

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b>	Discussing Park Improvements and Property Acquisition Priorities and Funding
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	Eric Friedli, PRCS Department Director
<b>ACTION:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution <input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion

**PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:**

In July 2017, following an 18-month community engagement process, the City Council adopted the 2018-2023 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (PROS Plan) via Resolution No. 412. The PROS Plan identifies a 20-year vision and framework for Shoreline’s recreation and cultural programs, and for maintenance and investment in park, recreation and open space facilities. Strategic Action Initiative (SAI) #3 in the PROS Plan established a goal to “expand recreation facility opportunities” and SAI #7 established a goal to “ensure adequate parkland for future generations”. Since the adoption of the PROS Plan, staff have developed concept designs for selected parks and reviewed opportunities for property acquisition to achieve those goals.

The City Council’s Goals for 2020-2022 includes an Action Step to “Implement the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan, including priority park improvements and acquisition of additional park properties.” At its Strategic Planning Workshop on February 28, 2020, the Council asked staff to prepare a proposal and recommendations for placing a bond measure before the voters in 2020 for priority park improvements and property acquisition.

The Council Strategic Planning Workshop was held prior to the Declaration of Health Emergency for COVID-19. On March 30, 2020, the City Council discussed whether to place a bond measure, ranging from \$21.1M to \$38.5M, for park property acquisition and park improvements on the August 2020 primary ballot. The Council determined at that time that the timing was not appropriate for the measure to appear on the August ballot given the COVID-19 Health Emergency. The Council directed staff to bring this item back for further discussion to determine if a measure should be placed on the November 2020 General Election ballot or a future election.

Tonight, staff will be asking Council for guidance on next steps towards potentially placing a bond measure before the voters. Several policy questions and four potential ballot measure alternatives are presented for discussion. One of the key issues for Council is to determine if the City should delay moving forward on a ballot measure until the impacts of COVID-19 are more fully understood on the local economy. This may mean delaying the issue until 2021.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

This staff report presents four alternatives with a different mix of park improvements and levels of property acquisition funding. Each alternative has associated cost estimates ranging from \$21.1M to \$38.5M. Detailed analysis of the financial impact on taxpayers is included in the Discussion section of this report.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that Council direct staff to prepare legislation and other materials necessary for placing a funding measure on either the 2020 November General Election or 2021 April Special Election for \$38,500,000 for park improvements and park land acquisition.

Approved By:            City Manager **DT**    City Attorney **MK**

## INTRODUCTION

The 2017-2023 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (PROS Plan), adopted by the City Council on July 31, 2017, establishes a 20-year vision and framework for Shoreline's recreation and cultural programs, and guides maintenance and investment in park, recreation and open space facilities. The PROS Plan includes a series of Strategic Action Initiatives with goals and objectives, including:

- Strategic Action Initiative #3 established the objective to “Expand recreation facility opportunities by adding at least one community garden, two basketball courts, two multi-purpose/pickleball courts, one playground, one swing set, one paved loop path, one spray park, and one adventure playground.”
- Strategic Action Initiative #7 established the objective to “Ensure adequate parkland for future generations by adding five acres on new parkland by 2023 and 20 additional acres by 2030.”

The City Council re-emphasized the importance of park improvements and land acquisition in its 2020-2022 City Council Goals and Workplan.

- Goal 2: Continue to deliver highly valued public services through management of the City's infrastructure and stewardship of the natural environment.
  - Action Step 2: Implement the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan, including priority park improvements and acquisition of additional park properties

The City Council's guidance from its February 28, 2020 Strategic Planning Workshop was for staff to develop a proposal for a voter approved bond measure to fund improvements to parks and park land acquisition.

The Council's Strategic Planning Workshop was held prior to the Declaration of Health Emergency for COVID-19. On March 30, 2020, the City Council discussed whether to place a bond measure, ranging from \$21.1M to \$38.5M, for park property acquisition and park improvements, on the August 2020 primary ballot. The Council determined, at that time, that the timing was not appropriate for the measure to appear on the August ballot given the COVID-19 Health Emergency. Council directed staff to bring this item back for further discussion to determine if a measure should be placed on the November 2020 General Election ballot or a future election.

