



Burien
WASHINGTON

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
March 22, 2011, 7:00 p.m.
Multipurpose Room/Council Chamber
Burien City Hall, 400 SW 152nd Street
Burien, Washington 98166

**This meeting can be watched live on Burien Cable Channel 21 or
streaming live and archived video on www.burienmedia.org**

1. ROLL CALL

2. AGENDA CONFIRMATION

3. PUBLIC COMMENT Public comment will be accepted on topics not scheduled for a public hearing.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES March 8, 2011

5. NEW BUSINESS

- Presentations Regarding:
 - Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan
 - Communities Putting Prevention to Work/
Healthy Eating Active Living Grant
 - Transportation Master Plan
 - Drainage Master Plan

6. OLD BUSINESS

**7. PLANNING COMMISSION
COMMUNICATIONS**

8. DIRECTOR’S REPORT

9. ADJOURNMENT

Future Agendas (Tentative) April 12 and April 26, 2011:

- North Burien Background
- Other “Must-Do” Items
- Early Ideas From Visioning

Planning Commissioners

Jim Clingan (Chair)

Ray Helms

Nancy Tosta (Vice Chair)

Greg Duff
Brooks Stanfield

Rachel Pizarro
John Upthegrove

City of Burien

BURIEN PLANNING COMMISSION
March 8, 2011
7:00 p.m.
Multipurpose Room/Council Chambers
MINUTES

To hear the Planning Commission's full discussion of a specific topic or the complete meeting, the following resources are available:

- Watch the video-stream available on the City website, www.burienwa.gov
- Check out a DVD of the Council Meeting from the Burien Library
- Order a DVD of the meeting from the City Clerk, (206) 241-4647

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Nancy Tosta called the March 8, 2011, meeting of the Burien Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Nancy Tosta, Greg Duff, Ray Helms, John Upthegrove

Absent: Jim Clingan, Rachel Pizarro

Administrative staff present: Scott Greenberg, Community Development Department director; David Johanson, senior planner

AGENDA CONFIRMATION

Direction/Action

Motion was made by Commissioner Upthegrove, seconded by Commissioner Helms, and passed unanimously to approve the agenda for the March 8, 2011, meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was noted that Commissioner Helms' absence was not noted in the minutes of the February 22, 2011, meeting, but has been corrected in the copy of the minutes for signature.

Direction/Action

Motion was made by Commissioner Duff, seconded by Commissioner Helms, and passed unanimously to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2011, meeting as corrected.

OLD BUSINESS

David Johanson, senior planner, gave a brief overview of the commission's work thus far in its review of the checklists provided to the commissioners at the February 8 meeting. The checklists are designed to help the commissioners identify what needs to be addressed in the scope of work for the 2011 Comprehensive Plan update process. Mr. Johanson and Scott Greenberg, Community Development director, responded to questions of clarification from the commissioners. Mr. Greenberg noted that anything that has been added to the checklists since the last time the commissioners saw them will be highlighted in yellow; anything the commissioners already have seen will not be highlighted.

Direction/Action

The commissioners and staff will think about ways to reformat the Comprehensive Plan to make it more readable and useable. Commissioners may e-mail staff with additions/ideas for the checklists in between meetings.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Greenberg reviewed the schedule for preparing the scope of work and submitting it to the City Council. May 10th is the date for the public meeting on scoping.

Direction/Action

The commissioners will be introduced to the functional plans – Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Storm Water, Transportation, etc. – at their next meeting.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS

Vice Chair Tosta said she will be unable to attend the April 26th meeting.

She also said she has been involved in the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program/National Marine Fisheries Service update of flood insurance, which requires local jurisdictions to adopt related ordinances by September 22nd, and asked if that topic will be brought to the Planning Commission before it goes to the City Council. Mr. Greenberg said he doesn't know at this time.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Direction/Action

MOTION to adjourn was made by Commissioner Duff and seconded by Commissioner Upthegrove. The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

Jim Clingan, chair
Planning Commission

**CITY OF BURIEN, WASHINGTON
MEMORANDUM**

DATE: March 16, 2011
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Scott Greenberg, AICP, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: 2011 Comprehensive Plan Update

There will be a new Commissioner and four presentations related to the 2011 Comprehensive Plan update at your March 22, 2011 meeting. The new Commissioner is Brooks Stanfield, who was appointed on March 14th by the City Council. The four presentations relate to the following topics:

- Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (see attached background information)
- Transportation Master Plan
- Drainage Master Plan
- Communities Putting Prevention to Work/Healthy Eating Active Living Grant (CPPW/HEAL)

Given the number of presentations, we are not planning to work with you on the detailed update scope of work at this meeting.

Visioning Community Meetings

We have set the dates and locations for three community forums. These free events will feature opportunities for the public to shape Burien's future through interactive visioning exhibits, facilitated community discussions, and individual scoring of priorities. Light refreshments will be available, as well as play activities for kids (unsupervised).

Please let me know if you'll be attending one or more of these meetings so we can provide proper notice if 4 or more Commissioners attend a meeting. Unfortunately, the Tuesday meeting is scheduled for the same night as a Planning Commission meeting. I've been told that this conflict was unavoidable.

Saturday, April 16

Seahurst Elementary
14603 - 14th Ave. S.W.
10 a.m. – Open House
11 a.m. – Program Begins

Tuesday, April 26

Hazel Valley Elementary
402 SW 132nd St.
5:30 p.m. – Open House
6:30 p.m. – Program Begins

Saturday, May 7

Southern Heights Elementary
11249 - 14th Ave. S.
10 a.m. – Open House
11 a.m. – Program Begins

**CITY OF BURIEN
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS**

I. PURPOSE OF REQUEST & PROJECT OVERVIEW.

The City of Burien (“City”) is requesting proposals for the purpose of assistance in the preparation of a Parks, Recreation and Open Space (“PROS”) Plan. The City’s needs are outlined in the following Request for Proposals (“RFP”).

The PROS Plan document will update information contained in past planning efforts approved by the City Council. The purpose of the current project is to produce a new PROS Plan that will provide guidance to the City in its management and development of park properties and recreation programs for the next six years. The document must also fulfill the planning eligibility requirements for park and recreation plans as set by the State of Washington Recreation & Conservation Office. The document must also fulfill Growth Management Act planning requirements for Comprehensive Plan Elements as outlined by the Washington State Department of Commerce (RCW 36.70A). A Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) will be developed based on existing conditions and proposed improvements for the various facilities and programs recommended. To prepare the plan, a public involvement process will be used to gather opinion of needs and requirements from community members and special advocate groups.

