



6. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN





IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Implementing this Plan advances the community-wide vision and guides long-term decision making. The critical balance is to provide enough direction to create action toward the community’s vision while retaining a high degree of flexibility to adapt to opportunities created by development and redevelopment, changes in political priorities, new partnerships and the availability of outside resources.

DECISION MAKING TOOLS

The goals of this plan offer direction for long-term change in the park system. The objectives provide additional clarity by describing the outcomes of these changes. Clear connection to the goals and objectives ensures that future development will be consistent with the desires of the community. The decision making tools further the community wide vision, goals and objectives by providing guidance for the provision of parks and recreation services and programming, the design of new parks and renovations, the prioritization of projects and the cost of building and maintaining improvements. This section explains these tools and how they can be applied to Renton’s future projects and opportunities.

RECREATION PROGRAM EVALUATION TOOL

This tool focuses attention on the recreation programming options offered by the City or in partnership with other agencies, non-profit organizations, the School District, businesses, volunteers and others. Every program requires a commitment of community resources. As the City proceeds with evaluating existing programming, the Recreation Programming Evaluation Tool will provide a basis for making decisions about where community resources should be invested. The tool can also be used to evaluate new project ideas as they arise.



The Recreation Program Evaluation Tool utilizes a worksheet format (included in Appendix B) that is built around nine target programming outcomes. These target outcomes were developed by the project team based on the input from the community and City staff. These outcomes do not need to be ranked or scored, but each should be a consideration in the process of evaluating new and existing programs. The end result of this evaluation is a recommendation by staff to continue the program (ongoing or on a trial basis) or to adjust/discontinue City support.

TARGET OUTCOMES

- Encouraging people to try new things, develop new skills and/or maintain existing skills.
- Adding healthy activities to participant lifestyles.
- Fostering a connection to the natural environment.
- Creating positive activities and fun environments for youth.
- Facilitating gatherings and bringing the community together.
- Promoting individual and community development.
- Offering a range of options for different income levels and different abilities.
- Adapting to new demographics and preferences.
- Offering programs that are responsive to community demands or interest.

Each program can be assessed against these outcomes to highlight the range of benefits the particular offering is achieving.



DESIGN GUIDELINES

This Plan recommends new design guidelines that revise the park classification system and update and expand the descriptions of what should, what could and what should not be included in the design and development of each park type. This tool also informs decision making about size and locations for future parks

ORGANIZATION

The guidelines are organized by park classification. For each park classification, there are five design guidelines topics:

- *Size and Access:* The size of a park, and particularly the developable area, determines the type of park and uses possible at the site. Access addresses the frontages, preferred modes of transportation and entrances to the site.
- *Recommended Resources:* There is a minimum set of park resources needed for a park location to meet the objectives developed from community input and analyzed in the Community Needs Assessment. Items listed in this sub-heading are intended to be the minimum elements for the given park classification.
- *Additional Resources:* The park resources identified in this sub-heading are additional resources for consideration. If site size allows, other resources can be incorporated into the park as long as the impacts of the resource do not exceed the capacity of the size and scale of the intended park site classification.
- *Structures:* If a structure is identified for the park site, additional review and standards will come into play. This section also calls out what non-recreation structures need additional consideration before being located within park sites.



- *Incompatible Resources:* In some cases, there are park resources that conflict with the purpose and character of a particular park classification.

The basic guidelines, by park category are provided below, the remaining guideline topics are detailed in Appendix B: Decision Making Tools.

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK

Intent: Provide close-to-home recreation opportunities for nearby residents, who typically live within walking and bicycling distance (.25-.5 miles) of the park in a residential setting.

Size and Access:

- Minimum developable park size 2 acres.
- Property faces front facades of adjacent development.
- Access from local street or trail.

COMMUNITY PARK

Intent: Provide opportunities for active recreation and organized play in a location that can accommodate increased traffic and demand, while also serving the neighborhood park function for nearby residents.

Size and Access:

- Minimum developable park size 10 acres.
- Access from a higher order public street on at least one side for main park entry.
- Main park entry should front a street with transit or bicycle route when applicable.
- Secondary access to the park from a public local access street or trail preferred.





REGIONAL PARKS

Intent: Provide destination park locations that can accommodate communitywide and regional demand, while also fulfilling the function of a community and neighborhood park for nearby residents.

Size and Access:

- Minimum developable park size 50 acres.
- Access from a higher order public street on at least one side for main park entry.
- Park may have multiple main entries which should front a street with a transit or bicycle route when possible.
- Secondary access points to the park from a public local access street or trail is encouraged.



SPECIAL USE PARKS

Intent: Provide space for unique features or places that create variety in the park system but cannot be accommodated within other park sites due to size or location requirements.

Size and Access:

- Size depends on the type of use proposed.
- Access from a higher order public street on at least one side for main park entry.
- Main park entry should front a street with a transit or bicycle route when applicable.
- Access may be limited during certain times of the day or to specific recreation activities.



NATURAL AREA PARK

Intent: Provide opportunities for users to interact with local nature or protect natural resources and systems within the standards of the existing natural resource regulatory environment.

Size and Access:

- Size of the natural area is variable, depending primarily on the extent of the natural resource being protected.
- Access is dependent on size of property and type of natural area. Generally, natural areas should have at least one identified entrance accessible from a public street.
- Public access may be limited or excluded if the natural resource is deemed too fragile for interaction. However maintenance access should be provided via trail or service road.