Whether now is the right time to present a ballot measure to the public for park improvements and land acquisition has become a new policy questions for Council to consider. This staff report also discusses the April 2021 Special Election as an optional date for a voter approved bond measure.

If Council is interested in moving forward with a ballot measure, staff would like guidance on these additional policy questions:

1. What park improvements should be included in a bond measure?
2. What is an appropriate amount to include for park land acquisition?
3. What should the overall bond measure cost?
4. What should the duration of the bond be?
5. Should the City move forward with the ballot measure this year, if not, then when?

There are staff recommendations associated with each of these policy questions outlined in the Discussion section below.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **2006 Park Bond Measure**

In May 2006, Shoreline voters approved a \$18.8M parks and open space ballot measure. This was a 15-year measure, which provided funding for a number of park and recreational facility improvements and the acquisition of open space properties including South Woods and the Kruckeberg Botanical Garden. The final year of property tax collections for this bond measure is 2021, as the bonds will be completely repaid by the end of 2021. A property owner of a median valued home has paid an average of \$76 per year.

### **Park Improvements**

The City Council included improvements to four parks in the 2019 Proposition 1 general election ballot measure – Brugger's Bog, Briarcrest (Hamlin Park), Richmond Highlands, and Hillwood. Those priority park improvements accounted for \$17.9 million of the \$103.6 million Proposition 1. Those four parks were selected by the Council after considering the recommendations of the 2019 Park Funding Advisory Committee (PFAC). The PFAC, which was a Committee of 16 community members from a diverse cross-section of Shoreline residents, met 10 times from September 2018 to March 2019 releasing its final recommendations in April 2019.

The proposed improvements to the four parks were identified as the result of concept designs that were completed for selected parks to guide the implementation of the PROS Plan. General information about the concept designs for expanding recreation amenities can be found at: [www.shorelinewa.gov/parksdesign](http://www.shorelinewa.gov/parksdesign).

As noted above, the cost of the priority park improvements included in Proposition 1 was estimated in 2019 at \$17.9 million. The estimate has been revised to account for cost inflation (\$501,000) and increases in the projected cost of acquiring necessary property for improvements at Brugger's Bog Park (\$750,000). The 2020 estimated cost for improvements to the four parks is \$19.2 million. The amenities to be included in the priority park improvements included as part of Proposition 1 remain unchanged and are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1: Amenities in Priority Park Improvements**

Park	Improvements	2020 Estimated Cost (millions)
Briarcrest – Hamlin Park	Play area, splash pad, community garden, picnic area, enhanced entrance form 25 <sup>th</sup> Ave NE	\$5.1
Brugger’s Bog	Relocated play area, multi-sports court, picnic shelter, landscaping,	\$4.8
Hillwood	Renovated play area, splash pad, perimeter trail, picnic shelter, adventure play area,	\$3.8
Richmond Highlands	Fully accessible play area, multi-sport court, picnic shelter, perimeter trail, sensory trail	\$5.5
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$19.2</b>

The Council identified the four parks as the highest priority for improvements in 2019 from a longer list of possible park improvements based on the desire to limit the impact to taxpayers of Proposition 1. The concept design process and the PFAC considered a larger list of park improvements. The PFAC prioritized list of park improvements is presented in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: PFAC Prioritized Park Investment Opportunities List**

	Investment Opportunity	2019 Estimated Project Cost (in millions)
1	Trails	\$2.4
2	Brugger’s Bog Park	\$5.4
3	Property Acquisition	\$15.0
4	Park at Town Center	\$3.0
5	James Keough Park	\$4.3
6	Richmond Highlands Park	\$5.6
7	Hillwood Park	\$4.2
8	Briarcrest Community Park	\$6.7
9	<i>Forest Restoration</i>	\$1.0
10	Ridgecrest Park	\$3.4
11	Shoreview Park	\$1.8

**Park Land Acquisition**

The Council did not include funding for general park land acquisition in the 2019 Proposition 1. Potential park land acquisitions were included in the PROS Plan (Table 3 below). Funding in the 2019 Proposition 1 was only included for acquisition of property at 17828 Midvale Avenue N for the proposed Shoreline Aquatics, Recreation and Community Center (ShARCC).

