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**Introduction**

In May 2018, the City of Shoreline began a process of soliciting community members interested in participating on a Parks Funding Advisory Committee (PFAC). Thirty-five applications were received by the July deadline and the City Manager selected 16 members from a diverse cross section of Shoreline neighborhoods with a broad range of interests such as public art, aquatics, indoor and outdoor athletics, social equity, accessibility, natural areas and environmental education, youth and teens, and programs for aging adults (see PFAC Roster). Two members of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services/Tree Board were selected to ensure a close connection between the Board and the Committee.

The purpose of the PFAC was to make a recommendation to the City Manager on:

- the priority parks and recreation improvements that ought to be included in a funding measure,
- the dollar amount (or range) of a property tax measure, and
- any other important considerations regarding a funding measure.

The PFAC met 10 times from September 2018 to March 2019 to learn more about the condition of the City’s existing parks; recommendations from the 2017 Parks and Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan; available financing options including a bond measure; and the community’s desires for park improvements, including a proposed Community and Aquatic Center. See Appendix A for the Committee’s Work Plan.

The Committee was also offered a tour of various parks being considered for improvements. Nine committee members attended.

---

**PFAC Roster**

- Donald Bell, Meridian Park (through 10/2018)
- David Chen, Echo Lake
- Bill Franklin, Meridian Park
- Philip Herold, Richmond Highlands
- Joan Herrick, Hillwood
- Jean Hilde, Briarcrest
- Carolyn Hope, Ridgecrest
- Julian Larson, Richmond Beach
- Esaac Mazengia, Richmond Highlands
- Yvette Perez, North City
- Jeff Potter, North City
- Sara Raab McInerny, Innis Arden
- Betsy Robertson, Ridgecrest (through 1/2019)
- Cecelia Romero, Richmond Highlands
- Nan Skinner, Ballinger
- Sally Wolf, Highland Terrace
INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Sixteen parks and recreation improvement opportunities were presented to the PFAC for consideration. Information for each opportunity included preliminary design concepts by landscape architecture firm, HBB, that respond to many of the identified needs in the 2017 PROS Plan. See Appendix B for more details on each opportunity. Several opportunities included options at different cost estimates based on a different mix of amenities and level of investment. The Committee members were invited to offer other ideas for consideration. No completely new opportunities were suggested by the PFAC although some alternatives to the options presented by staff were modified based on Committee member input.

1. Brugger’s Bog Park  
2. Briarcrest Community Park (Hamlin)  
3. Hamlin Park North  
4. Hillwood Park  
5. James Keough Park  
6. Park at Town Center  
7. Richmond Highlands Park  
8. Ridgecrest Park  
9. Shoreview Park  
10. Westminster Triangle Park  
11. Property Acquisition  
12. Trails  
13. Forest Restoration  
14. Public Art  
15. Kruckeberg Botanic Garden  
16. Community and Aquatics Center

Parks & Recreation Background

In 2006, a voter-approved bond expanded the parks system by 24.7 acres and made substantial improvements to nine parks in Shoreline. Shoreline’s current parkland per 1,000 residents is 7.38 acres, a number the City wants to maintain. To ensure the current level of service (LOS) as the population grows, an additional 95 acres of parkland is needed in Shoreline, of which approximately 43 acres should be in and around the two light rail station subareas at NE 145th and NE 185th. This increase of 95 acres is equivalent to another park 15 percent larger than Hamlin Park. The PROS Plan recognizes that adding 95 acres will be a difficult, if not impossible task, but emphasized that parkland needs to be added.

