future bike trail designation
- “2 lanes, no sidewalks & too fast for bikes” label on 428th future bike trail designation
- “bike pump track”
- Regarding interpretive displays, “pronunciation guides” & “what sound does “Kw” make?
- Map annotation: “City of Seattle – watershed” on Rattlesnake Lake
- Map annotation: “CCC Trail Middle Fork” (with arrow pointing west – off board)

### Facilitating the Future (tally dot voting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adding new linkages to land-based trails for better connectivity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding more riverfront access and connecting to trail systems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding park development and park facility improvements within District boundary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the quality of parkland maintenance, including on non-District sites</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling more water-based recreational opportunities and water trail access</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating coordination across local, county, state and federal land agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comment Cards

- “Let’s make NB the next Moab, UT or Brevard, NC”
- “Outdoor adult-focused fitness area; Parking adjustments for large events (Farmers Market, Festival at Mt Si); More outdoor youth programs; Bicycle paths for commuting; Skateboarding and bicycle events”
- “Mountain bike trails or skills park; Bike lanes – get more people on bikes; BMX pump track”
- “Ninja Warrior inspired playground for teens and adults with challenging, fitness play equipment; Themed playground for elementary aged kids. The current playgrounds are generic and lack character. I think play equipment that incorporated North Bend’s distinct alpine personality would be
more attractive and fun for kids. A great example I saw recently was the new play area at Northwest Trek – rock walls, mountain silhouettes, hollow faux old-growth trees – our kids absolutely loved it.”

Every effort has been made to accurately record this meeting. If any errors or omissions are noted, please provide written response within five days of receipt.

-- End of Notes --

cc: Travis Stombaugh
    Minna Rudd
    File
Si View Parks collecting feedback for 2017 district plan

by EVAN PAPPAS, Snoqualmie Valley Record Reporter
Today at 8:30AM

In preparation for an updated Parks District System Plan, the Si View Metropolitan Parks District held an open house on Wednesday, Sept. 14, at the Si View Community Center to receive feedback from residents on important projects for the future of the district.

Travis Stombaugh, executive director of the park district, said the last comprehensive plan the district used was from 2006 and this update, currently scheduled for early 2017, is necessary to address the issues of the rapidly changing Valley.

"We do have one… it’s about 11 years old," he said. "We've accomplished a lot of the things that were already in there. So that’s why we are looking to update it. It needs a refresh. Priorities change, obviously our population in the Upper Valley has changed, and the needs of that population have changed so we are updating it to make it relevant."

The event featured large comment boards for visitors to write about what they felt was important for the future of the parks district. Among the feedback were comments about furthering the development of park and trail facilities, an expanded swimming pool and aquatic center, trail connections, and partnering with the city to improve Torguson Park.

The open house was just one way the district is looking for feedback. They have also hired Conservation Technix, a consulting firm that assists with planning, surveys and property acquisitions. In June Conservation Technix did two surveys, one for North Bend residents and one
for Snoqualmie residents, to gather information on how people used the park facilities and what they would like to see from the district in the future.

Feedback: trails and pool are priorities

One of the big projects Si View has been looking at is linking the various trails around the area. They are looking for feedback on possible partnerships with the various land-owning agencies in the Valley in order to help connect the trails.

"You have King County out here, the city of North Bend, the state, DNR, state parks, federal parks. Where do you want us to fit in that?" Stombaugh said. "We will always mainly stay within our boundaries but should we be partnering with these other agencies and how so? Do the residents want to see more trails? There are a lot of missing links in the trail systems out here. Do they want to see us be an advocate, lead, or partner in linking those trails together?"

The community center's pool was another recurring topic; as the overall population has increased, the pool facilities are no longer adequate. Since the pool is small for the population of the Upper Valley, Stombaugh said one of the projects being looked at is a regional family aquatic center.

Steve Duh of Conservation Technix was at the open house and spoke about the feedback the agency has received so far.

"I think the thing people are most interested in are things having to do with trail connectivity, low-cost recreation, as well as looking at options for either a new or expanded pool. Those are the two big ones," Duh said. "It's pretty clear that people are very favorable to the efforts the district is putting forward for recreation programming and for providing the pool and park space here."

As feedback is collected, Conservative Technix works with the district to process and discuss the data. The district will use the data to form its plan and outline future priorities.

"Then we will be meeting as a board and district and reviewing that data," Stombaugh said. "We will come back with a recommendation and then we will, hopefully, have a comprehensive plan. It will line out strategies for moving forward and the priorities that we've identified in the district, (by the) early part of 2017."

To keep the conversation about Si View Parks improvements going, the district is using the online platform mySidewalk.com to speak with people interested in the district who might not have been able to come to the open house. To get the latest updates and leave feedback, visit www.siviewpark.org/compplan.html.

EVAN PAPPAS, Snoqualmie Valley Record Reporter
eappas@valleyrecord.com or (425) 358-1251
APPENDIX D

Stakeholder Discussion Notes
Steve offered an overview of the process for the District Comprehensive Plan and began with questions for the group.

**Comments**

The City of North Bend has a strong close working relationship with SVMPD; they have contractual interlocal arrangement for maintenance of sites. The City thinks very highly of what Si View MPD does.

In the future, the City could see turning over more parks to SVMPD in a stewardship role of city parks. They are really good at maintenance. The City maintenance crews are good, but they are spread between sewer, storm, streets and parks. Si View has a focus on parks, and it shows in how they take care of their sites. The City has gotten a lot of positive feedback following the start of maintenance of Torguson by Si View. The City is interested in moving the discussions forward about a park delivery model where the City secures the sites with PIF from development/growth and looks to the MPD as a partner for development and maintenance.

City sees active recreation as way to stimulate local economy.

Regarding sport fields, there is a need more fields, more lights and options for tournament play. Someone acquired land off Bolt Avenue for ballfields (private). Also, now the City has space for fields at Tollgate.

Hotels – Final plans for Marriott Hotel have been submitted. It will have 150 rooms and located near the outlet mall. There is also a preliminary application for a second hotel near exit 31.

There is an underutilization of trails along the river.

City Council is interested in seeing trails interconnect all parks, so folks can go from park to park along recreation trails.

There are gaps along the levee. It would be good to complete the circuit to enable looping trails and complete the levee trail along the South Fork.
There is a $15 million project for the extension of South Fork Avenue that will include a portion of a wildlife trail. It is planned to be a nice nature walk following the creek. It is financed, in part, by DOE and Mountains to Sound Greenway.

The City Trails Plan envisions more pedestrian and bike access to venues outside the City, such as Little Si, Mt Si and Rattlesnake. Some trails could be along roadways in the ROW, but be separated and feel more like trails rather than sidewalks.

One idea is to install a suspension bridge across the Middle Fork to link NE 8th Avenue to the trails at Little Si. If that could tie to the Snoqualmie Valley Trail, then folks could do a 4-5 mile loop.