**Table 3: Potential Park Land Acquisition (PROS Plan Table 6.6 + Westminster Triangle)**

Park or Area for New Park Land	2020 Estimated cost	
	Acquisition	Development
Paramount Open Space Acquisition	\$1,070,000	\$257,000
185 <sup>th</sup> & Ashworth Acquisition	\$1,076,900	\$520,000
Westminster Triangle*	\$620,000	\$310,000
Rotary Park	\$4,975,000	\$1,406,000
Cedarbrook Acquisition (1/4 of full cost estimate)	\$2,779,000	\$503,000
145 <sup>th</sup> Station Area Acquisition	\$6,291,000	\$1,113,000
5 <sup>th</sup> & 165 <sup>th</sup> Acquisition	\$7,041,000	\$4,456,000
Aurora-I-5 155 <sup>th</sup> -165 <sup>th</sup> Acquisition	\$9,931,000	\$1,615,000
DNR Open Space Access Acquisition	\$2,027,000	\$616,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$35,589,000</b>	<b>\$10,769,000</b>

- Westminster Triangle park land was not included in the PROS Plan but has since been added as a priority acquisition.
- Note: Acquisition of property at Brugger’s Bog Park is included in the project budget for improvements at that park and is not included here.

**DISCUSSION**

**What Park Improvements Should be Included in a Bond Measure?**

As shown in Table 1 above, the cost of the improvements for the four prioritized parks would be \$19.2 million. The decision to prioritize these park improvements was based in part on the dollar amount the Council considered acceptable for the overall Proposition 1 measure in 2019. Staff recommends including \$19.2 million in funding for priority park improvements in a bond measure. An alternative would be to reduce the scope of priority park improvements, provide less funding or expand the scope and add more funding. If the Council wants to consider other park improvements for inclusion in a 2020 bond measure, Table 2 above presents the list of park improvements that were considered by the PFAC and Council in 2019.

The highest priority amenities have been identified from each park previously considered by the PFAC and Council and are presented in Table 4 below. These amenities include off-leash areas at Ridgecrest and James Keough that would recognize the uncertain future of the Eastside Off-Leash Area at Fircrest. This proposal would also make permanent the off-leash area at Shoreview Park that was established as a temporary facility and has not had permanent fencing or other amenities provided. It would also convert the unusable dirt soccer field to grass making it available for little league, softball and youth soccer. The Kruckeberg Botanic Garden was not included on the PFAC recommended list but is proposed here in recognition of the ADA needs at the Garden and to augment a \$200,000 bequest received by the garden for access improvements to the children’s garden area.

Based on this, staff recommends including \$5.3 million in funding for additional park improvements in a bond measure. An alternative would be to include fewer, different or no additional park amenities.

**Table 4: Staff Recommended Park Amenity Priorities**

Park	Improvements	Estimated Cost (millions)
James Keough	Off-leash area, play area, parking, landscaping, perimeter trail	\$1.8
Town Center	Landscaping, art, gathering plaza	\$0.75
Ridgecrest	Off-leash area, play area	\$0.75
Shoreview	Off-leash area upgrades, dirt soccer field conversion to grass for little league, etc.	\$1.5
Kruckeberg	ADA improvements to education center and children's garden	\$0.5
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$5.3</b>

**What is an Appropriate Amount to Include for Park Land Acquisition?**

At its Strategic Planning Workshop on February 28, 2020, the Council expressed interest in including funding for park land acquisition in a bond measure in 2020. Table 5 below presents optional levels of funding for park land acquisition. Costs are also included for making improvements to park land that is newly acquired. The associated improvement costs are included as general estimates given that no design work or community outreach has been done to identify what improvements might be desired or appropriate for these new park lands. The new park land improvements budget would provide basic park improvements and it is anticipated that park impact fees and grants would provide additional funding for a higher level of improvements.

Staff recommends \$10 million be included in a bond measure for park land acquisition and \$4.0 million for improvements to acquired property. An alternative would be to add more or include less funding for park land acquisition.