CURRENT CHALLENGES

Almost every resident in Shoreline is within a 15-minute walk to some type of park or open space. While the City is well-served by community, large urban, and regional parks, there are some challenges:

- Based exclusively on geographic LOS standards, Shoreline lacks neighborhood parks close to residents in a few neighborhoods.
- Essential Park Amenities include children’s playgrounds, picnic areas, trails, and open grass areas for active and passive uses. The City does not meet its LOS target for providing these amenities within a 15-minute walk to all Shoreline residents.
- Natural areas are generally accessible to all residents except for the Hillwood and Echo Lake neighborhoods.
- There are gaps that will be targeted for land acquisition specially to meet the projected population growth in the 145th and 185th Street Station subareas, and along Aurora.
- The Shoreline Pool was constructed in 1972 and is beyond its useful life with expensive operations and maintenance costs.
- The Spartan Recreation Center is owned by the School District and may eventually be needed for other purposes.
2017-2023 PROS PLAN

The PFAC reviewed the PROS Plan to ensure their recommendations align with the Plan's goals, policies, and initiatives, including:

- The preservation, enhancement, maintenance, and acquisition of facilities
- Diverse, affordable community-based recreational, cultural and arts programs
- Equitable distribution of resources
- Partnerships that maximize the public use of all community resources
- Community engagement in parks, recreation and cultural service activities and decisions

The PFAC also reviewed a 2016 Community Survey conducted for the PROS Plan, that asked respondents to rate the facilities that should receive the highest priority funding. This list included:

- Nature trails
- Small neighborhood parks
- Paved walking/biking trails
- Natural areas
- Indoor swimming pool/aquatic center
- Adult fitness and wellness programs
- Programs for adults 50 and older
- Nature/environmental education programs

FINANCING OPTIONS

The PFAC also heard from the City’s Finance Department and Parks staff about how the City’s operations are funded generally and what revenue sources are available for parks and recreation, including parks impact fees and the current parks bond which expires in 2021. There may be some opportunities to expand parkland through the parks impact fee and by requiring developers to provide community space (whether indoor or outdoor) in significant new development around the light rail stations. These sources are not, however, expected to provide enough resources to meet the requirements for additional parks and open space.

The Committee discussed the scale of revenues available from impact fees and grants and concluded that these sources can only be expected to provide a fraction of the revenue needed, making a bond measure imperative to improving the system overall.

PROS PLAN Strategic Action Initiatives

1. Build a Community and Aquatics Center
2. Expand Opportunities to Connect with Nature
3. Expand Recreation Facility Opportunities
4. Serve the Full Spectrum of Aging Adult Recreation Needs
5. Support Diverse Communities
6. Enhance Place Making through Public Art
7. Ensure Adequate Park Land for Future Generations
8. Maintain, Enhance, and Protect the Urban Forest
9. Enhance Walkability In and Around Parks
10. Secure Sustainable Funding
11. Ensure Administrative Excellence
PFAC Assessment

In addition to the information from the 2017-2023 PROS Plan, the PFAC reviewed quantitative and qualitative data to help prioritize the investment opportunities.

QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

The PFAC reviewed maps (see Appendix C) with information on the various proposed investment opportunities. This data included:

▪ Proximity to parks that received recent improvements (since 2006)
▪ Median household income by Census Block
▪ Population under 18 by Census Block
▪ Population 60 or over by Census Block
▪ Percent of population that speaks a language other than English at home
▪ Impact on ongoing operations and maintenance (O&M)
▪ Whether it serves an interest group (off-leash dog areas, soccer or other sports groups, individuals with special needs)

Using a points system, the ten parks improvement opportunities were ranked based on the data criteria above. The highest-ranking projects were Park at Town Center, followed by Brugger’s Bog Park and Briarcrest Community Park (Hamlin) (see Table 1). All three parks are in neighborhoods with the lowest median income. The PFAC also considered the proposed amenities for each park (see Appendix D).

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

While the points ranking was helpful, the PFAC also took a qualitative approach to evaluating the opportunities considering factors like need, equity, access, urgency, placemaking and community identity, areas of future growth, and alignment to the PROS plan.

Need was defined as an area that has been underserved in terms of park amenities. This could mean lacking park space or having parks that are in poor condition. Need was also defined as projects that could not be funded by other revenue sources, either due to grant program or revenue source restrictions, or because the amount generated is inadequate to the scale of the project.

Urgency. With no immediate investment, what would the condition of existing parks or facilities be like in five or ten years?

Equity considerations focused on areas that have not seen investment, geographies that lack park space, and areas with high shares of low-income households and/or multi-family housing, which makes access to outdoor space that much more important. Increases in the number of apartments along Aurora Avenue, for example, also increases the number of residents in need of park space. PFAC members weighed geographic equity and investment equity. For example, would one part of the City receive a significantly greater investment than other areas?