Tanner Landing is a 40-acre +/- site owned by King County. The City is also in favor of the County turning over Tanner Landing to the MPD. Site improvements could include enhanced river access, an 18-hole disc golf course and signage. With gravel or a ramp, the site could be a better outtake spot for river users. Additional parking is needed as well.

The City is working to secure a park and trailhead site along SE North Bend Way. Also, a site located along Tanner Road is being sought as a river access point for ingress/egress and include a restroom.

There is a need for an indoor swimming pool; if Snoqualmie were part of the MPD boundary, it could broaden the base of residents helping to finance it. The City’s Parks Element also noted the need for a splash pad/park, in addition to a pool facility.

The City recently re-formed their Economic Development Commission. The City’s vision is that “North Bend is a premier outdoor recreation town in the greater Puget Sound region.” The vision is to grow areas in the downtown that complement outdoor recreation (i.e., beer/wine venues or retail for gear/equipment).

There is a strong music presence from the foothills to the Cascades, and the City sees music festivals as compatible with supporting outdoor recreation. They are looking at how to make it part of the bigger vision.

SVMPD comes up with great ideas, and there is interest from the City to do more with the SVMPD and have them take over more in the area. Proposing trailhead signage and improvements is important; maybe the MPD could assist with funding for such improvements. The City would like to get the MPD more involved at Meadowbrook Farms with programming and improvements.

In the coming ten years, the City would like to see Snoqualmie as part of the MPD and a new park constructed on the new acquisition area.

The City (Londi) has been happy with their dealings with Travis and the Board, and they have been welcoming to City staff and offer creative ideas. The City would like to see the MPD have a bigger influence and get more involved throughout the city.

-- End of Notes --
MEETING NOTES

Project Name: Si View District Comprehensive Plan  
Location: Snoqualmie City Hall  
Minutes by: Steve Duh

Attendees: Bob Larson, City Administrator  
Dan Marcinko, Parks & Public Works Director

Subject: Si View Stakeholder Session – City of Snoqualmie

Steve offered an overview of the process for the District Comprehensive Plan and began with questions for Bob and Dan.

Comments

Regarding the MPD boundary, City Council is less apt and reluctant to accommodate the inclusion of Snoqualmie into the MPD. Looking backward, there should have been a stronger push to get the City of Snoqualmie into the MPD when it was first formed. Snoqualmie generally has higher incomes that surrounding communities, and the City has been in a good position to manage its own needs.

The City has the community center that is operated by the YMCA, and they are interested in expanding the building into phase 2 to include a pool. The expansion will add about 20,000-22,000 square feet and provide space for aquatics, community room, and game room. The existing facility is too small and woefully inadequate. The center is often at capacity.

In terms of priorities, there are a few areas the City wants to see enhanced:

- Pool
- Open gym (the teen center at the Y is too crowded)
- Adult leagues (the 40+ adult softball has 9-11 teams and are doing small tournaments)
- Outdoor volleyball (the City will be installing temporary grass volleyball and move it around to different parks to test its popularity)

 Teens need more to do. The YMCA is too busy. The Y should be reaching out to the community to address community needs. The Y could also use racquetball courts for wallyball for 2:2 or 3:3 games with teens. The City has an idea for installing a skatepark and is trying to secure funding.

Trails - It would be good to find a way to install a trail along the railroad and connect to the two downtowns. There is enough room along the tracks for a 10-12’ wide shared use path.
Partnerships - There could be some future consideration about the shared use and programming of sport fields. The City of Snoqualmie has the most fields (9 of 12 +/-) in the Valley and accommodates lacrosse, soccer, softball and baseball, and additional fields are needed. Field lighting is not of interest.

In general, the City consistently tries to get partnerships with nearby jurisdictions and districts to enhance services for residents.

On future partnerships, the City would consider site improvements where it retains ownership of the land and contributes a fair share of fees for development or maintenance. The City would be willing to invest under that model.

With aquatics, there should be a regional facility that can serve residents of Fall City, Carnation and King County.

River access and usage – While the river is an attractor for enthusiasts, the areas downstream of the Meadowbrook bridge and about an 1/8-mile from the falls is a hazardous section that the power company is less interested in seeing used for water sports. The City is planning for a riverwalk along its river frontage and has spent $2.5 million over the years in studies. The City is interested in moving the project forward and can fund approximately one block of riverwalk in the near term.

Meadowbrook Farms – The oversight board was appointed by Snoqualmie and North Bend, but maybe the MPD could play a larger role in the development and management of that site. Snoqualmie’s interests for that site include recreational tourism (including mud runs, penny farthing rides, events), as well as farm-to-table activities and a working farm. The MPD is doing the best they can given the limitations placed by the board. The City would like to see the MPD be the steward of the site, rather than the board, and it would be willing to invest $250,000 annually initially to see more use at the site.

-- End of Notes --
At the beginning of the call, Steve offered an overview of the process for the District Comprehensive Plan and context for the District’s interest in hearing from the Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust.

Comments

Jenn has worked with the Mountains to Sound Greenway (MTSG) Trust for three years, and her current role is as the Snoqualmie Valley advocate. She acts as the point of reference for the Snoqualmie Valley.

One consistent theme for the Valley has been toward the promotion and improvement of outdoor recreation. The MTSG hosts a monthly meeting with regional land managers, who include the Forest Service, King County, Snoqualmie, North Bend, WTA and American Whitewater, among others. One goal of the sessions is to figure out how to better integrate projects and coordinate for recreation planning.

Recent problems in the Valley include safety concerns along the trails and heavy trail usage. A lot of folks have been coming out to the Valley, but the area has not really been able to harness the economic benefits from that tourism.

The context for outdoor recreation planning in the Valley is to really engage folks in downtown economic development for all four cities and to find solutions to address neighbor concerns about activity and usage. The solutions being discussed to address these include the following:

- Create a connected network – find ways to link federal, state, county and local trails throughout the Snoqualmie Valley
- Address congestion and active transportation options – look into ideas such as a trailhead shuttle service, connecting trails to parking areas in the downtowns, improve bike access
- Better utilize the Snoqualmie Valley Trail (SVT) – build upon the Trail Towns concept to link and harness the potential of trails connected to towns along the route

MTSG is considering upgrades to its interactive mapping to help promote information about trail routes. Wayfinding and trail standards are also important. They are also looking at trail standards and have Alta Planning + Design preparing a set of standards for three trail types. The idea is that each of the agencies in the Valley could
adopt and implement the proposed standards to facilitate a consistent look and feel for the trail corridors. The standards are expected to be completed over the summer. Locational and directional sign templates are also being looked at, which will rely heavily on the existing sign styles in use along the SVT corridor.

Regional branding is another topic area. MTSG is working with a graphic designer on concepts, and the current draft is “Savor Snoqualmie Valley.” The goal is to launch the brand with a website in about six months to include information about art, lodging, heritage and outdoor recreation opportunities.