**Table 5: Park Land Acquisition Options**

Possible Acquisition	Funding Level (millions)	Associated Improvement Costs (millions)
Match for Conservation Futures Tax (CFT) grant for Paramount Open Space, Westminster Triangle	\$1.2	\$0.77
PLUS, a portion of property at Rotary Park	\$3.4	\$1.5
PLUS, additional property at Rotary Park, light rail station areas	\$10.0	\$4.0
Alternative: Acquisition of 17828 Midvale Avenue N (Storage Court)	\$17.0	\$0

**What Should the Overall Bond Measure Cost?**

The current parks and open spaces bond measure (approved by voters in 2006) is set to be retired in 2021 and removed from property tax bills in 2022. A property owner of a median priced home is paying approximately \$76 in 2020 in property tax towards the repayment of the 2006 bonds. The staff recommendations for park improvements and property acquisition total \$38.5 million, which are outlined in Table 6 below.

**Table 6: Staff Recommended Bond Measure**

Bond measure component	Cost (millions)
Priority Park Improvements	\$19.2
Priority Park amenities	\$5.3
Park land acquisition	\$10.0
Improvement to acquired property	\$4.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$38.5</b>

Table 7 below shows the impact of a \$38.5 million bond measure on a median valued home (\$517,000), a home valued at \$750,000 and a home valued at \$1,000,000. As shown in Table 7, the net impact, or difference between the current 2006 Parks Bond and the proposed Parks Bond, on the owner of a median valued home would be between \$0 and \$12 per month depending on the length of the bond issue.

**Table 7: Impacts of an \$38.5 Million Bond Measure**

Amount of Bond Issue = \$38,500,000				Cost of Expiring Bond		Net Increase (Decrease)	
	Length of Issue (Years)	Annual Impact	Monthly Impact	Annual	Monthly	Annual	Monthly
2020 Median Valued Home (\$517,000)	15	\$218	\$18	\$76	\$6	\$142	\$12
	20	\$112	\$9	\$76	\$6	\$36	\$3
	30	\$72	\$6	\$76	\$6	(\$4)	(\$0)
Home Valued at \$750,000	15	\$316	\$26	\$110	\$9	\$206	\$17
	20	\$163	\$14	\$110	\$9	\$53	\$4
	30	\$105	\$9	\$110	\$9	(\$5)	(\$0)
Home Valued at \$1,000,000	15	\$421	\$35	\$147	\$12	\$274	\$22
	20	\$217	\$18	\$147	\$12	\$70	\$6
	30	\$140	\$12	\$147	\$12	(\$7)	(\$1)

**What Should the Duration of the Bond Be?**

Longer bond terms result in lower annual impact on taxpayers, but taxpayers are impacted over a longer period of time. Additionally, a longer bond term also results in overall higher interest paid by the City. Staff recommends a 20-year bond term as shown below in Table 8.



**Table 8: Impacts of an \$38.5 Million Bond Measure for 20 Year Bond**

Amount of Bond Issue = \$38,500,000				Cost of Expiring Bond		Net Increase	
	Length of Issue (Years)	Annual Impact	Monthly Impact	Annual	Monthly	Annual	Monthly
2020 Median Valued Home (\$517,000)	20	\$112	\$9	\$76	\$6	\$36	\$3
Home Valued at \$750,000	20	\$163	\$14	\$110	\$9	\$53	\$4
Home Valued at \$1,000,000	20	\$217	\$18	\$147	\$12	\$70	\$6

**Should the City Move Forward with the Ballot Measure This Year; If Not, When?**

As discussed previously in this staff report, the COVID-19 Health Emergency has changed the environment for a potential bond measure in 2020. Table 9 below presents a list of anticipated ballot measures between 2020 and 2022.

**Table 9: Potential Ballot Measures 2020-2022**

Election	Potential Measure
2020 General	King County Harborview Hospital Bond
2021	Fire Department Fire Benefit Charge Renewal
2021	King County Best Start for Kids Renewal
2021	King County Family Justice Center
2022	Shoreline Levy Lid Lift
2022	Shoreline School District O&M Levy Replacement/Renewal
2022	Shoreline School District Technology Levy Replacement/Renewal

Given the health emergency that currently exists, the Council may want to delay a ballot measure until the economic impacts from the COVID-19 Health Emergency are more fully understood.

The 2020 General Election will be held on November 3<sup>rd</sup>. A resolution to place a measure on the ballot is due to King County Elections by August 4<sup>th</sup>. If Council gives staff direction to move forward with a proposal for the 2020 General Election, staff would present a resolution to Council on July 13<sup>th</sup> and Council would be asked to act on the resolution on July 27<sup>th</sup>.