CORRIDOR

Intent: Narrow swaths of land that serve as connections between parks or to other destinations. Lands can include public land, private partnerships and/or easements. A corridor site can be the location of a trail or can provide a habitat linkage between two larger areas.

Size and Access:

- Size is dependent on corridor length and right-of-way or easement width and connectivity.

PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

The wide range of projects, from new fitness programs to a new play feature to natural area enhancement require criteria to evaluate how a specific program or project relates to the plan

Regular physical activity reduces the risk for [conditions such as] dementia and Alzheimer's disease in the elderly.

- Physical Activity and the Intertwine: A Public Health Method of Reducing Obesity and Healthcare Costs (2011)





By incorporating trees into a city's infrastructure, managers can build a smaller, less expensive stormwater management system.
 – American Forests Urban Resource Center

vision. Drawing from the extensive public input, the project team developed and refined seven criteria to apply to parks, recreation programming and natural area projects:

- *Advance programming objectives:* Project or program supports the 'Programming Target Outcomes'.
- *Provide multiple planning objectives:* Project or program is aligned with other adopted planning efforts of the City of Renton, King County or other aligned jurisdictions.
- *Fill identified gaps in service:* Project or program adds park sites, recreation facilities, natural areas or recreation programs to identified underserved populations or areas of the city.
- *Enhance partnerships or volunteerism:* Project or program creates new partnerships or strengthens existing partnerships.
- *Enhance (or improves use of) existing facilities:* Project or program makes the best possible use of the existing investments in land and facilities.
- *Contribute to system sustainability:* Project or program contributes to the long-term environmental and financial sustainability of the system.
- *Strengthen identity:* Project or program celebrates the unique features of Renton's neighborhoods or the city as a whole.

Scoring a project against these criteria allows for the sorting of disparate projects into an ordered list that focuses community resources. As part of the planning process, the consultant team scored each project against each criterion, on a scale of 0-5. This preliminary list was then reviewed by the public, project Steering Committee, Parks and Planning Commissions and the City Council's Committee of the Whole.

This ranking should be considered a snapshot view of priorities. As time passes, this list should not be considered fixed. The factors that feed into prioritizing based on these criteria are subject to change and should be reconsidered periodically. Additionally, while this ranking can be used to look at all projects in the system, it can also be broken down to examine the ranking by park type, community planning area or by specific types of improvements.

CAPITAL AND OPERATIONS COST MODEL

The Prioritization Criteria intentionally avoids making decisions based on cost. However, the cost of improvements at a park (and at the system-wide level) is an important consideration as the plan moves from this decision making stage into implementation planning. Critical cost considerations include both one-time capital costs and on-going operations and maintenance costs.

The Capital and Operations Cost Model allows broad “planning level” costs to be identified based on the recommended improvements. These costs are based on a series of assumptions based on recent park construction and operations experience of the project team as well as past project and operating costs in Renton. Six major project categories are identified in the model, along with a number of specific facilities, each of which has specific capital or operating cost implications. For each park in the system, the recommended projects and individual facilities are selected and added to the total project cost based on a per-unit or per-acre cost assumption specific to the type of park.

The result is a total capital cost by park location, which can be rolled up to a park type, community planning area or system-wide total. One additional function added to the model is an inflation factor that illustrates the capital cost projected 5, 10 and 20 years into the future, illustrating the value of completing projects sooner rather than later.

SIX CAPITAL PROJECT TYPES:

- Planning and Design
- Acquisition
- Development
- Renovation
- Stewardship Projects
- Major Maintenance and Reinvestment





Operating cost modeling includes the resources needed to maintain, staff and program park sites and facilities. These costs are driven by the size of a park site and the presence of key facilities, such as restrooms, sport fields and buildings. Operating costs are calculated for the existing park system as well as the facilities recommended to be added to the system. The final total (including both existing and proposed) removes the duplication of facilities that would be replaced by a recommended improvement, to avoid double counting.



The model is both a snapshot of the total costs based on the recommended improvements, and a live spreadsheet model that allows staff to change the assumptions about cost and specific facilities to adjust for changes over time. This flexibility allows the City to model different packages of projects that result in more, less or simply different investments in the park system. The totals reported from this tool are based on all of the recommendations in the plan, and are summarized following the Capital Projects List.



CAPITAL PROJECTS LIST

Table 6.1 presents a ranked list of all capital improvements recommended in the Plan. The Capital Projects List ranking utilizes the prioritization criteria and process described on pages 126-127 to apply public priorities to the wide range of potential projects. This scoring was based on achieving the vision of this plan and community needs and was completed prior to the development of project costs and funding options, which are applied later.

The list includes the project title, defining the specific site or type of improvement; a project description summarizing the full extent of the project over the 20-year Plan vision; and the total score out of 35 possible points, where a higher score means a higher priority. Where projects have the same score, they are sorted in alphabetical order within the list position (for example, all projects

scoring 28 points are in list position number one but there is no implied preference for Cedar River Park it falls alphabetically before Ron Regis Park).

USE OF THIS LIST

The Capital Projects List as presented on the following pages should be considered a snapshot of prioritization based on 2011-2012 conditions. As a 20-year plan, the implementation of these projects will be spread out over many years and this ranking will help to focus City efforts. Breaking down this list by time-frame, the top ten list positions (which include 28 projects) are the focus of the first six-years of plan implementation. The projects following position 10 will be considered long-term efforts but should be considered even in the short-term if special opportunities arise.