MTSG would encourage SVMPD to continue to be present as a partner and attend the land manager meetings. The District is a great connection to the community. The four cities in the Valley (Snoqualmie, North Bend, Carnation and Duvall) are small, trying to make it work, and competitive. The District can be the voice to show how important it is to work as a region that has a united vision. The District can help advance and advocate for the bigger picture for the region. The District should look at the Trail Towns self-assessment checklist to see if they can add any more information to the project about infrastructure, needs and gaps.

Regarding project ideas, there is interest in securing a short trail connection (~800’) from the SVT to the Little Si Trail. MTSG is working with King County Roads for this, since the alignment is within existing right of way. However, King County does not have funding to do the project.

Also, DNR is looking to build connector trails between Mt Si and Little Si and between Mt Si and Mt Tennerife Trail.

The development of a water trail for the Snoqualmie River is another project idea, but it is one that is likely a little further down the road in terms of priorities. A plan will be needed to look at water access options, infrastructure and signage. Jenn mentioned that Tom O’Keefe of American Whitewater said that he would like to be able to get to the river with his car and bike, but he has had a bike stolen because there was no secure way to lock his bike (no installed bike rack). The Sky-to-Sound Water Trail (Skykomish to Snohomish) is a similar style project currently in the planning phase and could be a good reference project.

Jenn said she will think more about potential roles for and opportunities with the District.

-- End of Notes --
MEETING NOTES

**Project Name:** Si View District Comprehensive Plan  
**Location:** Phone Conference  
**Minutes by:** Steve Duh  
**Attendees:** Doug McClelland, Assistant Region Manager, Conservation, Recreation and Transactions  
**Subject:** Si View Stakeholder Session – WA Dept of Natural Resources

Steve offered an overview of the process for the District Comprehensive Plan and began with questions for Doug.

**Comments**

The Mountains to Sound Greenway (MTSG) is leading the way in the Snoqualmie Valley, with Jennifer McKeown, over the past year or so and has led a healthy dialogue on the subject of coordinated recreation planning among multiple players. The group and the discussion are still in their infancy and in terms of any collaborative efforts. King County has not been as active in the monthly meetings with the MTSG, and their major role in the discussion should be around acquisitions and trail connections.

The growth in King County is evident with increasing visitation to recreation areas in the Snoqualmie Valley. King County maintains solid records of usage a Rattlesnake Lake. DNR has a couple years of data from trail counts, and the trend is definitely increasing.

**Priorities**

North Bend is a beautiful little town where three rivers come together, but you wouldn’t know it. It is a river town, but there is little river access. With the access points that do exist, there are issues of signage and public knowledge. Opportunities for new river access exist off Mt Si Road and near exit 32 near the golf course. The choice the City will face in the near future is between river access and more homes.

There are some key acquisitions that could support river access, and there are key acquisitions to enable trail connections to the south and east up to Rattlesnake Lake, to the South Fork and the North Fork. When asked, Doug said he would be willing to mark up a map with ideas on acquisition targets. The City of North Bend could be the center hub for recreation in the area.

The City is working on a joint acquisition with Si View now near exit 31, and this site will support a trail connection to DNR lands at Raging River.

DNR is trying to do a parking lot on Mt Teneriffe, but people attending the planning meeting were asking why they can’t walk from downtown North Bend. With the Snoqualmie Valley Trail passing through downtown, it would make sense to accommodate a connection from downtown along the SVT to Mt Si and Little Si trails. King County
Meeting Minutes (continued)

staff and DNR staff have started this conversation, but a local body (such as MTSG, Si View MPD or the City) will need to be an advocate and leader to push the project forward.

March to July is the peak traffic season for trail usage in the Valley, and trailheads are jammed with cars. Regarding shuttle services, a shuttle service was started by Compass Outdoor Adventures, but they were leaving from downtown North Bend. With the numbers of people coming to the Valley from the Seattle area, there is a low chance that they will transfer to a shuttle bus once they get to North Bend if they have already traveled 95% of the way to the trailhead. Snoqualmie Valley Transit is looking to DNR for grant funds to complete a shuttle bus study. Part of the study will look at places to start the service from (i.e., Issaquah, somewhere else).

Regarding events, DNR has been and is willing to be a property owner that accommodates events. Mountain biking events occur on Tiger Mountain, and events are planned for Raging River. The planned acquisition noted above (near exit 31) will enable the development of about 25 miles of new trail in that area. There are opportunities to grow events more, but they need to centered out of downtown, so as to not bottleneck the trailheads. The City needs to make more connections to facilitate more events.

Trail building on DNR land is booming right now. The Department has 12 excavators active now, which are building trails for mountain biking (mostly) and hiking (some). All of these new trails could be accessible from North Bend if some key sites were acquired to make the connections.

Also, King County Flood District is working on a flood management effort to move levees back in the area of North Bend. This will open up open space areas for North Bend and could be a huge opportunity for trail connections and river access. The planning process has slowed in recent months.

Separately, Doug referenced his past work with boy scouts and talked of new plans for a youth activity center as a meeting place for non-profit youth organizations. Planning is underway for a 22-acre site diagonal from Meadowbrook and near Tollgate Farms. Si View MPD might be a good fit to have a role in the management and use of this facility. As the permit process starts for the construction of the site, there is interest in reaching out to the MPD to see if/how they could be involved in the project. Community space in North Bend is hard to come by, and rentals have become too expensive.

-- End of Notes --
MEETING NOTES

Project Name: Si View District Comprehensive Plan
Project No.: Proj-16-082PLN
Location: Phone Conference
Meeting Date: August 5, 2016
Minutes by: Steve Duh
Meeting Time: 9:30 am
Attendees: Monica Leers, Capital Planning Section Manager
David Kimmett, Natural Lands Program/Project Manager
Steve Duh – Conservation Technix
Subject: Si View Stakeholder Session – King County

Steve offered an overview of the process for the District Comprehensive Plan and began with questions for Monica and Dave.

Comments

During the time of King County’s asset transfer in the early 2000s which was the impetus for SVMPD to form, the County was getting out of the recreation programming business. It did set up granting programs to support cities and districts in providing those services.

King County has been in discussions with and working with the Mountains to Sound Greenway and WA DNR with the goal to connect outdoor recreation opportunities in the Valley. King County would be open to coordination on projects with the Si View Metro Parks District.

King County’s focus is on trail acquisitions and buying land to fill the gaps. The County is looking at options to secure additional land at the old mill site and Weyerhaeuser. This would help fill some gaps and link to the Snoqualmie Valley trail.

The County is also starting discussions with the City of Snoqualmie about their interest in building the riverwalk in the downtown and other trail connections.

King County staff recently had a coordination meeting with DNR staff to discuss opportunities to address trail access and parking along the I-90 corridor. The two most popular trails in the state are Rattlesnake Ledge and Mt Si. With this popularity, there is a high demand for parking. DNR is interested in adding parking along the Middle Fork on King County land to support this demand. King County sees their main role as being able to step in to acquire gaps to support building trail connections. They are able to be more nimble and quick with their land acquisitions than the state.
If SVMPD moved more into outdoor recreation programming (i.e., outdoor education and camps) and wanted to use King County facilities, the County would be ready to partner. King County currently has an arrangement with a vendor in Fall City for a tubing business at the confluence of the Raging and Snoqualmie Rivers.