Placemaking and community identity was also assessed in terms of whether a neighborhood had existing gathering places to play or meet. The PFAC also considered larger-scale civic spaces such as a new town center for Shoreline.

Future growth expected around the 145th and 185th station subareas led to several discussions around the need to add parks space through acquisition, and potentially as part of developer agreements.
Table 1. Project Ranking based on Quantitative Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Age under 18</th>
<th>Age 60+</th>
<th>Language other than English</th>
<th>Special Use area</th>
<th>Estimated O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park at Town Center (Neighborhood)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugger’s Bog Park (Neighborhood)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briarcrest Community Park (Hamlin) (Community)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillwood Park (Community)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Keough Park (Neighborhood)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Highlands Park (Community)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlin Park (North) (Large Urban)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgecrest Park (Neighborhood)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Triangle (Pocket Park)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreview Park (Large Urban)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIORITIZED INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES LIST

Using the various qualitative and quantitative criteria plus the background information, the PFAC worked in small groups to generate an investment list with a maximum of $150 million in investments. The Committee decided that the Community and Aquatic Center is an urgent need that must be addressed, so it started in the top position for all groups. Once the groups came back together to discuss their consensus list, the total amount was below the target at $140 million. Given limited resources, the Committee recommends that the following investments be prioritized as shown in Table 2. More discussion on specific opportunities is included in the project specific recommendations section.

Table 2. Prioritized Investment Opportunities List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Opportunity</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost (in millions)</th>
<th>Cumulative Cost (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Community and Aquatics Center</td>
<td>$87.1</td>
<td>$87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Trails (Full Option)</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
<td>$89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Brugger’s Bog Park (Full Option)</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Property Acquisition (Option A)</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>$109.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Park at Town Center (Option A)</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$112.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 James Keough Park (Option A)</td>
<td>$4.3</td>
<td>$117.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Richmond Highlands Park (Option A)</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
<td>$122.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hillwood Park (Option B)</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$127.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Briarcrest Community Park (Option A)</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
<td>$133.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Forest Restoration (Full Option)</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$134.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Ridgecrest Park (Option A)</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>$138.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Shoreview Park (Off-leash Area)</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$139.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee decided not to include investments beyond the $140 million. While the opportunities below are worthy investments, they did not make the final list.

- Public Art
- Kruckeberg Botanic Garden
- Hamlin Park (North)
- Westminster Triangle. The PFAC believes this site has significant safety risks that discourage walkable local access given its challenging location between three roads.
Project Specific Recommendations

COMMUNITY AND AQUATICS CENTER

The Committee agrees that replacing the pool is an urgent need and supports the idea of creating a community center with a pool to create a central gathering place for people of all ages in the community. The City Council’s preferred site at 17828 Midvale Avenue N, located within the Town Center subarea, would help to create the civic and symbolic center of the community.

There was discussion among PFAC members that it makes sense to add additional features (recently proposed by community members) now, such as additional swim lanes or community space, as they would be difficult to add after the facility is built.

The Committee:

▪ Supports the additional two swim lanes and the spectator viewing area.
▪ Does not support adding a separate diving well unless identified as a priority and funded by the School District. Our understanding is that adding two lanes creates adequate space for diving.
▪ Encourages continued conversation with the school district about ways to support the CAC through contributions to initial capital funding, ongoing operations costs, or both.
▪ Supports additional community space with a commercial kitchen that could be used for senior programming, but there was concern about dedicating that space as a senior center and making it less available to the broader community. In addition to recreation activities, the additional space could be used as a cold weather shelter or in other emergency response situations.
▪ Encourages continued conversation with the senior center about ways to contribute to the CAC.

TRAILS

Committee members noted that trails ranked very highly on the community survey completed for the PROS Plan. Nature trails were ranked first, and paved walking/biking trails were in the third position. The indoor track at the Community and Aquatic Center will also serve as a walking opportunity, addressing some of the prioritized need related to adult fitness and wellness programs. This is a need throughout the city and there are opportunities at many parks to enhance walking opportunities.