This list is intended to be used as a dynamic tool. The total ranking will always need to be considered against practical realities and be reevaluated periodically to account for changing circumstances and conditions. In addition, the list can be filtered and sorted to identify priority order based on park category or community planning area, as shown in Appendix C.

The Capital Projects List, and the prioritization tool that informed it, is intended to feed into the City's Capital Improvement Plan process. Through the City's CIP process, the public's priorities for parks, recreation and natural areas will be matched with specific funding sources and amounts, and phased (if necessary) as the next step towards implementation.



Table 6.1: Ranked Project List

Priority #	Project	Project Description	Total Ranking
1	Cedar River Park	Existing major building facilities include RCC and Carco Theatre. Expand Henry Moses Aquatic Center, potential field reconfiguration. Renovate fields and add lighting. (Phased Tri-Park Plan). Also included in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the Cedar River Basin Plan.	28
	Ron Regis Park	Improve existing and undeveloped fields to competitive level; extend water service to the park; add a permanent restroom, playground, and picnic shelter(s). Park included in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the Cedar River Basin Plan. Potential for habitat improvements to stabilize shoreline.	28
2	Black River Riparian Forest	Develop according to concept plan (interpretive center, soft surface trails, limited parking, signage, Lake to Sound Trail), complete site inventory/management plan, implement management plan. Site is in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 9, Green/Duwamish Watershed Management Plan and the Black River Water Quality Management Plan.	27
	Cedar River Natural Area	Complete site inventory and management plan, implement management plan. Included in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8, Cedar River Basin Plan. Continue to acquire properties as they become available.	27
	Highlands Park and Neighborhood Center	Re-develop according to concept plan (multi-generational facility, internal paths, sport fields, skate area, parking, sport courts, picnic shelter, etc.). Existing property is under utilized as configured. Located within the larger Sunset Planned Action EIS area.	27
	May Creek Greenway	Complete site inventory and management plan, acquire additional land along creek corridor, install soft surface trail, trailhead, creek crossings and partner w/Newcastle. Included in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the May Creek Basin Plan.	27
	NARCO Property	Develop according to Tri-Park Master Plan to include 4 "field turf" soccer fields, relocated trail, parking, picnic facilities, play area, restrooms, bike park/bmx and climbing wall. Park included in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the Cedar River Basin Plan.	27
	Panther Creek Wetlands	Complete site inventory and management plan, acquire additional land along creek corridor. Managed by Surface Water Utility.	27
	Senior Activity Center Property	Phase out existing shop buildings. Redevelop site as a neighborhood park with future multi-generational spaces. Acquisition, planning and design included in City Center NP. Included in the City Center Plan, Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the Cedar River Basin Plan.	27
3	Honey Creek Greenway	Complete site inventory and management plan, implement management plan. Develop soft surface trail. Located in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the May Creek Basin Plan. Continue to acquire properties as they become available.	26
	Trail Expansion & Development	Trail connection projects from the Trails and Bicycle Master Plan that are connected to parks and natural areas	26

Priority #	Project	Project Description	Total Ranking
4	Liberty Park	Re-develop according to Tri-Park Plan. Improve ballfields in the short term. Included in the City Center Plan, Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the Cedar River Basin Plan.	25
5	"Benson Planning Area Community Park"	Acquire and develop new community park with Community Center	24
	East Plateau Planning Area Community Park	Acquire and develop new community park with Community Center	24
	Gene Coulon Memorial Beach Park	Develop facility for non-motorized boating, acquire land for additional parking, expand technology, renovate S. beach restrooms & bathhouse. High level of ongoing reinvestment due to intensive use. Included in the City Center Plan, Shoreline Master Program and WRIA 8.	24
6	Renton Wetlands	Continue to manage as required by Mitigation Banking Agreements. Portion managed by Surface Water Utility. Included in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 9, Green/Duwamish Watershed Plan.	23
7	Community Gardens	Acquire land and/or develop additional community gardens, potentially as part of new neighborhood or community parks	22
	Corridor Acquisition	Acquire or secure new properties providing important linkages between parks and natural areas. Included in the City Center Plan.	22
8	Edlund Property	Develop park according to concept plan (parking, small active area near barn, future connection to Panther Creek Wetlands), create and implement management plan addressing class 1 wetland. Continue acquisitions to make connection to the Panther Creek Wetland.	21
	Kennydale Beach Park*	Reconfigure dock for improved life guarding, renovate restroom/lifeguard facility. Acquire land to enhance usability. Park included in the Shoreline Master Program and WRIA 8.	21
9	Cedar River Trail Park	Included in City Center Plan, Shoreline Master Program, WRIA and the Cedar River Basin Plan. Invasive species removal, add utilities for Boathouse.	20
	Dog Parks	Acquire land and/or develop off-leash areas in four neighborhood or community parks	20
	May Creek/McAskill	Develop park according to concept plan (pkg., picnic, play area, hard surface court, open turf area, restrooms, trail connections), create/implement mgt. plan addressing possible wetlands. Potential acquisition to increase park usability.	20
	Tiffany Park	Renovate according to concept plan (play area close to activity building, outfield is short, parking configuration). Expand to connect to Cascade Park. Potential addition to Activity building.	20
10	Cascade Park	Renovate according to concept plan by expanding to connect Cascade Park to Tiffany Park, improve road access and increase visibility. Potential for off leash area within park.	19