The County has a Community Partnerships and Grants program for community groups to facilitate development of amenities on County lands. For example, American Whitewater has worked with the County to develop a water access point at Tanner Landing.

The County wants to do more to work with community groups to improve access to King County lands; these would be great partnerships.

King County offers a Youth Sports Facilities Grant which provides funding to many agencies in King County. Monica was not sure if SVMPD had received funding from this grant source.

Dave Kimmett was on the Meadowbrook Farms advisory board as a County representative for many years. He says it is good to see some progress with that site, and the SVMPD does all the scheduling. He suggested that the master plan and the business plan be reviewed for information about the planned development and opportunities of that site. Mary Norton of the advisory board would be a good contact for more information about that site.

Regarding Tanner Landing, the County has had discussions with the City of North Bend and the State about site improvements and ways to relieve the parking demands in the area. There is not much talk from the County at this point on the future development of this site, but in the future it might be a good site for camping, water access and related outdoor recreation – especially with proximity to Mt Si and the river.

On another note, MTSG is leading a branding effort for the Valley, which is intended to help with identity and branding for all the cities in the Valley.

-- End of Notes --
Steve offered an overview of the process for the District Comprehensive Plan and began with questions for Bill and Ryan.

**Comments**

The Snoqualmie Valley School District has an arrangement with SVMPD. They get preferential treatment over some groups for use of facilities, but not ahead of the needs of the School District. They get charged a little, but the School District is not charging so much that it even covers its own costs. Usage by SVMPD has increased over the years, and so has the usage by the School District.

SVMPD is easy to work with and responsive. They are quick to address problems when they come up. The School District worked with them on changes about how they leave buildings when they are done with their programs, and that has worked out fine.

Regarding gymnasium space, the MPD needs to look for ways to address their own needs for indoor space. The School District is charged with covering what they are doing first, and with usage increasing, it will be harder to coordinate for open slots.

The School District instituted a scheduling program about two years ago, and that has helped with scheduling and usage. The calendar is available online, so leagues and other users can see what’s available. The scheduling program has helped increase usage by 25% over the past 1.5 years.

Regarding fields, there are no turf baseball fields in the Valley. There is no 90’ baseball field either. The School District had to remove a field for its high school expansion project.

The School District capital facility plan relates more to buildings, rather than gym and field improvements. The School District priority is to improve fields for school use at middle schools and high schools. At the elementary schools, the focus is toward playgrounds and gymnasiums.
The School District has a partnership in place for a soccer league to make improvements at Fall City Elementary. The School District also has worked with the little league for some field improvements. Various groups ask for improvements, and the School District helps as they can with coordination, materials or limited labor.

The School District hasn’t had many discussions with MPD about partnerships; they don’t know the broader needs of the MPD.

There is a need for a full sized pool for high school teams. The School District could be a consistent user and renter of a pool, but they are not interested in owning, building or operating a pool. The School District currently rents time at an outdoor facility for use by the school teams. That arrangement is working and is OK for the five months that access to water is needed for the teams.

-- End of Notes --
MEETING MINUTES

Project Name: Si View District Comprehensive Plan
Project No.: Proj-16-082PLN
Location: Annex Building
Meeting Date: May 4, 2016
Minutes by: Steve Duh
Meeting Date: May 4, 2016
Time: 6:30 pm

Attendees:
- Travis Stombaugh, Director
- Minna Rudd, Recreation Supervisor
- Scott Loos, Finance and HR Manager
- Bridget Verhei, Aquatics Manager
- Dave Dembeck, Operations Manager
- Melissa Pasley, Admin Support Specialist

Attendees:
- Linda Grez, Commission President
- Bud Rasio, Commission Clerk
- Amy McGhee, Commissioner
- Mark Joselyn, Commissioner
- Susan Kelly, Commissioner
- Steve Duh – Conservation Technix

Subject: Si View MPD Board Session – District Comprehensive Plan

Commissioner Grez opened the meeting. Travis introduced Steve Duh. Steve offered an overview of the process and timeline for the District Comprehensive Plan and began with questions for the Commission.

**General Comments – Memories/Impact/Values**

- Provide opportunities and activities, so youth don’t have to leave the valley
- History of the District – the desire was to keep the pool open. There was the fear of the pool closure, and it was exciting to keep it from being boarded up by the County. There were photos of people swimming in the river to help sell it. Now with the recent renovations, the center is a place where people come and stay. They use the facility, the classes, the pool and linger in the lobby area. There are families here with four generations of family members who have swam at the pool.
- The District is continuing to promote and bring value to the Valley – festivals, sports, swimming
- Events lacking at Mt Si
- New Si View / old Si View – in the old days, kids used to run around in the park and play tag.
- Indoor playground at the community center
- Teen nights are being attended, and this is a strong indicator that teens see this places their community center – the place as home
- People are growing up with the system, and it means something to them. Kids who started in swimming lessons at age 6 are now serving as lifeguards and giving back.
- The impact is that there is a ‘care’ for this place; it’s the currency we (the District) gets to trade in and we’re damn lucky. We get to pass on the opportunities to the next generation.
- How do we do the best we can and play a role in how positive memories are shaped?
- The District doesn’t work hard to brand ourselves. It hasn’t been a focus or seen as important.
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- Name recognition might be affected. For example, in the North Bend section of the paper, the event and farmers market are noted without reference to the MPD. Also local elected officials are listed, but the elected members of the MPD are not.
- The park has grown with the community and is linked to several generations within the community.
- The pool is the heart and soul
- Issues with drugs and suicide. We need to offer programs for the generation who stay in the area and change for those who are new to the Valley

Pool – limitations and trends
- Fitness is expanding; water walking
- More classes
- Lifeguard instruction / water safety – be the “go to” place – requires classroom space for instruction; revenue producing
- Multi-use pool for lap swimming and lessons

Outdoor Recreation Comments
- “Trail Town Plan” to link local amenities to include trail development and signage ideas
- Two gaps in trails: Snoqualmie Trail and Weyerhaeuser
- Torguson pump track
- Tollgate Farm Park Master Plan – through this process, people might have opinions about what to do at that site, but we already have a master plan. There is an interlocal agreement with the City of North Bend to stay in accord with the site master plan.