II. TIME SCHEDULE.

The City will adhere to the following timetable, which should result in a selection of a firm by March 23, 2011.

Issue RFP	February 18, 2011
Deadline for Submittal of Proposals	March 10, 2011
Interview Shortlisted Firms	March 16-18, 2011
Notify Firm Preferred	March 25, 2011

III. INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS.

A. All proposals should be sent, by mail or delivery, to:

Steve Roemer, Parks Development & Operations Manager
City of Burien
Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services (PaRCS) Department
14700 – 6th Avenue SW
Burien, WA 98166-1908

For questions about the project or the RFP, please contact Steve Roemer, Parks Development & Operations Manager, at 206.248.5513.

B. All proposals must be in a sealed envelope and clearly marked in the lower left-hand corner: “RFP - Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan.”

- C. All proposals must be received by March 10, 2011 at 3:00 pm. Three (3) copies of the RFP response must be presented. No faxed or telephone proposals will be accepted.
- D. Proposals should be prepared simply and economically, providing a straight forward, concise description of provider capabilities to satisfy the requirements of the request. Special bindings, colored displays, promotional materials, etc. are not desired. Emphasis should be on completeness and clarity of content. Proposals shall be not more than ten (10) double sided pages. Use of recycled paper for requests and any printed or photocopied material created pursuant to a contract with the City is desirable whenever practicable. Use of both sides of paper sheets for any submittals to the City is desirable whenever practicable.
- E. The PaRCS Director or a representative of the PaRCS Department will notify the firm selected by March 25, 2011.
- F. All proposals must include the following information:
- The names of individuals from those firms who will be working on the project and their areas of responsibility.
 - Specific experience of individuals relative to the proposed project, and office location. Describe experience in park planning.
 - A brief history of related work by the company, along with recent representative project samples.
 - A proposed outline of tasks, products and project schedule.
 - A proposed budget based on the above outline of tasks, products and schedules.
 - List of public sector references.
 - Your firm's approach to the project.

IV. SELECTION CRITERIA.

A maximum of three firms or applicants will be selected, or "shortlisted" to interview for the project. Selection will be based on an evaluation of the submitted proposals using the factors below.

1. Responsiveness of the written proposal to the scope of service.
2. Proposed budget, based on tasks and products.
3. Ability and history of successfully completing contracts of this type, meeting projected deadlines and experience in similar work.
4. Performance in the interview, including proposed approach.

V. SCOPE OF SERVICES.

Project Background

The City of Burien adopted its most recent PROS Plan in 2001. The purpose of the current project is to produce a new plan and provide guidance to the City in its

management and development of park properties and recreation programs for the next six years. Adoption of the updated plan is expected in the late fall of 2011.

Project Description

The new City of Burien PROS Plan will be based on the needs and values of the citizens of Burien. The planning process will include public involvement in a variety of ways, and educating and surveying the community about the future of our park, recreation and community services system. The plan will be a working document that guides both day-to-day and long-range decision-making.

The total budget available for all planning efforts for the PROS Plan is \$70,000. This includes any public opinion survey work. Because of the limited budget and short time frame the City assumes some coordinated work effort by City staff will be necessary. Therefore, the proposal should indicate an approach that identifies work to be done by the firm(s), and efforts expected from the City.

Plan Elements

The new PROS Plan should include the following elements:

- **Public Process and Long-term Vision**

A survey of residents and use other public input methods to establish core values and develop goals and objectives for the City of Burien PROS Plan.

- **Trends**

Analysis of demographic characteristics of City residents, as well as recreation and social trends to determine potential facility and program requirements.

- **Park Inventory**

Park Inventory data and condition assessment of existing park and open space properties owned by the City of Burien, and other agencies and organizations that provide recreational facilities, such as the Burien Public Schools, Boys and Girls Club, and the YMCA.

- **Level of Service Standards**

Level of service standards for park and recreation facilities, services and programs.

- **Recreation and Community Services Program Strategy**

A recreation and community services program and service delivery strategy that includes the types of programs and services that the City will provide to the community, and where and when these programs should be offered.

- **Parks Strategy**

A park and facility strategy that includes the types and general locations of parks and major facilities to serve the community's parks and recreational needs over the next 6 to 20 years.

- **Open Space Strategy**

An open space management strategy that includes care of existing properties to provide natural habitat, protect fish and wildlife resources and to provide an

interconnected system of open spaces. The Plan should also identify the need for future open spaces.

- **Trail Strategy**

A trail enhancement and management strategy that includes identification of existing trails, a plan for property acquisition for future trail construction, and development of trail maintenance standards. The plan should also consider the rapid residential development in Burien and how this impacts the trail development strategy.

- **Action Plan**

An action plan to achieve the goals and level of service standards established as part of the planning process. The action plan should include a list of capital projects and facility maintenance needs and estimated costs.

- **Coordinate with Other Plans**

The Plan must be coordinated with the City of Burien Comprehensive Plan, Transportation Plan, Bike-Ped Plan, and the Vision Burien community visioning process.

- **Performance Measures**

Performance measures and procedures that will enable ongoing monitoring, measurement, and review of the Plan implementation and performance.

VI. TASKS

Task 100: Administration

Provide the necessary project administration services to ensure contract compliance, recording, documentation, communication, maintenance of schedules, and provision of deliverables. Provide project invoicing and progress reports prepared in accordance with formats and schedules established by the City.

Task 200: Research/Data Collection

This task will confirm existing information found in the 2001 PROS Plan and 2006 PROS Plan Update, and gather new information through interviews with City staff and user groups. This will be completed early in the planning process so the information is available to use in the analysis and plan development tasks. Documents that will be reviewed include, but are not limited to, the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, Recreation Facilities Plan, Community Vision Plan, Annexation Analysis and existing park master plans. Specific tasks will include:

- ❑ Confirm goals and objectives from past planning efforts
- ❑ Confirm and update inventory of public and private parks, open space and recreation-related facilities in the community. Identify individual recreation elements in the parks and compare with input from community survey requests and needs.
- ❑ Review and summarize the projects that have been completed since prior PROS Plans.
- ❑ Confirm and update as necessary the Level of Service (LOS) Standards used in the 2001 and 2006 PROS Plans. Compare these standards with those used by other communities in Western Washington.