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Priority #	Project	Project Description	Total Ranking
10	Cleveland/Richardson Property	Develop park according to concept plan (trails, play area, picnic tables/benches, open turf area and possible sport field), create and implement management plan.	19
	Non-motorized Boating Facility	Develop non-motorized boating facility.	19
	Sports Complex	Acquire plan and develop a 4 field (or more) sports complex to centralize competitive play.	19
11	Interpretive/Education Centers	Develop interpretive/education center.	18
	Kennydale Lions Park	Renovate according to concept plan. Park acreage is not fully developed and current configuration of facilities limits usage. Potentially re-purpose activity building.	18
12	Burnett Linear Park*	Included in the South Renton Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan and the City Center Plan. Improvements identify expanding park to the north.	17
	Community Garden/Greenhouse	Continue to maintain and operate, expand garden. Potential to be larger neighborhood Park - Planning and acquisition included in City Center NP. Included in the City Center Plan, Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8, and the Cedar River Basin Plan. Operations of this site are included in the Enterprise Fund	17
	Highlands Planning Area NP 3: Sunset Park	Develop new park according to concept plan and Planned Action EIS	17
	Philip Arnold Park	Potential partnership with neighboring landowner to enhance usability. Improve ballfield. Potential re-purpose of activity building. Renovate restrooms. Included in the City Center Plan.	17
13	North Highlands Park and Neighborhood Center	Potential re-purpose of Activity building. Design and construct inclusive playground. Potential for partnerships. Located within the larger Sunset Planned Action EIS area.	16
	Piazza & Gateway	Continue to maintain and operate. Potential future re-development as Big 5 is acquired and expanded. Included in the City Center Plan.	16
	SE 186th Place Properties*	Undersized and surrounded by private property - potential for community garden and/or tree nursery. If not used for neighborhood park functions, replace with an additional park east of SR 515.	16
	Thomas Teasdale Park	Improve outfield drainage. Potential re-purpose of activity building.	16
	Trailheads and Parking	Identify and develop appropriate access points to natural areas	16
14	"Cedar River Trail Corridor (City Owned)"	Secure ownership of remaining railbanked corridor land, include acquired land in the surrounding parks and natural areas; maintain corridor as a regional trail linkage	15
	Earlington Park*	Potential acquisitions to expand park usability.	15
	"Soos Creek Greenway: Boulevard Lane"	A portion of the King County owned Soos Creek Greenway, within the Renton City Limits. This property will be transferred to the City and developed as a neighborhood park with a substantial natural area.	15

Priority #	Project	Project Description	Total Ranking
15	Parkwood South Div #3 Park*	Acquire adjacent land to bring this site up to minimum size of 2 acres of developable land; master plan and develop a neighborhood park according to design guidelines.	14
	Skate Parks	Develop new skate park within a community park.	14
	Soos Creek Greenway: Renton Park	A portion of the King County owned Soos Creek Greenway, within the Renton City Limits. This property will be transferred to the City and developed as a natural area once Soos Creek Trail is complete.	14
16	Benson Planning Area NP 1	Acquire and develop one neighborhood park east of S Benson Rd and north of SE Puget Drive lack	13
	Benson Planning Area NP 2	Acquire and develop one neighborhood park west of SR 515 around SE 192nd Street	13
	City Center Planning Area NP 1	Develop neighborhood park amenities at existing Senior Activity Center site after phasing out existing maintenance buildings. Included in the City Center Plan, Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the Cedar River Basin Plan. (See Senior Activity Center property).	13
	East Plateau Planning Area NP 1	Acquire and develop a neighborhood park south of Sunset Boulevard and east of Duvall	13
	East Plateau Planning Area NP 2	Acquire and develop a neighborhood park north of SE 128th Street	13
	Highlands Planning Area NP 1	Acquire and develop a neighborhood park north of Sunset Boulevard, west of Duvall	13
	Highlands Planning Area NP 2	Acquire and develop a neighborhood park south of NE 3rd Street	13
	Kennydale Planning Area NP 1	Acquire and develop a neighborhood park west of I-405	13
	Kennydale Planning Area NP 2	Acquire and develop a neighborhood park east of I-405 and north of the May Creek Greenway	13
West Hills Planning Area NP	Acquire and develop one neighborhood park north of Renton Ave.	13	
17	Boeing EIS Waterfront Park**	A new park with lakefront access as noted in the Boeing Comprehensive Plan Amendment EIS dated 10/21/03	12
	Glencoe Park*	Acquire land to expand usability.	12
	Kiwanis Park	Potential acquisition to expand park to increase usability. Improve field and install ADA walk from Union Avenue. Potentially re-purpose activity building.	12
	Maplewood Golf Course	Continue to maintain and operate, acquire property as it becomes available. See adopted Master Plan, included in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8, and the Cedar River Basin Plan. Capital and operations costs are outside of the Community Services budget, within an enterprise fund	12
	Talbot Hill Reservoir Park	Renovate site with features that differentiate it from nearby Thomas Teasedale Park. Potential community garden site with raised beds.	12
18	Heritage Park	Increase on-site drainage capacity.	10
	Windsor Hills Park	Potential acquisitions to enhance park usability and visibility from street.	10