In light of the COVID-19 Health Emergency and the resulting economic impacts, the Council may decide to delay placing a bond measure until a special election in 2021 of which there are two – February and April. King County Elections has not published a calendar for 2021 but staff would anticipate special election dates of February 9<sup>th</sup> and April 27<sup>th</sup>. Council would need to act on a resolution to place a bond measure on the ballot by December 11, 2020 for a measure to be on the February special election and by February 26, 2020 to appear on the April special election.

## Approval and Validation Requirements

A bond measure requires a minimum 60% ‘yes’ vote to pass. Special and primary elections require that in order for the ballot measure to ‘validate’, that at least 40% of the number of votes cast in the previous general election need to be cast in the special or primary election. The City will not know the actual voters required to validate a 2021 special election until after the 2020 general election in November.

In 2020, King County Elections reports for Shoreline that:

- Active registered voters = 38,362
- Voted at the 2019 General Election = 19,415 (50% voter turnout)
- 40% (minimum to validate a 2020 Special Election) = 7,766
- 60% yes (minimum to receive approval of the bond measure based on the 40% validation) = 4,660
- 60% yes based on voter turnout (requirement to pass at the 2019 General Election) = 11,649 (60% of 19,415 votes)

For the most recent presidential election year (2016):

- Active registered voters = 37,993
- Voted in the 2016 General Election = 30,883 (81% voter turnout)
- 40% (minimum to validate a 2017 Special Election) = 12,353
- 60% yes (minimum to receive approval of the bond measure based on the 40% validation) = 7,412
- 60% yes based on voter turnout (requirement to pass at the 2016 general election) = 18,530 (60% of 30,883 votes)

Staff has done some research on voter turnout for Shoreline for the last few years. Registered Voters and Times Counted for Shoreline precincts for the February 2017, February 2018, and August 2018 elections can be used to illustrate how many voters were sent ballots and how many ballots were returned. In the table below, if there is an “N/A” under the Active Registered Voters and Ballots Returned columns, that means there were no ballots mailed to Shoreline precincts.

Ballot Return Statistics												
Past Elections: <a href="https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/elections/elections/past-elections.aspx">https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/elections/elections/past-elections.aspx</a>												
Year =>	2016			2017			2018			2019		
Month	Active Registered Voters	Ballots Returned	Ballots Ready for Counting	Active Registered Voters	Ballots Returned	Ballots Ready for Counting	Active Registered Voters	Ballots Returned	Ballots Ready for Counting	Active Registered Voters	Ballots Returned	Ballots Ready for Counting
November	37,993	31,231	30,863	37,451	14,632	14,459	37,633	28,978	N/A	38,359	19,606	N/A
August	N/A	N/A	N/A	37,801	12,205	12,056	37,430	16,987	N/A	38,427	13,431	N/A
May	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
April	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
February	N/A	N/A	N/A	37,865	14,526	N/A	37,264	11,743	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Final Precinct Level Election Results												

Staff anticipates that the 2020 General Election will have a large turnout and that this will set a high threshold for the validation requirements for the 2021 Special and Primary Elections. At the same time, the number of votes to get 60% approval for the 2020 General Election will be significant.

### **Staff Recommendation**

1. *Should the City move forward with a Park Improvement/Park property acquisition ballot measure?* – **Staff recommends yes.** The Shoreline community has consistently ranked parks and recreation services as a priority. Based on historical responses to resident surveys there has been a high level of satisfaction with parks and an indication that residents want continued investment in park improvements and increased park/open space properties.
2. *Should the City move forward with the ballot measure in 2020 or wait until 2021?* – **Staff leans toward the special election in April 2021 but is also supportive of the November 2020 General Election.** Staff's primary concerns with the November 2020 Election center around the on-going COVID-19 Health Emergency and the related economic impacts, and the 60% threshold for what is expected to be a large voter turn-out. The primary concern with waiting until a Special Election in 2021 (February or April) or the August 2021 Primary is the 40% validation requirements based on the November 2020 General Election. It is possible that there could be Council candidate qualifying elections on the August 2021 Primary and delaying park improvements could continue to see capital cost escalation. The City's 2006 Park Bond was done at a May Special Election and received the needed 60% approval rate to pass, along with sufficient ballots cast to reach the required 40% validation, but 2006 validation numbers were not based on a large voter-turnout in November 2005.
3. *What park improvements should be included in a bond measure?* – **Staff recommends a total of \$28.5M for park improvements.** Staff recommends that the ballot measure include \$19.2M for the four priority parks that were included in the 2019 Proposition No. 1; \$5.3M for park amenity improvements at James Keough, Town Center, Ridgecrest, Shoreview parks and Kruckeberg Botanic Garden; and \$4.0M in improvements on newly acquired park land.
4. *What is an appropriate amount to include for park land acquisition?* – **Staff recommends a total of \$10M for park land acquisition.**
5. *What should the overall bond measure cost?* – **Staff recommends a total of \$38.5M for the bond measure.**
6. *What should the duration of the bond be?* – **Staff recommends 20 years.**