New Opportunities
- Teen center – pool table, ping pong, games, esteem builders, outings. You can hear stories from other places “the Y saved me”
- Youth activity center, hang out space, meeting space for 4H, scouts, etc. There are no free spaces any more in the community for meetings. The Train Depot has a fee.
- It was cautioned about the operating demand for staffing and operating costs for a limited use facility, like a stand-alone teen center that basically is in service in the late afternoons.
- We need to provide consistent programs
- Green infrastructure and linkages – make places connect and get improved
- Diversify recreation platform to get people active
- Farm house idea – animal husbandry, bee patch, farm to table
- Get community input from different age groups (i.e., seniors, youth, teens)
- Shaping the recreational opportunities for the Valley
- Branding related to level of service, quality service and customer service

City of North Bend
- There is talk of a new city hall. Maybe a teen center should be part of it
- The city is surrounded by great opportunities: Mt Si, Rattlesnake, North Fork Rd
- Regional Outdoor Plan
- Further promoting resources to non-local residents
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- There are willing partners to help (County, Mountains to Sound Greenway, City), which translates to exposure and partnerships for the District to facilitate and promote outdoor recreation and greenspaces. The MPD could be a leverage partner that can provide assets to Valley residents and foster relationships.
- The Community Center is being used to the max; we need resources for maintenance and care to keep it up. Do we need to expand?

Constraints
- Funding is a constraint since the MPD tax rate is currently prorated since it is a junior district. The District needs to look at options for long-term, substantial funding that doesn’t change over time.

MPD boundary
- 50% of pool usage is from Snoqualmie residents. Snoqualmie’s community center is the Y and residents have to pay membership dues to use the facility and programs. The City of Snoqualmie is mostly built out with residential development, and they will need tax money going forward to cover the cost of roads and infrastructure. They are looking for areas to be developed with retail for improved tax base. The City of Snoqualmie is doing a levy lid lift for safety (police and fire) and there is little room for other needs.
- The Board sees the role of the MPD as a non-partisan regional bridge. They serve residents of two different cities, and there is a historic competition between the two. The leadership in the two cities is still evolving. The Board doesn’t want to be seen as wagging the tail with regard to inquiring about the City of Snoqualmie’s interest in becoming part of the MPD. They want the City to come to the District. There is a fear of loss of control on the part of the City. Acting as a bridge, it could be possible for the MPD to provide capital for park improvements if the City were part of the District.

-- End of Notes --
Travis opened the meeting and introduced Steve Duh. Steve offered an overview of the process and timeline for the District Comprehensive Plan and began with questions for the group.

**Youth Sport Leagues & Fields**

Little League has about 400-450 participants. This includes ages 4 – 13. There about 15 teams at the 5 year old group to 3-5 teams at the 12 year old group. (Falls Little League has about 650 kids, and SVLL will be at this level in the future.) About 80-90% of the field usage is provided at Torguson. Twin Falls Middle School is used some, but the field quality is poor. The school district also has a bus facility with a grassy field that is used for some practices. They have taken Snoqualmie Elementary School (SES) out of their field rotation due to poor conditions. Little League needs access to all-weather fields and under-cover facilities. They have used Bucky’s in the past for indoor batting practice. Go to SVLL.net for boundary map.

Mt Si Lacrosse is a K-12 club for boys and girls. In all, there are about 410 participants in the club. Lacrosse is the fastest growing sport in the state. Season starts in February. The spring season is February to May, and the fall season is September to November.

Si View Park is a gem. It is a little small to fit a full-sized field, but it is good for K-6 teams. Safe dimensions are not there for the over 6th grade group. The site needs a wider berth at the playground to accommodate a larger field layout and setbacks.

Lacrosse can be hard on turf. Mt Si Lacrosse doesn’t have access to SES during winter break, and the field quality is subpar. The league could use access to more synthetic fields. Locally, limitations exist due to high rainfall and floodplain locations. The club uses Jeanne Hansen Park in Snoqualmie.
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Regarding school district coordination – Little league and baseball have been easier for the district to understand in terms of field dimensions and history. School districts in the region are now lining fields for lacrosse, although Mt Si High School is not lined for lacrosse. Scheduling and coordination of fields with the school district is poor.

Tournaments – Utilizing fields to host tournaments is a challenge. There is little access to lodging. The nearest hotels are in Issaquah.

Lighting – there is not much cost benefit for lighting locally. A better use of resources is for indoor or covered space for little league. For little league, the playing season is spring-summer, so the days are longer anyway.

Field Availability – need education and communication about status of fields and numbers, so folks know about growth and opportunities. The Twin Falls Middle School field is newest asset, but it is slowly getting worse. The school district won’t allow leagues to maintain fields. They only allow the use of hand tools. For safety reason, SVLL is only putting younger kids on that field. Little league could grow into majors/select if they had access to quality fields.

MPD ideas – make improvements to Twin Falls School and North Bend Elementary (easy access to Torguson)

River Access & Whitewater

American Whitewater (AW) – Tom is the regional stewardship director and is also on the mountains to Sounds Greenway board. The river season is winter to spring and related to the rainy season and snow melt. The Snoqualmie Valley has spectacular assets for a diversity of skills levels, and all access points can use some enhancements. The river is and can be used for a number of recreationalists for canoeing, kayaking, fishing, etc.

The Snoqualmie Valley is a gateway to the outdoors.

Even with the great river access, the AW has thought about hosting events or the national board meeting, but the lack of lodging is a non-starter.

It would be good to have a controlled space for kayak instruction, like a pool, but the Si View Pool is too small and heavily programmed.

Other Considerations

- Trail access is key. A trail along the river would improve access and visibility, but there have been past issues of squatters and homeless encampments. Access points should have defined parking and signage, recognized as a recreational facility and formalized. Sanitation is also important (waste, restroom, water for washing). There is a need to enhance the quality of the experience. This will bring benefits to users and visitors, and the less desirable uses shift away. People aren’t aware of access points, and this limits usage of the river. This is true even for water contact and viewing opportunities. Access improvements were recently done by Earth Corps at the Mine Creek DNR site.
- Also, there is a need to look at trail connection opportunities via DNR and State Parks. Mountain biking and road biking resources are great too. The region could use a loop route for road cyclists that is well-defined and signed.
- Rental Facilities – Is there a critical mass to support bike, paddle board and kayak rentals? Probably not for kayaks. It might be worth looking at options for renting paddle boards at Rattlesnake Lake. At the King County site Tanner Landing, there is room for a mountain biking park, rock climbing and white water access.
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- Consider reaching out to Ben Huey who is a Mountains to Sounds Greenway staffer and look at the DNR trails plan for the region.

-- End of Notes --
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APPENDIX E

Online Engagement Comments
Investing for the Future - What are Your Priorities?

1. More recreation programming (youth and adults)
2. Additional parks and trails (outdoor recreation infrastructure)
3. Promotion of recreational opportunities (expands support, marketing, communication)
4. Promotion of "measles" identity (engage local businesses)
5. Enhanced identification / connection between outdoor recreation and local economy
6. More recognition/promotion of the community role of St. John's

Vote now! Help us make your voice heard.
Like & Share.
For Kids Sake: Remembering Play...

What are your kids' favorite activities? What do you want your kids to remember about growing up with Metro Parks?