- ❑ Review service area boundaries to consider arterial, highway, and topographic and other barriers to assess facility access by neighborhoods residents.
- ❑ Identify sources of past acquisition and development funding for parks and recreation projects. List any new funding sources available to the City.
- ❑ Confirm and if necessary recalculate Impact Fee Calculations used in the 2001 PROS Plan.
- ❑ Review and describe maintenance activities and practices currently used by the City.
- ❑ Confirm City demographic information and projections.
- ❑ Compare City’s Comprehensive Plan with the prior PROS Plans as they address park, recreation, open space and trails issues.

Task 300: Public Involvement

This task covers a formal meetings and workshops and informal interviews to gather information, comments and concerns regarding parks and recreational facilities and programs. The emphasis is to identify priorities for the spending of limited funds to acquire, develop, operate and maintain recreational resources. It is preferable to hold the public meetings a week or so prior to scheduled Parks Board meetings so the input from the public meeting is available for discussion and consideration. We would expect that from these meetings and interviews, a statement on need and priority for acquisition and development can be prepared for inclusion in the final plan document.

In addition to public meetings, interviews will be conducted with special interest user groups to gain insight and information on their issues, concerns and ideas. An emphasis will be placed on seeking information on the groups’ ability to partner with the City to assist in the development, maintenance and operation of facilities that they use. Consultant will seek opportunities through established channels to get information out to the public about the park and recreation planning effort.

Task 400: Needs Assessment Survey

Consultant will administer a statistically valid random sampling Needs Assessment Survey of at least 450 households in the City of Burien for use by Burien Parks Department in forming consensus in the PROS Plan. The survey can be administered by mail/phone, by phone or via Internet-based survey methodologies.

Task 500: Site Plans, Project Identification and Cost Estimates

This task builds on the inventory effort in Task 200 and prepares updated sketch plans for selected park facilities in the city, identifies desired improvements and estimates their costs. The Plan will determine when these improvements would be available for the public use. These project descriptions, costs and schedules for completion will be used in the development of the Capital Improvement Plan.

Consultant will work with City staff to update and prioritize the above list to determine the level of effort necessary to complete this task to meet the needs of the City. Included in the document will be a discussion of the impacts on the Burien Park System of possible annexation proposal(s) as they affect workload, maintenance and service to the community. The maintenance levels and costs for public parks and facilities as currently provided by the City will be reviewed and summarized. This

maintenance level will be assessed as to comparable communities in the area based on level of service and costs. The plan will include a park acquisition strategy for the City. The strategy will address property assessment, funding, and long-term use and value.

Task 600: Capital Improvement Plan/Program

Task 500 utilizes all of the information developed in the previous tasks to prepare a plan to address the demand and need for facilities and programs from 2013 through 2019. Based on the demand and needs analysis, the CIP will be prepared in table form to identify the acquisition/project, the year the action will take place, planned cost of the action and the funding source(s) expected to finance the action. City staff and Parks Board will review the Draft CIP prior to submittal and approval by the City Council.

Task 700: Recreation Plan

Working with recreation staff, Consultant will review and document existing recreation programs offered by the City of Burien and survey neighboring community recreation providers determine their offerings and to note duplication of programs. Consultant will conduct a focused meeting with Park staff on new programs, assessment of existing programs, facilities and staffing. This will provide free discussion of opportunities, directions and “new thinking” in providing programs to meet the needs of the community. From this discussion, questions will be crafted to be included in the telephone survey and possibly for presentation during public workshops. Based on the findings of the public workshops, public survey and focus meeting, program recommendations, policies and an action plan will be prepared.

Task 800: Draft and Final Draft Documents

Consultant will develop draft document for review and consideration by City staff and the Parks Department. Comments will be addressed and adjustments made prior to the presentation of the document to the City Planning Commission by the Consultant. Consultant will address any Planning Commission issues in a Final Draft Plan Document for recommendation by the City Planning Commission to the City Council. Presentation of the Draft PROS Plan document will be made to the City Council by the Consultant. Consultant will address any Council issues in a Final Plan Document for adoption by the City Council.

Overall results for the entire survey of 450 households will have a 95% level of confidence with a margin of error of no more than 5% overall. Consultant will guarantee the completion of at least 450 surveys for the entire City of Burien.

Consultant will specialize in conducting survey research that assists clients in prioritizing the unmet need for outdoor and indoor parks and recreation facilities, developing level of performance standards, voter referendums, and other strategic issues to assist decision makers in making better decisions.

Questions on the survey will be developed in partnership with the City of Burien. The survey instrument will be administered at a timeline within the project where the information can best be used to help break down barriers and build consensus.

In addition to survey development, Consultant will provide survey administration, data processing and analysis, sub-analysis/banner cross-tabular analysis, draft and final reports.

VII. COMPENSATION.

- A. Please present detailed information on the firm's proposed fee schedule for the proposed work.
- B. Payment by the City for the services will only be made after the services have been performed, an itemized billing statement is submitted in the form specified by the City and approved by the appropriate City representative, which shall specifically set forth the services performed, the name of the person performing such services, and the hourly labor charge rate for such person. Payment shall be made on a monthly basis, thirty (30) days after receipt of such billing statement.

VIII. PUBLICATION.

This RFP is not being published. It is being sent to selected firms on the City's Small Works Contractors and Consultants Roster that provide planning services.

Manual 2

Planning Policies and Guidelines

January 2011

Section 2

Developing Your Plan

In this section, you'll learn about

- ✓ Who must plan
- ✓ Recommendations for your planning process

Who Must Plan

This manual is intended as guidance for organizations wishing to become eligible for grants from the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB).

In four RCFB grant programs, organizations must establish eligibility by producing a comprehensive plan before they may apply for grants. The plan must be adopted and meet the requirements and guidelines explained in this manual.

This planning requirement has been in place since the RCFB was established in 1964. The requirement exists for several reasons, not the least of which is to demonstrate that the public supports your program and your grant proposals.

Applicants to the grant programs listed below must complete a plan. Those not sure in which grant category their proposal best fits should consult RCO staff.

- Boating Facilities Program (BFP)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund LWCF)
- Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA)
 - Nonhighway Roads category

- Nonmotorized category
- Off-Road Vehicles category
- Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)
 - Habitat Conservation Account – Critical Habitat, Natural Areas, Riparian Protection, State Lands Restoration and Enhancement, and Urban Wildlife Habitat categories
 - Outdoor Recreation Account – Local Parks, State Lands Development and Renovation, State Parks, Trails, and Water Access categories

RCO strongly recommends that organizations interested in any grant program develop a plan whether or not the program requires a plan. In addition to the benefits outlined above, grant evaluators often ask for information that typically is found in a plan.