Priority #	Project	Project Description	Total Ranking
19	Riverview Park	Park in Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the Cedar River Basin Plan. Continue to maintain facilities	9
	Springbrook Watershed	Managed by Water Utility, not accessible to the public. Capital and operations costs are outside of Community Services budget.	9
20	Veterans Memorial Park	Continue to maintain and operate, tile refurbishment. Included in the City Center Plan.	8
21	Tonkin Park	Continue to maintain and operate. Potential picnic shelter. Included in the City Center Plan.	7
22	Jones Park	Included in the City Center Plan. Adjacent trail corridor adds enough size to serve as a full neighborhood park. Park in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and Cedar River Basin Plan.	6
	Maplewood Roadside Park	Continue to maintain and operate. Included in the Shoreline Master Program, WRIA 8 and the Cedar River Basin Plan.	6
23	Maplewood Park	Renovate restrooms.	5
24	Sit In Park	Continue to maintain and operate. Included in the City Center Plan.	4
25	Lake Street Open Space	Inventory and manage as part of the Panther Creek Wetlands, potential for tree nursery.	1
25	Panther Creek 4A Parcel	Included in Edlund Property concept plan and management plan. Continue connection to the Panther Creek Wetlands.	1
26	Sunset Court Park*	No additional improvements, maintain until replaced by Sunset Planned Action EIS Park	0

* Provisionally categorized parks that do not meet the minimum size guideline



SUMMARY OF CAPITAL COSTS

Each new or existing project park site has a set of recommended projects, and may include specific facilities recommendations. The details of these recommendations are provided in Appendix C along with the capital costs per project. The total amount of capital investment identified in the cost model is \$213,237,000. Table 6.2 on the following page breaks this total down by major project and additional facilities with percentages of the total cost.

Table 6.2: Capital Cost Summary

Major Project Type	Total Cost	% of Total Cost
Planning and Design	\$10,950,000	5%
Acquisition	\$34,303,706	16%
Development	\$38,871,244	18%
Renovation	\$9,372,943	4%
Stewardship Projects	\$2,643,717	1%
Major Maintenance and Reinvestment	\$19,293,458	9%
Subtotal: Capital Project Types	\$115,435,068	54%
Additional Facilities	Total Cost	% of Total Cost
Play Area - Small	\$7,000,000	3%
Play Area - Large	\$3,000,000	1%
Picnic Shelter - Small	\$4,025,000	2%
Picnic Shelter - Large	\$1,500,000	1%
Trails (Miles)	\$13,500,000	6%
Multi Purpose Sport Field	\$7,200,000	3%
Sport Field with Artificial Turf/Lights	\$11,000,000	5%
Sport Courts	\$2,550,000	1%
Restroom	\$6,250,000	3%
Building	\$24,000,000	11%
Other Major Capital	\$18,330,000	9%
Subtotal: Additional Facilities	\$98,355,000	46%
Total Capital Costs	\$213,789,000	100%

INFLATION OF COSTS

The projected inflation of the total capital cost is based on a 5% annual inflation factor. Over the long-term the costs of the recommended investment in the park system will increase greatly. Table 6.3 at the bottom of this page shows the projected cost for five, ten and twenty years in the future.

In twenty years the cost of developing the improvements recommended here would more than double. Appendix C includes further breakdown of these numbers by project.



Table 6.3: Inflation Projections

Total Capital Cost 2011	\$213,789,000
Total Capital Cost Projection 5 Years	\$286,502,000
Total Capital Cost Projection 10 Years	\$348,245,000
Total Capital Cost Projection 20 Years	\$567,259,000



SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS COSTS

Operations costs are modeled on a per acre basic maintenance cost that is based on Renton’s actual costs of providing maintenance, equipment, supplies and support services. In addition facilities that require additional maintenance or staffing such as sports fields, include operating cost allocations on a per unit (bonus) basis. Special facilities, such as the aquatic center and recreation staffing at swimming beaches and the aquatic center were added to the total as Other Operations costs.

Table 6.4: Operating Cost Summary

Operating Type	Existing	Proposed	Total (Existing and Proposed)
Basic Maintenance	\$2,641,100	\$1,750,200	\$4,391,300
Bonus Sport Fields	\$325,000	\$725,000	\$1,050,000
Bonus: Restrooms	\$875,000	\$875,000	\$1,750,000
Bonus: Picnic Shelter	\$55,000	\$115,000	\$170,000
Staffing: Building	\$3,750,000	\$2,700,000	\$5,400,000
Other Operations	\$2,113,000	\$1,040,000	\$3,153,000
Total Annual Operating Cost (2011 Dollars)	\$9,758,600	\$7,205,700	\$15,914,300

Note: The total is less than existing plus proposed cost due to some facilities being replaced.

PROGRAM PROJECTS LIST

In addition to the capital projects, a series of program areas were identified for exploration and growth. These program projects have been separated from the capital projects due to the different funding needs and implementation process. These projects are not an exhaustive list of ongoing Renton recreation programs, but rather areas that received special interest from the community and should be a focus of development.