### **ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION**

Staff has also created a couple of alternatives for a potential ballot measure for Council consideration. Any of these Alternatives could be placed on the 2020 General Election ballot or delayed to a future election. The alternatives are as follows:

#### **Alternative 1a (Staff Recommendation) - \$38.5M**

Alternative 1a, which is the staff recommendation, would place a 20-year \$38.5M bond measure on the April 2021 Special Election ballot. As noted above, this alternative includes in the ballot measure \$19.2M for the four priority parks that were included in the 2019 Proposition; \$5.3M for park amenity improvements at James Keough, Town

Center, Ridgecrest, Shoreview parks and Kruckeberg Botanic Garden; \$10M for park land acquisition; and \$4.0M in improvements on newly acquired park land.

**Alternative 1b: Priority Park improvements, minimal park acquisition and 17828 Midvale Avenue N (Storage Court) acquisition- \$38.1M**

Alternative 1b would include the same items as Alternative 2 below but would also add the cost of paying off the bond anticipation note used to purchase the 17828 Midvale Avenue N property (see Table 10 below). The Council authorized the purchase of the property using proceeds from Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) and using the proceeds of the storage business revenue to pay the interest. While staff anticipates that the business will generate some additional revenue that will be applied to the purchase price, staff is conservatively estimating that the full purchase price would need to be refinanced through a voter-approved or councilmanic bond at some time in the future. This alternative is roughly the same cost as Alternative 1a, but the \$17M BAN payoff is included as opposed to funding for priority park amenities, greater park land acquisition and greater improvements to acquired property.

**Alternative 2: Priority Park improvements and minimal park acquisition - \$21.1M**

Alternative 2 would include the four priority park improvements as described in Alternative 1a. In addition, Alternative 2 would include \$1.2 million for property acquisition and \$0.77 million for improvements to the acquired land (see Table 10 below). Property included for acquisition would be Westminster Triangle and Paramount Open Space providing the match for a Conservation Futures Tax grant.

**Alternative 3: Priority Park improvements and park acquisition to total \$26 million bond measure - \$26M**

The intent of Alternative 3 is to have no net change in the amount that taxpayers are paying for a park related bond measure. The current parks and open spaces bond measure (approved by voters in 2006) is set to be retired in 2021 and removed from property tax bills in 2022. A property owner of a median priced home has been paying approximately \$76 per year in property tax towards the repayment of the 2006 bonds. Maintaining a property tax impact of \$76 per year would allow for \$26.0 million in bonds.

Alternative 3 would include the priority park improvements (1a) and the amount allocated to park land acquisition would be adjusted to maintain a no net change in property tax levels. The result is \$4.5 million available for park land acquisition and \$2.25 million available for improvements to newly acquired land.

**Table 10: Bond Measure Alternatives**

Bond measure component	Cost (millions)			
	Alternative 1a (Staff Recommendation)	Alternative 1b	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Priority Park Improvements	\$19.2	\$19.2	\$19.2	\$19.2
Priority Park Amenities	\$5.3			
Park land Acquisition	\$10.0	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$4.5
Improvement to Acquired Property	\$4.0	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$2.3
Storage Court Acquisition		\$17.0		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$38.5</b>	<b>\$38.1</b>	<b>\$21.1</b>	<b>\$26.0</b>
<b>Net Monthly Impact of 20-year bond measure on median valued home compared to current 2006 Park Bond</b>	\$3	\$3	(\$1)	\$0

**STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH**

After the adoption of the PROS Plan, staff actively engaged the community in development of park concept designs. The PFAC provided a forum for stakeholders to provide input into park improvements. The PRCS/Tree Board has consistently been kept informed and provided input at its monthly meetings.