Partnership Options

Apart from an organization developing its own plan, there are ways that it may use another (partner) agency's plan to save resources and attain eligibility. Agencies that may do this include those:

- Whose jurisdiction overlaps with another's -or-
- Who wish to combine planning programs into a single cooperative document.

Shared Jurisdiction Plan

School, port, and utility districts often are willing to accept the adopted park and recreation or habitat conservation plans of other agencies, such as a parks department when working collaboratively with another jurisdiction. This option recognizes that a park department's facilities can complement the programs of agencies like the special districts mentioned above. This is especially true when recreational or resource opportunities are provided as a secondary activity to the district's primary mission.

This option may be used only if each of the following four items can be demonstrated to RCO:

- The area where the district wishes to seek an RCFB grant is within the planning or service area of a partner agency whose plan has been accepted by RCO.
- The district formally has adopted all plan elements required by RCFB – the elements may be taken directly from the partner agency’s plan as long as appropriate modifications are made. For example, a school district’s recreational goals and objectives may not be exactly the same as a park department’s goals.
- The partner agency has confirmed in writing that the district’s plan is compatible with the partner agency’s actions.
- The plan is no more than 6 years old.

Cooperative Plan

Regional planning commissions and councils of governments often select this option. It recognizes that a single plan may be the most efficient way to provide public facilities. There is no limit to the number of agencies that may be included in a cooperative plan. RCFB recommends that when more than two agencies are involved, that one agency coordinates the planning activities.

This option may be used only if each of the following items can be demonstrated to RCO:

- The completed plan includes all elements required by RCFB (Section 3).
- The completed plan has been adopted by each participating agency.

Nonprofit nature conservancy corporations or associations seeking to become eligible¹ for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program’s riparian category have the option to certify that the corporation or association has published a plan or document that has been accepted or incorporated into a plan or program managed by a public agency for public purposes. For example, an “ecoregional assessment” accepted

¹ Complete nonprofit nature conservancy corporation or association eligibility requirements are explained in RCFB “Manual 10b Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Habitat Conservation Account and Riparian Protection Account.”

or incorporated by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife or other public agency would meet this requirement.

Recommendations for Your Planning Process

RCO recommends, but does not require, determination of a level of service for park and recreation planning, including trails. An analysis with the level of service tool will indicate strengths and weaknesses of your parks and trails system, suggesting where you may need additional resources.

The level of service tool works best for those considering grants from these grant programs:

- Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA)
- Boating Facilities Program (BFP)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund LWCF)
- Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)
- Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF)

The level of service tool uses indicators in three categories, each with measurable elements. There are two level of service (LOS) tools: one for local agencies and one for state agencies. Both are explained in the appendix.

Once the categories and elements have been assessed and scored, it is your choice whether to average the scores or to keep each separate. Consider how you will use the level of service scores when deciding.

For example:

- If you are applying for a grant to build a new ball field, you may wish to present results of the quantity criteria that support your request.
- If you are building a budget request for additional maintenance resources, you may wish to use results from the quality criteria. Providing new trails can be justified with the access criteria.

- If you are developing a report to citizens, you may wish to publish results of each of the criteria, and suggest an overall average.

Estimating Future Need

Using the level of service “Quantity Criteria” can help estimate future need. If you choose to use per capita data goals and have determined current per capita levels, the gap is one estimate of future need.

In addition, you can make estimates of the growth of current activities. Participation in various outdoor activities will be affected by changes in population, available sites and infrastructure, lifestyles, economics, technology, and the politics of land use. With an understanding of these characteristics, you can use available data to make a best estimate of change in recreation patterns in your community.

Completely new activities are nearly impossible to predict: For example, the emergence of the personal watercraft and the mountain bike in the 1980s and 1990s were not accounted for under traditional projection methods.

A simplistic way to estimate future need is to use population estimates from the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). Recreation participation tends to change slowly, with participation levels often directly tied to overall population growth.

Planners can simply decide that participation in current activities will grow at the same rate as the population. However, we suggest that this approach needs to be tempered by consideration of more than simple population growth. Consider the following:

- **Participation by age group** is a key consideration in estimating future participation. Varying physical demands of different activities will encourage or discourage continued participation as people age. Vigorous field sports such as soccer or rugby, for example, tend to be the domain of younger people; walking or bird watching, on the other hand, will appeal to older adults who seek to enjoy outdoor recreation in relative comfort.

According to the Office of Financial Management, all age groups will experience considerable growth through 2020. The most growth will be in the older age groups, 50 and older.

- **User group organization and representation** makes up the political landscape in which your planning is done. However, as tempting as it is to plan for “those who show up,” it is important to consider that some activities appear not to lend themselves to “user group” organization. Sidewalk users, perhaps those walking or walking with pets, have not formed known significant organizations apart from socially oriented *Volksmarching* groups or perhaps neighborhood associations that deal with a variety of issues.
- **Land use and land designations** have profound impacts on recreation. As urban density grows, it is often accompanied by fewer backyards and open lots. Therefore, more density will suggest the need for more parks and open spaces.
- **Economic conditions** strongly influence recreation patterns. Boat sales, for example, are known to follow the national economy. Activities such as walking that do not require “big ticket” consumer items, on the other hand, may not respond to economic changes because the activity simply does not cost much money.

National projections of recreation change are available from the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE)². The national survey has earned a solid reputation as a principal data resource for recreation planning. A key feature of the survey is its projections of future participation in outdoor recreation. Projections are for nationwide participation, as well as for regions.

² The Interagency National Survey Consortium, Coordinated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Recreation, Wilderness, and Demographics Trends Research Group, Athens, GA, and the Human Dimensions Research Laboratory, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.

Section 3

Required Elements

In this section, you'll learn about:

- ✓ Plan requirements
- ✓ How long your plan will be good for
- ✓ The Growth Management Act and your plan
- ✓ RCO review of your plan

Required Elements

RCO has no requirements in terms of number of pages, number of chapters, or format. Whether an organization needs a modest or more robust plan is dependent on the needs of that organization. A successful plan is one that accurately reflects the characteristics of the organization for which it has been prepared.