It is important to note that recreation programming and park and recreation facilities are closely tied together. As facilities are developed or redeveloped, new or additional programs should be added to maximize their use. The program recommendations do not have associated costs, as the scale of programming and the

Table 6.5: Program Projects

Priority #	Project	Project Description	Total Ranking
1	Renton School District Partnership	Identify and explore improvements to school facilities to serve community recreation needs.	27
2	Environmental Education	Develop and pilot hands-on environmental programs that focus on the natural resources found in the Renton park system.	25
3	Special Events	Expand the number and variety of special events.	23
4	Performing Arts	Expand partnerships to maximize use of existing community performing arts facilities. Included in the Arts and Culture Master Plan.	22
5	Athletics	Expand partnerships for enhanced programming.	21
	Recreation Programming Plan	Develop detailed Recreation Programming Plan to address specific actions for each program offering.	21
	Special Populations	Enhancing programming aimed at special populations groups in Renton, building on successful Special Olympics and other activities. Integrate opportunities into other program areas as well.	21
6	Outdoor Recreation	Identify and develop programs that make appropriate use of outdoor recreation resources within the Renton system.	18
	Crafts and Visual Arts	Expand crafts and visual arts offerings to enhance variety and explore options that could appeal to teens and young adults. Included in the Arts and Culture Master Plan.	18
7	Gardening Programs	Create programs that appeal to both community and home gardeners.	16

cost recovery goals are yet to be developed. These details will be clarified as the Recreation Programming Plan and Cost Recovery Model are completed.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

There are several strategies that can move the community vision forward. Ensuring that new development contributes a fair share to park system improvements and pursuing a strategy to build community support for future initiatives, are two of the most critical paths to success. Park related projects that combine with other public services such as transportation and stormwater, may be able to utilize alternative sources of funding and maximize community benefits. Additionally, leveraging recreation

[Parks] bolstered the collective wealth of Seattleites—by more than \$80 million in total property value.... Which translates to \$14,771,258 per year in additional tax receipts.

- The Economic Benefits of Seattle's Park and Recreation System (2011)



programming as a community building strategy can extend additional support for the City's offerings:

- *Development/Redevelopment Partnerships:* Efforts to build the envisioned park system will require substantial financial investment. While tax payers will ultimately share in some of these costs, private development should be responsible for contributing toward the related increased impacts on the parks and recreation system. The City should rely on a system of regulations and rewards that ensure new development and redevelopment pays a portion of public improvements. Incentives such as density bonuses, reductions in required parking and system development credits can attract private development to directly contribute to park projects in redevelopment areas. Beyond the incentives, feedback about recreation elements and access as well as education about the financial benefits to developer projects (especially increased property values) can increase the overall contribution individual projects make to the system.
- *Building Community Support:* All new mechanisms to fund public improvements will require the will of voters. It will be important to employ public input, education, outreach and polling before any specific funding mechanism is attempted.
- *Integrating Parks, Natural Areas and Infrastructure:* Combining the community benefits of infrastructure investment with the recreational benefits of park land has considerable potential to enhance the use of natural systems in Renton as well as meeting the plan goals. The desired result of this integration is reducing the amount of land reserved for the exclusive use of infrastructure

and maximizing recreational value. In an environment of limited public resources (including land and operating funding) the City and the community should explore integrating compatible infrastructure into parks and using infrastructure land for park and natural area purposes. The design guidelines provided in Appendix B include considerations for both infrastructure additions to park and natural area sites and the addition of park and natural features to infrastructure sites. One of the opportunities presented by combining sites and functions is the potential for stormwater fees to help fund enhancements that provide multiple benefits and natural area management.

- *Recreation Program Positioning:* The Recreation Division has built an extensive set of program offerings and developed an informative guide to both City operated and partner programs. Renton should continue to build on this to ensure that the What's Happening brochure is the "go to" guide for all events occurring in Renton. One of the things that Renton can offer to potential programming partners is the opportunity for inexpensive exposure. Each major program area should be discussed as an investment in the community, directly related to the City's goals. Parks, recreation programming, trails and natural areas provide opportunities for physical activity resulting in the long term investment in public health.





- *Building School District Partnership:* The City has long had a working relationship with the Renton School District that has allowed City recreation and community organizations to use indoor and outdoor facilities. The future will require closer integration of the parks, recreation and natural areas system with the public school buildings and sport facilities. The City has a unique opportunity to revisit the structure of the existing partnership. Potential changes could enhance the public's access to sport fields, indoor spaces, gyms and classrooms, particularly in Benson and East Plateau. In addition as annexations in these Community Planning Areas occur, building new partnerships with the Issaquah and Kent School Districts is recommended.

FUNDING STRATEGIES

A variety of funding sources are available for park construction and operation. The following pages present existing and potential financing and funding sources for acquiring, developing and maintaining parks, natural areas, trails and recreational programs.

CURRENT AND RECENT FUNDING SOURCES

GENERAL FUND

This is the City's primary source for operating revenue. Most of this revenue comes from taxes levied on property, the sale of merchandise and utilities within the City's boundary. Fees collected through the park and recreation system, such as recreation program fees, boat launch fees, picnic shelter or other facilities rental fees, are also returned to the general fund. These revenues are generally thought to return to the Community Services budget, but in practice the revenue number is only a point of justification of the annual budget and has no direct connection to the level of funding.

REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX (REET)

Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) is a tax on all real estate sales and is levied against the full value of the property. The City is allowed under the statutes to levy 0.5% in addition to the State of Washington tax. These funds can only be used for projects identified in the Capital Facilities Plan Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The City projected approximately \$400,000 per year of REET expenditures for the next two years. Since this funding is dependent on real estate transfers, the current slow economic recovery will constrain resources.

PARK IMPACT FEES

Park Impact Fees are fees imposed on new development to pay for capital projects required to accommodate the impacts of development on the City's infrastructure. Renton's existing park impact fee is \$530 per single family home and \$354 per multi-family unit. These fees are currently under review to determine if they adequately reflect the incremental costs to provide park facilities to serve the growing community. The current review is also transitioning the fee from SEPA based to a Growth Management Act (GMA) based fee.