BRUGGERS BOG PARK

This park is in an area that lacks park access and has a high share of, and proximity to, multifamily housing. The children’s play area floods seasonally to such an extent that it limits usability and there was support for replacing this amenity (see Appendix D for Amenities by Park Opportunity). The PFAC felt this park has urgent needs that should be addressed in a neighborhood that should receive additional investment. Of the neighborhood parks on our list, the group felt this park rose to the top – consistent with its high points ranking (see page 5) – and addressed equity, need, and urgency.
PROPERTY ACQUISITION

Acquisition is important as it is not possible to create more land and it will only become more expensive, especially as the light rail stations near completion. The PFAC understands the City does not have full control of opportunities and timing. However, given that grants for land purchase, including the King County Conservation Futures Tax Levy funds, typically require matching dollars, the PFAC supports the idea of having money set aside to facilitate opportunistic purchases. The Committee also acknowledges that many grant programs have limitations in terms of allowable uses or amount of funding and would on their own be insufficient to meet the need. The bond measure would provide an opportunity to raise the funds needed to make larger purchases. There was also discussion that while acquisition sites have been identified in the PROS Plan, it is possible that development of newly acquired park or open space land would not take place during the life of the bond measure.

PARK AT TOWN CENTER

Committee members view this opportunity as complementary to the CAC. Together, the park at Town Center and the CAC would create the active civic center that Shoreline has lacked since incorporation. Should the CAC ultimately not be located adjacent to the Park at Town Center on Midvale Avenue, the PFAC would maintain the high ranking of this park due to the need for park space along the Aurora corridor with the increase in multifamily development, proximity to the Interurban Trail, and its high points ranking.

The Committee recognizes the opportunity to create a truly accessible space, especially for individuals with mobility issues, and add a park in an underserved, diverse part of the city where new multifamily development has occurred. However, the site has some challenges related to noise and proximity to Aurora Avenue N and the Committee wants to ensure that that the investment produces a high-quality, safe space that attracts users. The PFAC recommends that traffic flow on Midvale be reduced to maximize connection with the CAC.

JAMES KEOUGH PARK

Bounded by Interstate-5, this park is one of Shoreline’s most visible to through traffic, yet it is relatively unknown to residents due to its entrance at the end of a dead-end street. This park contains the only play area in this underserved neighborhood – one slide and a swing. With no onsite parking and proximity to I-5, James Keough Park’s location is challenging, and the park has fallen into disrepair. The PFAC believes that the addition of an off-leash area with parking will make it a destination that attracts park users from outside the area. Improving the play area and picnic area will provide improved amenities to neighborhood residents. The PFAC also feels that significant investment is likely needed for this to be a high-quality City park.

RICHMOND HIGHLANDS PARK

This opportunity includes an accessible (Americans with Disabilities Act) all-ages playground and a paved loop path which would increase access for an underserved population while also supporting Specialized Recreation programming at the adjacent Richmond Highlands Recreation Center. Additional improvements and activation could help improve park safety. This opportunity also received a high equity rating in that the area has high shares of multifamily housing close to Aurora and the largest concentration of people speaking a language other than English.
HILLWOOD PARK
The improvements provide a variety of amenities for people of all ages including a splash pad, sport
court, playground, picnic tables, and walking opportunities. Located in the center of the Hillwood
neighborhood, it functions currently as a community park but there is an opportunity to bring more
people in and strengthen the neighborhood’s community identity.

BRIARCREST COMMUNITY PARK (EAST HAMLIN PARK)
The Briarcrest community would benefit from a central gathering place and easy, safe access to
Hamlin Park. While the east side of Hamlin borders the Briarcrest neighborhood, it has its back to the
neighborhood, is inaccessible for people with mobility issues, and viewed as unsafe for young children.
The proposal is to make improvement to this community park by replacing two underused ballfields,
located on the hill between Shorecrest High School and Kellogg Middle School, which would provide
Briarcrest residents with a safe, accessible gathering and play space.