Required Elements

Regardless, RCO looks for a minimum of six elements in a plan, whether the plan supports a grant application for a capital project (facility development and land acquisition) or a non-capital project (architectural, engineering, planning, etc.). The elements are detailed below.

1. Goals and objectives
2. Inventory
3. Public Involvement
4. Demand and Need Analysis

5. Capital improvement program
6. Plan adoption

Goals and Objectives

The plan must support the applicant's habitat conservation or park and recreation mission, including the current project, with broad statements of intent, or goals. Goals describe desired outcomes. An example is to "make athletic fields more accessible" or to "provide mule deer habitat."

Objectives, on the other hand, are both measurable and more specific. Include objectives to help describe when a goal has been attained. An example of an objective is to "create six athletic fields in East County" or "acquire 300 acres of mule deer habitat near the North Creek Planning Unit."

Goals and objectives should be realistic, supported by resources you can reasonably expect to have available, and reflect the needs in your community or service area, or for habitat projects the needs of species of interest. These needs will be discovered through your experience, inventory assessment, and public involvement.

Examples

- You may have found that your ball fields are filling up early in the season and that the waiting list has been the same for years. Your experience is evidence of need, which can be confirmed by consulting with the public. You may decide that the goal is to eliminate or significantly reduce the waiting list. The objective could be to add lights to extend use, to add a field, or to purchase and develop additional property
- Your inventory may indicate that there are several facilities that are obsolete or have reached their useful service life. Or you may find that facilities are underused because of their location or changing demographics. A resulting goal could be a major renovation or relocation of facilities.

The public is always interested in helping to set goals and objectives. Public involvement is indispensable, not only to hear what people have to say, but also to give you the opportunity to share your organization's needs.

Inventory

Depending on the project to be submitted, an “inventory” or “planning area description,” refers to:

- A description of the planning or service area, including the physical setting and conditions, and relevant demographic, program, and resource information.
- A list of proposed capital projects (land acquisitions, developments, renovations and restorations), or
- A report on the supply and condition of existing recreational facilities or opportunities, habitat conservation species, or relevant land types
- A report on the projected annual maintenance and operational costs for each existing recreational or habitat conservation site in the inventory.

The purpose of an inventory is to provide the context for proposed improvement, renovation, or new projects. RCO requires no specific format for the inventory.

The inventory may include a comprehensive account of the area’s facilities, lands, programs, and condition. It also may include local, state, federal, and private facilities and extend beyond the applicant’s jurisdiction. The inventory may be completed in a quantitative or a qualitative (narrative) format.

Assessing the **condition** of your inventory is important. Sites and facility condition will reveal weaknesses in your maintenance and operation, help identify facilities that may need renovation or replacement, and provide indicators of use levels. If you manage habitat or natural areas, you will want to assess the health of the natural systems, the extent of invasive species, adjacent land uses, and other issues. Habitat conservation elements may assess habitat types, certain species, threats, ownerships, and historical gains or losses.

Another key consideration is the **capacity** of your current inventory. Are ball fields under used, or are teams turned away every season? Do park reservation sites fill up at the start of the year? Are trail head parking lots full, causing people to park on adjacent streets? If a habitat or conservation plan, is there sufficient habitat to support desired species or functions?

Maps

RCO strongly encourages use of maps, especially with Geographic Information Systems (GIS). Mapping and GIS should be combined with the service area concept, in particular to determine whether recreation sites and facilities are found where people need them most. Research has found that the closer the opportunity, the more likely it is that people will use it.

Public Involvement

Include a description of how the planning process gave the public ample opportunity to be involved in plan development and adoption. Try and select methods that support the planning strategy. Even the best efforts sometimes do not provide sufficient information, data, or results. For example there may be a limited response to a survey or a poor turnout at a meeting. What works for one community may not work for another – be flexible. Some examples include:

- Internet surveys
- A citizen’s task force or advisory committee
- Workshops
- Surveys or interviews (formal or informal)
- Community TV
- “Listening posts” and demonstrations
- Public meetings
- Round table discussions or focus groups.

Selecting only one public involvement method may create unanticipated problems. For example, if using only public meetings, your plan can be unduly influenced by those who have the time to attend. There usually are many other people with different perspectives and interests unable to attend meetings for a variety of good reasons.

The public involvement process should be thorough and suitable to local conditions and the service area. However, you are strongly encouraged to gather as much objective data as possible.

Surveys are important. A survey can reveal opinions on need, willingness to pay, participation in recreation activities, interest in habitat protection, and so on. If you do not have the money to pay for a survey, you may find that secondary data sources can help fill in the gaps. RCO, for example, keeps recreation participation data useful to a regional level. The Washington Office of Financial Management has excellent population data, and also publishes an annual Washington state survey that includes recreation and other data.

Whatever the process, you should consider current public satisfaction with currently available sites and facilities, as well as public demand for additional sites and facilities. Allowing sufficient time for the public to respond is important.

Good documentation of public involvement and support is important. You'll need the documentation to defend your plan and the decisions you make because of the plan. Also, this documentation is one element used by RCO for evaluating grant projects.

Demand and Need Analysis

The analysis takes your inventory work and public involvement into consideration, balancing public demand with your organization's capacity. The analysis may indicate that the current inventory is sufficient if certain improvements are made. On the other hand, you may find that the public is demanding a significant expansion of sites and facilities. These demands may not be possible to meet with the resources you have now: your plan should include a way to make sure you get the resources you need.

Discuss both the community's and organization's priorities. Explain how the decision to acquire land, develop-preserve-enhance-restore-or manage was made. For example, what options were considered, which were rejected, and what are their advantages and disadvantages. Ultimately, the questions to be answered are "specifically, what does the community want" and "how do we know this to be true."

RCO recommends that "need" is best determined by assessing multiple criteria or metrics.

- For recreation projects, the criteria could include current levels of participation, anticipated change based on trends, capacity of your current inventory, distance between residential areas and existing opportunities in the planning service area, public satisfaction, manager needs, current maintenance levels, and access issues.
- For habitat projects, the criteria could include number and extent of species present, known threats, condition of available habitat, opportunities for habitat restoration or improvement, public support, management needs, stewardship levels, and the potential for compatible public access.

Capital Improvement Program

Include a capital improvement or capital facility program of at least six years that lists land acquisition, development, renovation, and restoration projects. The capital improvement program should include the list of projects in ranked order of preference, indicate the year of anticipated implementation, and include the plan for financing the projects. Include any capital project submitted to RCFB for funding. RCO considers all capital improvement and capital facility program costs as estimates.