EXACTIONS

Costs of necessary public improvements are passed onto designated landowners through the development agreement process.





RECENT GRANT SOURCES

The City of Renton has had success competing for grant funding from a wide range of programs. Recognizing and facilitating this, the City sets aside funding each year to match grant funds to ensure that if proposals are accepted for funding, the City is prepared with the matching funds:

- King County Conservation District;
- King County Conservation Futures; and
- Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program



OTHER RECENT FUNDING SOURCES

- Charles L. Custer/Renton Park Department Memorial Fund: The City's park system benefits from an estate gift managed by the Renton Community Foundation, which funds small enhancements to the park system.



OTHER FUNDING OPTIONS

There are a number of additional options Renton could consider for funding parks, recreation and natural area improvements. The list below represents both capital and operations funding sources.

KING COUNTY PROPOSITION 2 PARKS EXPANSION LEVY

In August of 2007, King County voters approved Proposition 2, funding open space acquisition and trail development. Twenty percent of the funding raised will be distributed among cities in King County to fund the acquisition of open space and natural lands or the acquisition and development of trails. Funding will be distributed through 2013 and must be used by the end of 2014. King County is considering a similar levy to extend funding that may go to voters in 2012.

UNLIMITED GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND

These are voter-approved bonds paid off by an assessment placed on real property. The money may only be used for capital improvements. This property tax is levied for a specified period of time (usually 15-20 years). Passage requires approval by 60%. Major disadvantages of this funding option are the voter approval requirement and the interest costs.

LIMITED TAX GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

Also known as councilmanic bonds, these bonds are paid directly out of the general fund and require no additional taxation. Therefore no authorizing vote is necessary, however the City must have the ability to repay the bonds prior to bond issuance. These bonds may be used for any purpose (not only capital).

CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION

This is a lease-purchase approach where the City sells Certificates of Participation (COPs) to a lending institution. The City then pays the loan off from revenue produced by the facility or from its general operating budget. The lending institution holds title to the property until the COPs are repaid. This procedure does not require a vote of the public.

REVENUE BONDS

These bonds are sold to investors and are paid back from the revenue generated from the facility operation.

METROPOLITAN PARK DISTRICT

A special tax district, authorized under RCW 35.61.210, with a board of park commissioners could take over part or all of park ownership and operations. If the boundaries of the district match the city limits, the City Council can serve as the commissioners. Metropolitan Park Districts are funded by a levy, with the total rate allowed up to \$0.75/1000 of property value.





PARK AND RECREATION SERVICE AREA

A type of special tax district that can levy regular property tax up to \$0.60 / 1,000 property value. Authorized under RCW36.68.400.620, when voter approved by special levy. A PRSA is typically used for facilities that serve an unincorporated area.

DONATIONS

The donation of labor, land or cash by service agencies, private groups or individuals is a popular way to raise small amounts of money for specific projects. One common example is a service club, such as Kiwanis, Lions or Rotary, funding playground improvements.



EXCHANGE OF PROPERTY

If the City has an excess parcel of land with some development value, it could be traded for private land more suitable for park use.

JOINT PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

This concept has become increasingly popular for park and recreation agencies. The basic approach is for a public agency to enter into a working agreement with a private corporation to help fund, build and/or operate a public facility. Generally, the three primary incentives a public agency can offer are free land to place a facility (usually a park or other parcel of public land), certain tax advantages, and access to the facility. While the public agency may have to give up certain responsibilities or control, it is one way of obtaining public facilities at a lower cost.



ESTATE GIVING

A variety of arrangements to accept donations for park and recreation as an element of an estate. One example of this would be a Lifetime Estate: an agreement between the City and a land owner, where the City acquires the property but gives the owner

the right to live on the site after the property transfer in exchange for the estate maintaining the property or for other agreed upon services.

PARTNERSHIPS

The City could consider developing partnerships with other jurisdictions, agencies or non-profit service providers to implement projects identified in the plan. Some potential partners include the YMCA, Boys and Girls Club, private sport groups, neighborhood organizations, the County and neighboring city governments.

PRIVATE LAND TRUSTS

Private land trusts, such as the Trust for Public Land, Inc. and the Nature Conservancy will acquire and hold land for eventual acquisition by a public agency.

SHARED FACILITIES

In some situations other services provided in the city, or in private utilities, may be able to share the cost of improvements that would benefit the parks, recreation and natural areas system. One example is utility corridors; in many cases land used for sanitary sewer, water or power lines may make an excellent trail corridor, such as the City's Honey Creek Trail. In this situation, the utility may pay to develop a service road that can also serve as a trail.

GRANT PROGRAMS

Following the City's own resources, the largest funding source for park and recreation projects are grants from the State of Washington Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). The RCO is responsible for administering a wide variety of public funds and provides technical assistance and policy development in addition to preparing statewide plans on trails, boating facilities, habitat preservation and off-road vehicles. This section outlines





the major RCO programs as well as several other relevant granting agencies. It is important to note that most grant programs require a portion of the project cost to be provided by a local partner as match funding. In most cases granting agencies will not fund more than 75 percent of a project's cost. These programs also require training, tracking and other staff attention throughout the year to maximize success.