JaneAllenSeymour: My kids are grown, but we lived in Ellicott City and the Metro Parks were right down the street. The first thing we did when we arrived in the valley was to take advantage of them. Soccer teams, soccer games, bike rides, etc. We even took advantage of summer concerts, farmers’ markets, yoga classes. They are disappointed that the play area came after they were grown but it’s awesome to see how much they enjoyed.

Collapse
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APPENDIX F

Funding & Implementation Tools
The Si View MPD possesses a range of local tools that could be accessed for the benefit of growing, developing and maintaining its parks and recreation program. The sources listed below represent likely potential sources, but some also may be dedicated for numerous other local purposes which limit applicability and usage.

**LOCAL FUNDING OPTIONS**

**General Obligation Bond**


For the purposes of funding capital projects, such as land acquisitions or facility construction, cities and counties have the authority to borrow money by selling bonds. Voter-approved general obligation bonds may be sold only after receiving a 60 percent majority vote at a general or special election. If approved, an excess property tax is levied each year for the life of the bond to pay both principal and interest. The state constitution (Article VIII, Section 6) limits total debt to 5% of the total assessed value of property in the jurisdiction.

**Excess Levy for Operations and Maintenance**

Some special districts may also impose a one-year (two for fire districts, four for school districts) levy, commonly known as an “operations and maintenance” levy.

Nine special purpose districts may impose an excess levy, but not a regular levy.

The excess levy requires a voter approval of 60 percent of 40 percent of those voting in the last general election (Washington State Constitution, Art. VII, Sec. 2(a)).

The districts allowed an excess levy are: metropolitan park district, park and recreation service area, park and recreation district, water-sewer district, solid waste disposal district, public facilities district, flood control zone district, county rail district, service district, public hospital district, road district, rural county library district, island library district, rural partial-county library district, intercounty rural library district, cemetery district, city, town, transportation benefit district, emergency medical service district with a population density of less than one thousand per square mile, cultural arts, stadium, and convention district, ferry district, city transportation authority, or regional fire protection service authority.

The excess levy is not subject to the regular levy’s aggregate $5.90 and one percent rate limits.
Regular Property Tax - Lid Lift

http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=84.55.050

A levy lid lift is an instrument for increasing property tax levies for operating and/or capital purposes. Taxing districts with a tax rate that is less than their statutory maximum rate may ask the voters to “lift” the levy lid by increasing the tax rate to some amount equal to or less than their statutory maximum rate.

Process to Enact:

A simple majority vote of citizenry is required.

Revenue Authority:

Cities and counties have two “lift” options available to them: Single-year/basic or Multi-year.

Single-year: The single-year lift does not mean that the lift goes away after one year; it can be for any amount of time, including permanently, unless the proceeds will be used for debt service on bonds, in which case the maximum time period is nine years. Districts may permanently increase the levy but must use language in the ballot title expressly stating that future levies will increase as allowed by chapter 84.55 RCW. After the initial “lift” in the first year, the district’s levy in future years is subject to the 101 percent lid in chapter 84.55 RCW. This is the maximum amount it can increase without returning to the voters for another lid lift.

The election to implement a single-year lift may take place on any election date listed in RCW 29A.04.321.

Multi-year: The multi-year lift allows the levy lid to be “bumped up” each year for up to a maximum of six years. At the end of the specified period, the levy in the final period may be designated as the basis for the calculation of all future levy increases (in other words, be made permanent) if expressly stated in the ballot title. The levy in future years would then be subject to the 101 percent lid in chapter 84.55 RCW.

In a multi-year lift, the lift for the first year must state the new tax rate for that year. For the ensuing years, the lift may be a dollar amount, a percentage increase tied to an index, or a percentage amount set by some other method. The amounts do not need to be the same for each year. If the amount of the increase for a particular year would require a tax rate that is above the maximum tax rate, the assessor will levy only the maximum amount allowed by law.

The election to implement a multi-year lift must be either the August primary or the November general election.
Limitations on Revenue:

The single-year lift allows supplanting of expenditures within the lift period; the multi-year left does not, and the purpose for the lift must be specifically identified in the election materials.

Overview of Specific Provisions:

For both single- and multi-year lifts, when the lift expires the base for future levies will revert to what the dollar amount would have been if no lift had ever been done.

The total regular levy rate of senior taxing districts (counties and cities) and junior taxing districts (fire districts, library districts, etc.) may not exceed $5.90/$1,000 AV. If this limit is exceeded, levies are reduced or eliminated in the following order until the total tax rate is at $5.90.

1. Parks & Recreation Districts (up to $0.60)
   Parks & Recreation Service Areas (up to $0.60)
   Cultural Arts, Stadiums & Convention Districts (up to $0.25)
2. Flood Control Zone Districts (up to $0.50)
3. Hospital Districts (up to $0.25)
   Metropolitan Parks Districts (up to $0.25)
   All other districts not otherwise mentioned
4. Metropolitan Park Districts formed after January 1, 2002 or after (up to $0.50)
5. Fire Districts (up to $0.25)
6. Fire Districts (remaining $0.50)
   Regional Fire Protection Service Authorities (up to $0.50)
   Library Districts (up to $0.50)
   Hospital Districts (up to $0.50)
   Metropolitan Parks Districts formed before January 1, 2002 (up to $0.50)
FEDERAL & STATE GRANTS AND CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program

National Park Service

http://www.nps.gov/ncrc/programs/rtca/

The Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program, also known as the Rivers & Trails Program or RTCA, is a technical assistance resource for communities administered by the National Park Service and federal government agencies so they can conserve rivers, preserve open space and develop trails and greenways. The RTCA program implements the natural resource conservation and outdoor recreation mission of NPS in communities across America.

Community Development Block Grants

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

These funds are intended to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low and moderate income persons. King County administers CDBG funds on behalf of the King County CDBG Consortium. The Consortium is established under interlocal cooperation agreements between the County and 34 cities and towns and has a Joint Recommendations Committee to advise King County on CDBG funding and program guidelines decisions.

North American Wetlands Conservation Act Grants Program

US Fish & Wildlife Service

http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/index.shtm

The North American Wetlands Conservation Act of 1989 provides matching grants to organizations and individuals who have developed partnerships to carry out wetland conservation projects in the United States, Canada, and Mexico for the benefit of wetlands-associated migratory birds and other wildlife. Two competitive grants programs exist (Standard and a Small Grants Program) and require that grant requests be matched by partner contributions at no less than a 1-to-1 ratio. Funds from U.S. Federal sources may contribute toward a project, but are not eligible as match.
The Standard Grants Program supports projects in Canada, the United States, and Mexico that involve long-term protection, restoration, and/or enhancement of wetlands and associated uplands habitats.

The Small Grants Program operates only in the United States; it supports the same type of projects and adheres to the same selection criteria and administrative guidelines as the U.S. Standard Grants Program. However, project activities are usually smaller in scope and involve fewer project dollars. Grant requests may not exceed $75,000, and funding priority is given to grantees or partners new to the Act's Grants Program.

**Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)**

**Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)**

www.nrcs.usda.gov/PROGRAMS/wrp/

The WRP provides landowners the opportunity to preserve, enhance and restore wetlands and associated uplands. The program is voluntary and provides three enrollment options: permanent easements, 30-year easements, and 10-year restoration cost-share agreements. In all cases, landowners retain the underlying ownership in the property and management responsibility. Land uses may be allowed that are compatible with the program goal of protecting and restoring the wetlands and associated uplands. The NRCS manages the program and may provide technical assistance.

**Recreation and Conservation Office Grant Programs**

**Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office**

www.rco.wa.gov

The Recreation and Conservation Office was created in 1964 as part of the Marine Recreation Land Act. The RCO grants money to state and local agencies, generally on a matching basis, to acquire, develop, and enhance wildlife habitat and outdoor recreation properties. Some money is also distributed for planning grants. RCO grant programs utilize funds from various sources. Historically, these have included the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund, state bonds, Initiative 215 monies (derived from unreclaimed marine fuel taxes), off-road vehicle funds, Youth Athletic Facilities Account and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program.

**Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA)**

This program, managed through the RCO, provides matching grants to state and local agencies to protect and enhance salmon habitat and to provide public
access and recreation opportunities on aquatic lands. In 1998, DNR refocused the ALEA program to emphasize salmon habitat preservation and enhancement. However, the program is still open to traditional water access proposals. Any project must be located on navigable portions of waterways. ALEA funds are derived from the leasing of state-owned aquatic lands and from the sale of harvest rights for shellfish and other aquatic resources.

**Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)**

The RCO is a state office that allocates funds to local and state agencies for the acquisition and development of wildlife habitat and outdoor recreation properties. Funding sources managed by the RCO include the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program. The WWRP is divided into Habitat Conservation and Outdoor Recreation Accounts; these are further divided into several project categories. Cities, counties and other local sponsors may apply for funding in urban wildlife habitat, local parks, trails and water access categories. Funds for local agencies are awarded on a matching basis. Grant applications are evaluated once each year, and the State Legislature must authorize funding for the WWRP project lists.

**Land and Water Conservation Fund**

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) provides grants to buy land and develop public outdoor facilities, including parks, trails and wildlife lands. Grant recipients must provide at least 50% matching funds in either cash or in-kind contributions. Grant program revenue is from a portion of Federal revenue derived from sale or lease of off-shore oil and gas resources.

**National Recreational Trails Program**

The National Recreational Trails Program (NRTP) provides funds to maintain trails and facilities that provide a backcountry experience for a range of activities including hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, motorcycling, and snowmobiling. Eligible projects include the maintenance and re-routing of recreational trails, development of trail-side and trail-head facilities, and operation of environmental education and trail safety programs. A local match of 20% is required. This program is funded through Federal gasoline taxes attributed to recreational non-highway uses.

**Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) Program**

The YAF provides grants to develop, equip, maintain, and improve youth and community athletic facilities. Cities, counties, and qualified non-profit organizations may apply for funding, and grant recipients must provide at least 50% matching funds in either cash or in-kind contributions.
Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Fund

Grants are awarded by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board for acquisition or restoration of lands directly correlating to salmon habitat protection or recovery. Projects must demonstrate a direct benefit to fish habitat. There is no match requirement for design-only projects; acquisition and restoration projects require a 15% match. The funding source includes the sale of state general obligation bonds, the federal Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund and the state Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Fund.

STP/CMAQ Regional Competition - Puget Sound Regional Council
http://psrc.org/transportation/tip/selection/

Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds are considered the most “flexible” funding source provided through the federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU). Many types of projects are eligible, including transit, carpool/vanpool, bicycle/pedestrian, safety, traffic monitoring/management, and planning projects, along with the more traditional road and bridge projects. The purpose of the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) program is to fund transportation projects or programs that will contribute to attainment or maintenance of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. The two goals of improving air quality and relieving congestion were strengthened under SAFETEA-LU by a new provision establishing priority consideration for cost-effective emission reduction and congestion mitigation activities when using CMAQ funding. The King County Growth Management Planning Council serves as the countywide board in the allocation of some federal transportation grant funds to projects within King County, through the Puget Sound Regional Council.

King County Grant Exchange
http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wlr/pi/grants.htm

The Grant Exchange is a clearinghouse of grant and technical assistance programs offered by the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks with the goals of protecting and enhancing the environment, increasing community stewardship, and providing expertise and consultation to projects. Grants and technical support are an important way in which King County increases opportunities for community stewardship of natural resources. These funds are leveraged by developing and strengthening partnerships with community organizations and local governments. On average, every dollar invested through grants is matched by three dollars in cash and in-kind contributions.
Wild Places in City Spaces

http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wlr/pi/grant-exchange/wildplaces.htm

Wild Places in City Spaces provides grants up to $10,000 to volunteer organizations, community groups and government agencies for projects reforesting urban areas and restoring habitat within the urban growth area of King County. Funds are available under the Urban Reforestation and Habitat Restoration Grants Program. Grants support projects to reforest urban areas, remove invasive non-native plant species or provide wildlife habitats.

Natural Resource Stewardship Network

http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wlr/pi/grant-exchange/NRSN.htm

The Natural Resource Stewardship Network assists urban forestry and watershed stewardship projects and provides grants and technical assistance to projects that involve communities and youth in improving neighborhood green spaces and forests. Grants of up to $20,000 are available for projects within the urban growth area of King County that enhance, protect and manage urban forest, soil and water resources and will reimburse up to 50% of labor and materials costs. Inner-city and low income communities receive priority for support. Funds are provided by the King County Forestry Program and the King Conservation District.

WaterWorks Grants

http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wlr/pi/grant-exchange/waterworks.htm

Individual grants up to $50,000 are available for community projects that protect or improve watersheds, streams, rivers, lakes, wetlands and tidewater. Projects must have a demonstrable positive impact on the waters of King County and provide opportunities for stewardship. A minimum of 10 percent cash match is required for awards more than $2,500.

King County Youth Sports Facilities Grant (YSFG)

The Youth Sports Facilities Grant Program is intended to facilitate new athletic opportunities for youth in King County by providing matching grant funds to rehabilitate or develop sports fields and facilities. The maximum award is $75,000 and projects should be located on public land or have public access for the proposed youth sports use.
OTHER METHODS & FUNDING SOURCES

Business Sponsorships/Donations

Business sponsorships for programs may be available throughout the year. In-kind contributions are often received, including food, door prizes and equipment/material.

Interagency Agreements

State law provides for interagency cooperative efforts between units of government. Joint acquisition, development and/or use of park and open space facilities may be provided between Parks, Public Works and utility providers.

Private Grants, Donations & Gifts

Many trusts and private foundations provide funding for park, recreation and open space projects. Grants from these sources are typically allocated through a competitive application process and vary dramatically in size based on the financial resources and funding criteria of the organization. Philanthropic giving is another source of project funding. Efforts in this area may involve cash gifts and include donations through other mechanisms such as wills or insurance policies. Community fundraising efforts can also support park, recreation or open space facilities and projects.