Plan Adoption

Include a resolution, ordinance, or other adoption instrument showing formal approval of the plan and planning process by the governing entity. The level of governing entity approval must be equivalent to the plan's scope. Thus, a city or countywide plan must be approved at the council or commission level. Department heads, district rangers, regional managers or supervisors, etc., as determined by the applicant in coordination with RCO, will approve other plans.

Format Options

Because there are a wide variety of agency needs and approaches to planning, RCFB is flexible about the format and types of plans that may be submitted to meet eligibility requirements. Contact RCO staff if you have questions about your submission and meeting the planning requirement.

Here are two examples of acceptable formats:

- Adopt RCFB required elements into a larger plan, such as a regional, all-agency comprehensive, or Growth Management Act plan.
- Adopt RCFB required elements into individual plans for each program in which the grant applicant wishes to compete.
- Adopt RCFB required elements into individual plans for different types of recreation, such as a boating or trails plan.

Plan Eligibility

Standard Eligibility

Once the planning requirements are met, RCO grants eligibility for up to six calendar years from the date of plan adoption. This means, in some cases, less than six years of eligibility may be granted if, for example, the agency plans for a six year period yet does not adopt the plan quickly.

Extended Eligibility

RCFB provides the option of extended eligibility to cities or counties that combine park and recreation and/or habitat conservation planning into the planning required under the Growth Management Act. This allows cities or counties to compete for an RCFB grant even though they only have a draft plan.

To qualify, the agency must submit a written request for extended eligibility when submitting a grant application to RCO. In such cases, the date of RCFB eligibility and the date a county, city, or town is required to adopt its comprehensive plan under chapter 36.70A Revised Code of Washington is the same. The agency must submit all materials to fulfill RCFB's planning requirements by this deadline.

This extended eligibility provision expires on the date established under chapter 36.70A Revised Code of Washington.

The Growth Management Act and RCFB Plans

The Growth Management Act (GMA) encourages recreation and habitat conservation planning in several ways, including –

- A GMA goal designed to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans is to – “Encourage the retention of open space and development of recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks.”³
- “Each county shall adopt development regulations that protect critical areas.”⁴
- “Each comprehensive plan shall include... a land use element designating the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of land, where appropriate, for... recreation, open spaces....”⁵
- “Comprehensive plans may include... other subjects relating to the physical development within its jurisdiction, including... recreation.”⁶
- “Each county and city that is required or chooses to prepare a comprehensive land use plan under RCW [36.70A.040](#) shall identify open space corridors within and between urban growth areas. They shall include lands useful for recreation, wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas as defined in RCW [36.70A.030](#).”⁷
- “Whenever a state agency is considering awarding grants... to finance public facilities, it shall consider whether the... requesting [agency] is a party to a county-wide planning policy under RCW 36.70A.210... and shall accord additional preference to the [agency] if such policy exists.”⁸

³ Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.020(9)

⁴ Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.060(2)

⁵ Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(1)

⁶ Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.080(1)(c)

⁷ Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.160

⁸ Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250

Many of RCFB's planning requirements parallel those in the Growth Management Act, including a capital facility element with inventory, forecast of future needs, and the multi-year financing plan. It is important that agencies working to meet RCFB's planning requirements consult with the growth management planners in their jurisdiction. Not only is it likely that both planning groups will discover areas of mutual interest and concern, but they also will be able to discuss coordinating survey efforts, data sharing, and other efficiencies. Note, however, that the deadlines for the Growth Management Act and RCFB planning requirements may differ.

Recently Added Growth Management Act Guidance

The Washington State Department of Commerce recently updated its Washington Administrative Codes that guide Growth Management Act planning. The "parks and recreation element" is available on the Internet at <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/wac/default.aspx?cite=365-196-440>.

RCO Review

The applicant must submit a relevant plan to RCO for review. If RCO does not approve the plan, it will be returned, along with the reason the plan was rejected. Applicants may make any necessary corrections and re-submit the plan to RCO. If RCO approves the plan, the applicant is eligible to participate in identified grant programs for up to six years from the date of adoption by the applicant's governing entity. After that period, the applicant must submit a new or revised plan to retain eligibility.

Submitting Draft Plans

If you are currently planning, you are welcome to consult with RCO staff at any time. You may submit an outline, draft, or other material for RCO staff review. A draft or preliminary review helps determine any need for additional technical assistance and can be more efficient for applicants working under a compressed time line.

For this review to result in an accepted plan, RCO encourages agencies seeking eligibility to submit their plans in draft form as early in the year as possible or in the year before submitting an application. This allows staff time to advise applicants of anything that may need correction before the planning deadline.

Appendix B

Self-Certification Form

Self-Certification Form

The form is a reproducible master. On the first three lines, enter the name and adoption date of the plans and other documents submitted in fulfillment of RCFB's planning requirement. If more space is needed, use the reverse.

Check or initial each plan element that will be provided to RCO with this form. In the right column, enter information that will enable RCO staff to locate quickly each item initialed.

Certify the accuracy of the information on the form by completing the signature line and submit all material to RCO according to the submission requirements for final plans.

Planning Process Self Certification Form (Form #222)		
Use this form to certify that the need for your projects have been determined through an appropriate planning process. Provide the completed form with the subject plans (on CD-ROM) and adoption documentation to RCO.		
Name and adoption date of documents submitted in fulfillment of this requirement:		
▶		
▶		
▶		
Check or Initial Each to Certify Completion	Plan Element Certification	Document and Page Number Location of Information
	1. Goals, objectives: The attached plan supports our project with broad statements of intent (goals) <i>and</i> measures that describe when these intents will be attained (objectives). Goals may include a higher level of service.	
	2. Inventory: The plan includes a description of the service area's facilities, lands, programs, and their condition. <i>(This may be done in a quantitative format, or in a qualitative/narrative format.)</i>	
	3. Public involvement: The planning process gave the public ample opportunity to be involved in plan development and adoption.	
	4a. Demand and need analysis: In the plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An analysis defines priorities, as appropriate, for acquisition, development, preservation, enhancement, management, etc., and explains why these actions are needed. • The process used in developing the analysis assessed community desires for parks, recreation, open space, and/or habitat, as appropriate, in a manner appropriate for the service area (personal observation, informal talks, formal survey(s), workshops, etc.). 	
	4b. Level of Service assessment (optional): An assessment of the criterion appropriate to your community. Possibly establish a higher level of service as a plan goal (above).	
	5. Capital Improvement Program: The plans includes a capital improvement/facility program that lists land acquisition, development, and renovation projects by year of anticipated implementation; include funding source. The program includes any capital project submitted to RCFB for funding.	
	6. Adoption: The plans and process has received formal governing body approval <i>(that is, city/county department head, district ranger, regional manager/ supervisor, etc., as appropriate)</i> . Attach resolution, letter, or other adoption instrument.	