FOREST RESTORATION
The PFAC recognizes the mental and physical health benefits that access to nature provides in an
urbanized area. Community survey respondents ranked this highly. Forest restoration is an important
component of protecting the community’s natural resources and is especially important as the City adds
more buildings and people.

RIDGECREST PARK
Like James Keough, Ridgecrest is in an out-of-the-way location with one point of access and bounded
by I-5. The addition of an off-leash area could help attract more users and possibly overcome the
challenging location. The playground was so deteriorated it had to be removed. Adjacent to a
proposed trail along the Sound Transit route, the new playground, loop path, and multipurpose sport
court would provide a variety of amenities for people of all ages.

SHOREVIEW PARK
Because the park received considerable investment in the last bond measure, the PFAC recommends
only that the well-used off-leash area be funded to replace the temporary fences and make it a
permanent, high-quality community amenity.

Overall System Recommendations

Partnerships. Whether in the form of other government agencies, service providers, “Friends of”
groups, foundations, or individual donors, partnerships should be encouraged. Partnerships can add
sources of capital, land, human resources, and volunteer hours, and possibly expand grant
opportunities.

- The City of Shoreline may want to explore the feasibility of establishing a Shoreline Parks
  Foundation to provide a mechanism for residents and philanthropists to donate to park
  improvements and operations. Like grants and impact fees, these funds could contribute but would
  be insufficient to address the significant need.
Operations Expenses. Any new parks investments will increase the need for funds for operations and maintenance and this should be considered as any package is put together. All costs considered for the PFAC’s prioritization exercise included ongoing operations and maintenance. Operations and maintenance costs for the CAC would decrease over current costs given how energy inefficient the existing pool is. There are other expected operating efficiencies due to having a joint facility. Revenues from user fees are also expected to increase with new amenities such as the recreation pool and larger lap pool.

Affordability. The Committee is aware that a bond measure that only includes the CAC would be a significant funding request for voters and is sensitive to the property tax burden facing many households. The PFAC considered the interests of the entire community with respect to the amount of the bond and length of the bond term and what park and recreation improvements might be included (see Appendix E). Without survey information on support for investments and willingness to pay, the PFAC feels more exploration of the following questions is needed:

▪ How to ensure that in trying to serve existing households we don’t cause them to move elsewhere in search of a lower cost of living?
▪ Should a bond measure only address Citywide needs such as the CAC, acquisition, trails, and forest restoration and not name specific parks? Are two bond measures (one for CAC and another for parks) a better approach rather than one combining both?
▪ How to balance a measure that has something for everyone with affordability?

The PFAC also discussed that their recommendations relied on the use of a $150 million budget to guide priorities and select investments. Had the amount been different (either smaller or larger) the recommendations may also have been different.

Conclusion

The PFAC has worked for seven months to understand the City’s finances, parks funding opportunities, and the details of the proposed investment opportunities. The PFAC used this wealth of information to develop its recommendation for a prioritized list of investment opportunities. While the group represents many diverse perspectives, discussions generated agreement on guiding principles and recommendations the PFAC believes are in the best interests of all Shoreline residents. The PFAC is grateful for the opportunity to serve; it has been both challenging and rewarding. The PFAC is also grateful to City of Shoreline staff for their responsiveness and support throughout the process.

The PFAC recognizes that this is a significant moment in the evolution of the parks and recreation for the City of Shoreline. Shoreline is a City that values its parks and open spaces, recreational opportunities, and cultural activities. The PFAC members look forward to continuing to help Shoreline grow and evolve.
# Appendix A: Committee Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2018</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 1:</strong> Welcome, introductions, ground rules, process, Charter, and schedule review; Intro to PRCS programs/services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2018</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 2:</strong> Shoreline – current demographics and Citizen Satisfaction Survey results and future projections; City Funding 101.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2018</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 3:</strong> PROS Plan process and Strategic Action Initiatives; Intro to Park Concept Designs and cost estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/2018</td>
<td>Optional tour of park sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 4:</strong> Deep dive into Aquatics and Community Center Feasibility Study, and current design process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 5:</strong> Presentation and discussion of funding options, including partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/2019</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 6:</strong> Update on Community and Aquatics Center design and cost estimates; Discuss prioritization methodology; Prioritize project ideas – Round 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2019</td>
<td>Council Dinner Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/2019</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 7:</strong> Draft recommendations and guiding principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/2019</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 8:</strong> Prioritize project ideas – Round 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/2019</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 9:</strong> Finalize the Plan and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27/2019</td>
<td><strong>Meeting 10:</strong> Confirm recommendation and Celebration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All meetings were held from 7:00 – 9:00 pm at Shoreline City Hall.
## Appendix B: Investment Opportunities