ACQUISITION TOOLS & METHODS

Direct Purchase Methods

Market Value Purchase

Through a written purchase and sale agreement, the District purchases land at the present market value based on an independent appraisal. Timing, payment of real estate taxes and other contingencies are negotiable.
Partial Value Purchase (or Bargain Sale)

In a bargain sale, the landowner agrees to sell for less than the property’s fair market value. A landowner’s decision to proceed with a bargain sale is unique and personal; landowners with a strong sense of civic pride, long community history or concerns about capital gains are possible candidates for this approach. In addition to cash proceeds upon closing, the landowner may be entitled to a charitable income tax deduction based on the difference between the land’s fair market value and its sale price.

Life Estates & Bequests

In the event a landowner wishes to remain on the property for a long period of time or until death, several variations on a sale agreement exist. In a life estate agreement, the landowner may continue to live on the land by donating a remainder interest and retaining a “reserved life estate.” Specifically, the landowner donates or sells the property to the District, but reserves the right for the seller or any other named person to continue to live on and use the property. When the owner or other specified person dies or releases his/her life interest, full title and control over the property will be transferred to the District. By donating a remainder interest, the landowner may be eligible for a tax deduction when the gift is made. In a bequest, the landowner designates in a will or trust document that the property is to be transferred to the city upon death. While a life estate offers the District some degree of title control during the life of the landowner, a bequest does not. Unless the intent to bequest is disclosed to and known by the District in advance, no guarantees exist with regard to the condition of the property upon transfer or to any liabilities that may exist.

Gift Deed

When a landowner wishes to bequeath their property to a public or private entity upon their death, they can record a gift deed with the county assessors office to insure their stated desire to transfer their property to the targeted beneficiary as part of their estate. The recording of the gift deed usually involves the tacit agreement of the receiving party.

Option to Purchase Agreement

This is a binding contract between a landowner and the District that would only apply according to the conditions of the option and limits the seller’s power to revoke an offer. Once in place and signed, the Option Agreement may be triggered at a future, specified date or upon the completion of designated conditions. Option Agreements can be made for any time duration and can include all of the language pertinent to closing a property sale.
Right of First Refusal

In this agreement, the landowner grants the District the first chance to purchase the property once the landowner wishes to sell. The agreement does not establish the sale price for the property, and the landowner is free to refuse to sell it for the price offered by the District. This is the weakest form of agreement between an owner and a prospective buyer.

Conservation and/or Access Easements

Through a conservation easement, a landowner voluntarily agrees to sell or donate certain rights associated with his or her property (often the right to subdivide or develop), and a private organization or public agency agrees to hold the right to enforce the landowner’s promise not to exercise those rights. In essence, the rights are forfeited and no longer exist. This is a legal agreement between the landowner and the District that permanently limits uses of the land in order to conserve a portion of the property for public use or protection. The landowner still owns the property, but the use of the land is restricted. Conservation easements may result in an income tax deduction and reduced property taxes and estate taxes. Typically, this approach is used to provide trail corridors where only a small portion of the land is needed or for the strategic protection of natural resources and habitat. Through a written purchase and sale agreement, the District purchases land at the present market value based on an independent appraisal. Timing, payment of real estate taxes and other contingencies are negotiable.

Park or Open Space Dedication Requirements

Local governments have the option to require developers to dedicate land for parks under the State Subdivision Law (Ch. 58.17 RCW) and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (Ch. 43.21C RCW). Under the subdivision law developers can be required to provide the parks/recreation improvements or pay a fee in lieu of the dedicated land and its improvements. Under the SEPA requirements, land dedication may occur as part of mitigation for a proposed development’s impact.

Landowner Incentive Measures

Density Bonuses

Density bonuses are a planning tool used to encourage a variety of public land use objectives, usually in urban areas. They offer the incentive of being able to develop at densities beyond current regulations in one area, in return for concessions in another. Density bonuses are applied to a single parcel or development. An example is allowing developers of multi-family units to build at higher densities if they provide a certain number of low-income units or public open space. For density bonuses to work, market forces must support densities at a higher level than current regulations.
Transfer of Development Rights

The transfer of development rights (TDR) is an incentive-based planning tool that allows land owners to trade the right to develop property to its fullest extent in one area for the right to develop beyond existing regulations in another area. Local governments (e.g., City of North Bend) may establish the specific areas in which development may be limited or restricted and the areas in which development beyond regulation may be allowed. Usually, but not always, the "sending" and "receiving" property are under common ownership. Some programs allow for different ownership, which, in effect, establishes a market for development rights to be bought and sold.

IRC 1031 Exchange

If the landowner owns business or investment property, an IRC Section 1031 Exchange can facilitate the exchange of like-kind property solely for business or investment purposes. No capital gain or loss is recognized under Internal Revenue Code Section 1031 (see www.irc.gov for more details). This option may be a useful tool in negotiations with an owner of investment property, especially if the tax savings offset to the owner can translate to a sale price discount for the District.

Current (Open Space) Use Taxation Programs

Property owners whose current lands are in open space, agricultural, and/or timber uses may have that land valued at their current use rather than their "highest and best" use assessment. This differential assessed value, allowed under the Washington Open Space Taxation Act (Ch.84.34 RCW) helps to preserve private properties as open space, farm or timber lands. If land is converted to other non-open space uses, the land owner is required to pay the difference between the current use annual taxes and highest/best taxes for the previous seven years. When properties are sold to a local government or conservation organization for land conservation/preservation purposes, the required payment of seven years worth of differential tax rates is waived. The amount of this tax liability can be part of the negotiated land acquisition from private to public or quasi-public conservation purposes. King County has four current use taxation programs that offer this property tax reduction as an incentive to landowners to voluntarily preserve open space, farmland or forestland on their property. More information is available at

OTHER LAND PROTECTION OPTIONS

Land Trusts & Conservancies

Land trusts are private non-profit organizations that acquire and protect special open spaces and are traditionally not associated with any government agency. Forterra (formerly called the Cascade Land Conservancy) is the regional land trust serving the Si View area, and their efforts have led to the conservation of more than 234,000 acres of forests, farms, shorelines, parks and natural areas in the region (www.forterra.org). Other national organizations with local representation include the Nature Conservancy, Trust for Public Land and the Wetlands Conservancy.

Regulatory Measures

A variety of regulatory measures are available to local agencies and jurisdictions. Available programs and regulations include: Critical Areas Ordinance; State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA); Shorelines Management Program; and Hydraulic Code, Washington State Department of Fisheries and Department of Wildlife.

Public/Private Utility Corridors

Utility corridors can be managed to maximize protection or enhancement of open space lands. Utilities maintain corridors for provision of services such as electricity, gas, oil, and rail travel. Some utility companies have cooperated with local governments for development of public programs such as parks and trails within utility corridors.