The PRCS/Tree Board voted at its May 28, 2020 meeting to recommend the City Council move forward with a Bond measure in November 2020 for park improvements and acquisition that would be a renewal (approximately \$26 million) of the expiring parks bond and the Board would like to offer input on the contents of that Bond measure.

**NEXT STEPS**

If Council is interested in moving a ballot measure forward for the 2020 (November) General Election, staff recommends that the Council provide direction to staff to bring forward draft ballot language for Council review on July 13, 2020, with potential adoption on July 27, 2020. Council’s direction this evening will provide staff with the guidance on size, timing, and components to include in the ballot measure. If a

measure is going to be placed on the 2020 General Election ballot, the measure must be submitted to King County Elections no later than Tuesday, August 4, 2020.

If Council would like to delay a ballot measure, staff recommends that the Council provide direction to staff to schedule a discussion with Council in November 2020 to reevaluate the current climate.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

This staff report presents four alternatives with a different mix of park improvements and levels of property acquisition funding. Each alternative has associated cost estimates ranging from \$21.1M to \$38.5M. Detailed analysis of the financial impact on taxpayers is included in the Discussion section of this report.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that Council direct staff to prepare legislation and other materials necessary for placing a funding measure on either the 2020 November General Election or 2021 April Special Election for \$38,500,000 for park improvements and park land acquisition.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A - Impact Comparison Recommendation Compared to Alternative 3

Table 1: Impacts of an \$38.5 Million Bond Measure

Amount of Bond Issue = \$38,500,000				Cost of Expiring Bond		Net Increase	
	Length of Issue (Years)	Annual Impact	Monthly Impact	Annual	Monthly	Annual	Monthly
2020 Median Valued Home (\$517,000)	15	\$218	\$18	\$76	\$6	\$142	\$12
	<b>20*</b>	<b>\$112</b>	<b>\$9</b>	<b>\$76</b>	<b>\$6</b>	<b>\$36</b>	<b>\$3</b>
	30	\$72	\$6	\$76	\$6	(\$4)	(\$0)
Home Valued at \$750,000	15	\$316	\$26	\$110	\$9	\$206	\$17
	<b>20*</b>	<b>\$163</b>	<b>\$14</b>	<b>\$110</b>	<b>\$9</b>	<b>\$53</b>	<b>\$4</b>
	30	\$105	\$9	\$110	\$9	(\$5)	(\$1)
Home Valued at \$1,000,000	15	\$421	\$35	\$147	\$12	\$274	\$22
	<b>20*</b>	<b>\$217</b>	<b>\$18</b>	<b>\$147</b>	<b>\$12</b>	<b>\$70</b>	<b>\$6</b>
	30	\$140	\$12	\$147	\$12	(\$7)	(\$1)

\*Staff Recommendation

Table 2: Impacts of an \$26.0 Million Bond Measure (Replace Expiring Bond)

Amount of Bond Issue = \$26,000,000				Cost of Expiring Bond		Net Increase	
	Length of Issue (Years)	Annual Impact	Monthly Impact	Annual	Monthly	Annual	Monthly
2020 Median Valued Home (\$517,000)	15	\$147	\$12	\$76	\$6	\$71	\$6
	<b>20*</b>	<b>\$76</b>	<b>\$6</b>	<b>\$76</b>	<b>\$6</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	30	\$49	\$4	\$76	\$6	(\$27)	(\$2)
Home Valued at \$750,000	15	\$213	\$18	\$110	\$9	\$103	\$9
	<b>20*</b>	<b>\$110</b>	<b>\$9</b>	<b>\$110</b>	<b>\$9</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	30	\$71	\$6	\$110	\$9	(\$39)	(\$3)
Home Valued at \$1,000,000	15	\$284	\$24	\$147	\$12	\$137	\$11
	<b>20*</b>	<b>\$147</b>	<b>\$12</b>	<b>\$147</b>	<b>\$12</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	30	\$95	\$8	\$147	\$12	(\$52)	(\$4)

\*Staff Recommendation