### Investment Opportunity Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brugger’s Bog</td>
<td>$5,361,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Briarcrest Community Park (Hamlin)</td>
<td>$9,552,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hamlin Park North</td>
<td>$3,980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hillwood Park</td>
<td>$13,941,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>James Keough Park</td>
<td>$6,368,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Park at Town Center</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Richmond Highlands Park</td>
<td>$9,907,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ridgecrest Park</td>
<td>$5,361,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shoreview Park</td>
<td>$18,122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Westminster Triangle Park</td>
<td>$3,630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Forest Restoration</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kruckeberg Botanic Garden</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Community and Aquatics Center</td>
<td>$79,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$217,447,000</td>
<td>$127,715,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Add-On Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>add 2 lanes</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add separated diving capacity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add spectator viewing</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add dedicated senior program space</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investment Opportunity # 1: Brugger’s Bog Park

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $4,633,000

DESCRIPTION

Brugger’s Bog Park would be substantially upgraded to provide enhanced and added amenities. The playground in this park is substandard, located in relatively hidden place and is frequently flooded. The concept design relocates the active features closer to the front of the park along 25th Ave NE where they would be visible to the community. This Opportunity provides environmental stewardship in the interior of the Park along the stream and bog. It provides trails through the park connecting to Ballinger Way and a loop around the natural areas of the Park.

OPTIONS

Option A. Cost = $2,613,000

Relocate the playground, add multi-sport court, add picnic shelter, and reduce plantings and number of trails added.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $29,000
- OPTION A = $9,000
Investment Opportunity # 2: Briarcrest Community Park (Hamlin Park)

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $9,552,000

DESCRIPTION

A new community park would be created to provide a community anchor for the Briarcrest neighborhood. The portion of Hamlin Park facing 25th Ave NE would be redeveloped with a mix of park amenities to be oriented towards the east and create a presence in the Briarcrest neighborhood. The concept design retains restrooms and trees, enhances one of the existing diamond fields, and adds an entry plaza, community garden, perimeter trail, picnic shelters, playground, open lawn, skate and/or fitness features along the trail, splash pad, amphitheater and public art.

OPTIONS

Option A. Cost = $6,641,000

Splash pad, playground, picnic shelter, lesser landscaping improvements, improvements to entrance from 25th, small community garden, perimeter path, minor landscape improvement.

Option B. Cost = $3,892,000

Splash pad, smaller playground, picnic shelter, minor landscaping improvements, improvements to entrance from 25th, minor landscape improvement.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $44,000
- OPTION A = $30,000
- OPTION B = $28,000
Investment Opportunity # 3: Hamlin Park – North

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $3,980,000

DESCRIPTION

The Concept Design would create a full adventure playground with extensive paths, boardwalk, and parking improvements.

OPTIONS

Option A. Cost = $1,025,000

Smaller adventure playground, benches, path improvements.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $13,000
- OPTION A = $6,000
Investment Opportunity # 4: Hillwood Park

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $13,941,000

DESCRIPTION

Hillwood Park would remain in the same basic configuration but with added amenities. The environmental restoration area would remain in place. The concept design adds a Splash Pad, multi-sport court, replacement playground, two picnic shelters, benches, picnic tables, restroom replacement, landscape improvements, perimeter path, enhanced landscaping, rain garden, public art, renovated ballfield/open lawn and improved entrance from 3rd Ave NW.

OPTIONS

Option A. Cost = $10,327,000

Splash Pad, multi-sport court, replacement playground, picnic shelters, benches, picnic tables, restroom replacement, landscape improvements, perimeter path, enhanced landscaping, rain garden, public art, renovated ballfield/open lawn.