Appendix C

Level of Service Tool and Guide

Level of Service for Local Agencies

The level of service tool works best for local communities considering grants from these grant programs:

- Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA)
- Boating Facilities Program (BFP)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund LWCF)
- Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)
- Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF)

Level of Service Summary					
Local Agencies					
Indicators and Criteria For Local Agencies	A	B	C	D	E
Quantity Criteria					
Number of Parks and Recreation Facilities Percent difference between existing quantity or per capita average of parks and recreation facilities and the desired quantity or per capita average	<10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	>41%
Facilities that Support Active Recreation Opportunities Percent of facilities that support or encourage active (muscle-powered) recreation opportunities	>60%	51-60%	41-50%	31-40%	<30%
Facility Capacity Percent of demand met by existing facilities	>75%	61-75%	46-60%	30-45%	<30%
Quality Criteria					
Agency-Based Assessment Percentage of facilities that are fully functional for their specific design and safety guidelines	>80%	61-80%	41-60%	20-40%	<20%
Public Satisfaction Percentage of population satisfied with the condition, quantity, or distribution of existing active park and recreation facilities	>65%	51-65%	36-50%	25-35%	<25%
Distribution and Access Criteria					
Population within Service Areas Percentage of population within the following services areas (considering barriers to access): 0.5 mile of a neighborhood park/trail 5 miles of a community park/trail 25 miles of a regional park/trail	>75%	61-75%	46-60%	30-45%	<30%
Access Percentage of parks and recreation facilities that may be accessed safely via foot, bicycle, or public transportation	>80%	61-80%	41-60%	20-40%	<20%

Quantity Criteria

Indicators and Criteria For Local Agencies	A	B	C	D	E
Quantity Criteria					
Number of Parks and Recreation Facilities Percent difference between existing quantity or per capita average of parks and recreation facilities and the desired quantity or per capita average.	<10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	>41%
Facilities that Support Active Recreation Opportunities Percent of facilities that support or encourage active (muscle-powered) recreation opportunities	>60%	51-60%	41-50%	31-40%	<30%
Facility Capacity Percent of demand met by existing facilities	>75%	61-75%	46-60%	30-45%	<30%

Number of Parks and Recreation Facilities

This indicator measures the quantity of existing park and recreation facilities in a community. It is intended as a classic comparison of population to available facilities: it measures the difference between the existing per capita average of park and recreation facilities and the desired per capita average with respect to the desired quantity of facilities. It is based on goals found in local community plans, as well as national guidelines such as those published several years ago by the National Recreation and Park Association.

Whether to include school facilities is a community choice.

Example: your community may have a planned goal of 5 acres of park for each 1,000 people. Your current inventory is 3 acres for each 1,000 people. The difference is 2 acres per thousand, or 40 percent. The result is a "D" on the level of service.

Facilities that Support Active Recreation Opportunities

This indicator measures the percent of facilities that support or encourage active recreation opportunities. "Active recreation" is defined as predominantly muscle-powered: walking, jogging, paddling, cycling, field and court sports, and so on. The indicator provides a more direct measure of a park and recreation system's ability to

encourage participation in activities through the types of facilities (and potentially programs) it offers.

Whether to include school facilities is a community choice.

Example: Your community has 40 park and recreation sites, 30 of which support active recreation, such as walking, field sports, court sports, and so on. The other 10 sites support “passive” recreation. The active sites are 75 percent of the total inventory. The result is an “A” on the level of service.

Facility Capacity

This indicator measures the existing capacity of a community’s park and recreation facilities.

Whether to include school facilities is a community choice.

Example: You decide what your capacity may be, either the system as a whole, or specific site or facility types. You determine, whether by survey or estimate, the actual use and compare it to the capacity. Your ball fields have capacity for 100 regular season adult games, and you are being asked to schedule 125. You are meeting 80 percent of demand with your current capacity. The result is an “A” on the level of service.

Quality Criteria

Indicators and Criteria For Local Agencies	A	B	C	D	E
Quality Criteria					
Agency-Based Assessment Percentage of facilities that are fully functional for their specific design and safety guidelines	>80%	61-80%	41-60%	20-40%	<20%
Public Satisfaction Percentage of population satisfied with the condition, quantity, or distribution of existing active park and recreation facilities	>65%	51-65%	36-50%	25-35%	<25%

Agency-Based Assessment

This indicator measures the current status or condition of existing park and recreation facilities, as determined by park and recreation staff. You assess the percentage of sites and facilities that are fully functional for the specific design and safety guidelines you have assigned to them.

Example: You assess your park and recreation inventory of 50 sites. You find that five are substandard; the rest, 90 percent, are fully functional according to your own standards. The result is an "A" on the level of service.

Public Satisfaction

This indicator measures the public's satisfaction with the condition, quantity, or distribution of existing park and recreation facilities in their community.

Example: You survey your community and find that 55 percent are satisfied or highly satisfied with your parks and recreation sites and facilities. The result is a "B" on the level of service.

Distribution and Access Criteria

Indicators and Criteria For Local Agencies	A	B	C	D	E
Distribution and Access Criteria					
Population within Service Areas Percentage of population within the following services areas (considering barriers to access): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.5 mile of a neighborhood park/trail • 5 miles of a community park/trail • 25 miles of a regional park/trail 	>75%	61-75%	46-60%	30-45%	<30%
Access Percentage of parks and recreation facilities that may be accessed safely via foot, bicycle, or public transportation	>80%	61-80%	41-60%	20-40%	<20%

Population within Service Areas

This indicator measures the distribution of and population served by existing park and recreation facilities in a community. This indicator requires the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) and should incorporate access points, barriers to access, and census block data into the analysis.

Whether to include school facilities is a local choice.

Example: You map your community and compare service areas to population. You find that 55 percent of your population is within ½ mile of a local park. The result is a “C” on the level of service.