BOATING FACILITIES PROGRAM (BFP)

This grant program is funded by boaters' gasoline taxes and administered by the RCO. Projects eligible under this program include acquisition, development, planning and renovation projects associated with launching ramps, transient moorage and upland support facilities. RCO allocates up to \$200,000 for planning projects and up to \$1,000,000 for acquisition, development or projects that combine planning with acquisition or development. Grants are distributed on an annual basis and require a minimum of 25 percent matching funds by a local agency.



LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND (LWCF)

This is a federal grant program that receives its money from offshore oil leases. The money is distributed through the National Park Service and is administered locally by the RCO. In the past, this was one of the major sources of grant money for local agencies. In the 1990s, funding at the federal level was severely cut, and now funding varies from budget to budget. The funds can be used for acquisition and development of outdoor facilities and require a 50 percent match.

WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION PROGRAM (WWRP)

This program is administered by the RCO. There are two accounts under this program: 1) Habitat Conservation; and 2) Outdoor Recreation. Projects eligible under this program include

acquisition and development of parks, water access sites, trails, critical wildlife habitat, natural areas and urban wildlife habitat. Applicants must provide a minimum of a 50 percent non-RCO match. Local park projects have maximum requests of \$300,000 for development and \$500,000 for acquisition costs. There are no maximum request levels in the following categories: urban wildlife habitat, trails and water access.

YOUTH ATHLETIC FACILITIES (YAF)

The Youth Athletic Facilities is a grant program designed to provide funding for new, improved and better maintained outdoor athletic facilities serving youth and communities. This program was established by State Statute (RCW 79A.25.800-830) as part of the State Referendum 48, which provided funding for the Seattle Seahawks Stadium. The program is administered by the RCO and applicants must provide matching funds of at least 50 percent. The grant amounts vary by use from a minimum of \$5,000 for maintaining existing facilities to a maximum of \$150,000 for developing new facilities.

AQUATIC LAND ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT (ALEA)

This program is administered by the RCO and supports the purchase, improvement or protection of and access to aquatic lands for public purposes. Grant applications are reviewed once every two years for this program. Applicants must provide a minimum of a 50 percent match.

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD (SRFB)

Salmon recovery grants are awarded by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board, from state and federal sources, to protect and restore salmon habitat. The board funds projects that protect existing, high quality habitats for salmon and that restore degraded habitat to increase overall habitat health and biological productivity. The board also awards grants for feasibility assessments to determine future projects and for other salmon





related activities. Projects may include the actual habitat used by salmon and the land and water that support ecosystem functions and processes important to salmon. The program funds acquisition, restoration, design and non-capital projects with no project limit. Local agencies are required to match 15% of grant funds.

BOATING INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM (BIG)

The Boating Infrastructure Grant Program provides funding to develop and renovate boating facilities targeting recreational boats 26 feet and larger. Grants also may be used for boater education. This program is funded by the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund and administered by the RCO. The local agency match requirement is 25% and projects are split into two categories for projects under \$95,000 and over \$100,000.



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS (CDBG)

These grants from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development are available for a wide variety of projects. Most are used for projects in lower income areas of the community because of funding rules. Grants can cover up to 100 percent of project costs.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2011

Through the years, Washington has received considerable revenue for trail-related projects from this source. Originally called the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), this six-year program funded a wide variety of transportation-related projects. The act was reauthorized in 2005 under the name Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act — a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), and then extended in 2011 with similar provisions. In addition to bicycle, pedestrian and trail-related projects, these funds can generally be used for landscape and amenity improvements related to trail and transportation projects. The future of this source is unclear with the current

transportation equity act set to expire in September of 2011. The Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) administers the transportation enhancement (TE) funding through the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO). The Puget Sound Regional Council is Renton's RTPO.

RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (RTP)

The Recreational Trails Program, funded by federal gas taxes and administered by RCO, provides funds to rehabilitate and maintain recreational trails and facilities. These grants support a backcountry experience, which means that the trail's physical setting, not its distance from a city or road, should be predominately natural. For example, a backcountry trail can provide views of cities or towns. Backcountry also means that the user will experience nature as opposed to seeing or hearing evidence of human development and activity. Under limited circumstances, new "linking" trails, relocations, and education proposals are also eligible. Grants top out at \$75,000 per project and require a 20% match for local agencies.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (USFW)

USFW may provide technical assistance and administer funding for projects related to water quality improvement through debris and habitat/vegetation management, watershed management and stream bank erosion, and sediment deposition projects.

PRIVATE GRANTS AND FOUNDATIONS

Private corporations and foundations provide money for a wide range of projects, targeted to the organizations' mission. Some foundations do not provide grants to governments, but will often grant to partner organizations. Private grants can be difficult to secure because of the open competition and the up-front investment in research and relationship building.





MONITORING, REVIEWING AND UPDATING

The vision, goals and objectives of this plan should serve this community to the end of this decade and beyond. However, it will be important to check in with the community and validate or adjust the plan for any major shifts in priorities or project opportunities. The six-year period defined by the Recreation and Conservation Office presents a good time for this check in.



The implementation of this plan will continue well past the six-year update cycle mandated by the state. Following the adoption of this plan, the staff and the Parks Commission could develop a work plan. This work plan should recognize that there are factors that may limit the ability to move forward on any one project but each high priority site could have recommendation elements that can be moved forward. This work plan can be revisited biannually, ahead of the budgeting process, to reevaluate progress and priorities (making use of the prioritization criteria and other decision making tools) and adjust for new opportunities.