Access

This indicator measures the ability of people to access park and recreation facilities without a personal motorized vehicle. The measure is an estimate of pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation access to park and recreation facilities. It may be investigated with the help of GIS.

Example: You have 100 park and recreation sites and 25 are in neighborhoods and can gotten to by using sidewalks. An additional 10 are on bus stops. You think all parks can be reached with a bicycle, but staff reports few bicycles in the bike racks, and there is no demand for additional bike racks. You conclude that 35 sites are accessible without a car. That is 35 percent of the total inventory. The result is a “D” on the level of service.

Level of Service for State Agencies

The state agency level of service tool may be useful for federal as well as state agency applicants in the Boating Facilities Program, Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities program, and the Recreational Trails Program, especially the criteria concerning resource protection.

Like the local agency level of service, it is based on three categories. However, the elements of the criteria have been modified to recognize the difference in what state agencies provide as compared to local agencies. The state agency level of service is summarized in the table below.

Level of Service Summary State and Federal Agencies					
Indicators and Criteria for State and Federal Agencies	A	B	C	D	E
Quantity Criteria					
Capital Facility Development Biennial average percentage of unmet capital facility development (redevelopment, renovation, and/or restoration) goals	<30%	30-40%	41-50%	51-60%	>60%
Quality Criteria					
Agency-Based Assessment Percentage of facilities that are fully functional per their specific design and safety guidelines	>80%	61-80%	41-60%	20-40%	<20%
Public Satisfaction Percentage of visitor population satisfied with existing park and outdoor recreation facilities/experiences/opportunities	>65%	51-65%	36-50%	25-35%	<25%
Access Criteria					
Sustainable Access Percentage of access/recreation areas/facilities that provide sustainable recreation opportunities (e.g., help protect natural and cultural resources, use green infrastructure to strengthen natural processes, minimize encroachment and/or user-developed facilities, prohibit poaching, etc.)	>65%	56-65%	46-55%	36-45%	<35%

Quantity Criteria

Indicators and Criteria for State and Federal Agencies	A	B	C	D	E
Quantity Criteria					
Capital Facility Development Biennial average percentage of unmet capital facility development (redevelopment, renovation, and/or restoration) goals	<30%	30-40%	41-50%	51-60%	>60%

Capital Facility Development

This indicator measures the biennial average percent of unmet capital facility development goals for a state agency. Capital facility development goals generally are defined as any redevelopment, renovation, or restoration projects.

Example: Your agency capital plan may call for investment of \$70 million in a biennium but only \$30 million is available. The 50 percent difference would result in a “C” on the level of service.

Example: You may have scheduled 50 projects for completion but were able to complete only 10; 80 percent of your projects were not completed. This would result in an “E” on the level of service.

Quality Criteria

Indicators and Criteria for State and Federal Agencies	A	B	C	D	E
Quality Criteria					
Agency-Based Assessment Percentage of facilities that are fully functional per their specific design and safety guidelines	>80%	61-80%	41-60%	20-40%	<20%
Public Satisfaction Percentage of visitor population satisfied with existing park and outdoor recreation facilities/experiences/opportunities	>65%	51-65%	36-50%	25-35%	<25%

Agency-Based Assessment

This indicator measures the current status or condition of existing park and recreation facilities, as determined by park and recreation staff.

Example: You assess your access and recreation site inventory of 50 units. You find that five are substandard; the rest, 90 percent, are fully functional according to your own standards. The result is an "A" on the level of service.

Public Satisfaction

This indicator measures the public's satisfaction with current access and recreation facilities, experiences, and opportunities.

Example: You survey your constituents or user groups and find that 55 percent are satisfied or highly satisfied with your parks and recreation sites and facilities. The result is a "B" on the level of service.

Access Criteria

Indicators and Criteria for State and Federal Agencies	A	B	C	D	E
Access Criteria					
Sustainable Access Percentage of access/recreation areas/facilities that provide sustainable recreation opportunities (e.g., help protect natural and cultural resources, use green infrastructure to strengthen natural processes, minimize encroachment and/or user-developed facilities, prohibit poaching, etc.)	>65%	56-65%	46-55%	36-45%	<35%

Sustainable Access

This indicator measures the provision of sustainable recreation opportunities at state-managed parks, recreation areas, and facilities. Sustainable access generally is defined as recreation opportunities that do not substantially degrade natural, cultural, and historic resources, or provide a measure of protection for these resources.

Examples of sustainable access may include facilities that help protect natural, cultural, and historic resources; use green infrastructure to strengthen natural processes, minimize encroachment, or user-developed facilities, and/or prohibit poaching, among others.

Example: A trail in a riparian area is unsustainable. A re-routed trail on terrain that drains well would be sustainable. Your total system adds up to 250 miles; 35 miles are in sensitive riparian areas, making 86 percent of the inventory sustainable. The result is an "A" on the level of service.

It is up to the agency to determine its resource protection goals and how well they are being met. However, the measure is meaningless unless access is being provided.

Habitat and conservation projects cannot overlook the issue of public access. Access can be important for public support: Even a nature trail with a few interpretive panels could help establish the public support needed to secure and protect a site. Habitat planning proactively should encourage appropriate access.

PLAN UPDATE—MASTER SCHEDULE

March 14, 2011

DATE	TENTATIVE AGENDA ITEMS
Feb. 8 Planning Commission Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 Work Program, GMA and planning process • Vision 2040 (PSRC staff)
Feb. 22 Planning Commission Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countywide Planning Policies • Review of Comprehensive Plan • Review of compliance checklists
Mar. 8 Planning Commission Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of compliance checklists • Scoping discussion
Mar. 22 Planning Commission Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Works—TMP and DMP • Parks—PROS Plan • CPPW/HEAL Grant • Scoping discussion
April 12 Planning Commission Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Burien background • Other “must do” items • Ideas from visioning
April 25 Issue notice for private Comp Plan amendment requests	
April 26 Planning Commission Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Burien background? • Other “must do” items? • Ideas from visioning
May 10 Planning Commission Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public scoping meeting
May 24 Planning Commission Meeting	
June 1 Deadline for private Comp Plan amendment requests	
June 14 Planning Commission Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and possible recommendation to City Council on update scope (docket)
June 20 City Council Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Planning Commission’s recommendation on update scope (docket) and possible adoption of resolution establishing scope of work
July 1 Deadline for Planning Commission recommendation on update scope (docket)	
July 18—next Council Meeting	
August 1 Deadline for City Council decision on update scope (docket)	