Option B. Cost = $4,199,000

Splash Pad, multi-sport court, replacement playground, picnic shelters, benches, picnic tables, restroom replacement, moderate landscape improvements.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $46,000
- OPTION A = $37,000
- OPTION B = $34,000
Investment Opportunity # 5: James Keough Park

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $6,368,000

DESCRIPTION

James Keough Park once had a multisport court and playground. Both have fallen into disrepair. The concept design would restore both of those amenities as well as add new features including Off-leash area, community garden, natural play elements, public art restroom, perimeter trail, landscape improvements, picnic shelter, picnic tables restroom and parking.

OPTIONS

Option A. Cost = $5,579,000

Off-leash area, minor landscape improvements, parking improvements, partial perimeter trail, play area, picnic shelter, kids garden, picnic tables

Option B. Cost = $1,770,000

Play area, picnic shelter, kids garden, picnic tables.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $47,000
- OPTION A = $29,000
- OPTION B = $11,000
Investment Opportunity # 6: Park at Town Center

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $10,000,000 (not verified)

DESCRIPTION

The Park at Town Center site is located between North 175th Street and North 185th Street, and Aurora Avenue North and Midvale Avenue North. The approximately five-acre project area includes parcels owned by the City of Shoreline, Seattle City Light (SCL). It is located across Midvale from the site of the proposed Community and Aquatics Center. The City adopted the Park at Town Center Master Plan in 2012. The Master Plan calls for public gathering places, a water feature, art plaza, formal and informal landscape areas. The adjacency of this park with the Community and Aquatics provides the opportunity to create civic center for Shoreline.

OPTION A. COST = $3,000,000

Enhanced landscape areas, gathering places and art plaza.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $41,000
- OPTION A = $9,000
Investment Opportunity # 7: Richmond Highlands Park

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $9,907,000

DESCRIPTION

Perimeter trail, landscape improvements, sensory trail, picnic shelters, picnic tables, ballfield renovation, site access improvements, ADA accessible play area, multi-sport court, picnic tables, community garden, streetscape and parking improvements, synthetic turf infield, extensive landscape improvements.

OPTIONS

Option A. Cost = $5,579,000

Perimeter trail, landscape improvements, sensory trail, picnic shelter, picnic tables, ballfield renovation, site access improvements, ADA accessible play area, multi-sport court, picnic tables.

Option B. Cost = $1,770,000

ADA accessible play area, multi-sport court, picnic tables.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $30,000
- OPTION A = $9,000
- OPTION B = $5,000
Investment Opportunity # 8: Ridgecrest Park

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $5,361,000

DESCRIPTION

Ridgecrest Park would be substantially upgraded to provide enhanced and added amenities. The playground in this park has been removed due to age and severe deterioration. A review of recent usage and demand determined that the existing diamond field is no longer needed. There is an outdoor handball court that, while unique, gets relatively little use and would be replaced. The concept design provides for an off-leash area, perimeter trail, picnic shelter, playground, open lawn, multi-sport court, public restroom and public art. A new parking lot will be provided by Sound Transit. This park is adjacent to the proposed trail along the rail.

OPTIONS

Option A. Cost = $3,357,000

New playground, off-leash area, perimeter path, picnic table and shelter, benches, open lawn.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $48,000
- OPTION A = $27,000
Investment Opportunity # 9: Shoreview Park

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $18,122,000

DESCRIPTION

The Shoreview Park Concept Design would enhance the off-leash area by adding permanent fencing, upgrade the surface, add trails, agility equipment, drinking fountain and wash-down area; replace the existing gravel surface soccer filed with synthetic turf and add lights. It would replace playground equipment and add an amphitheater, pave loop path, picnic shelter, and a bouldering area.

OPTIONS

Option A – Off-leash Area Only. Cost = $1,825,000

The Shoreview Park off-leash area was created with minimal investment and has received minimal improvements. The concept design calls for converting the dirt surface to pea gravel and providing for appropriate drainage, installing permanent fencing, adding benches, providing for perimeter pathways and agility equipment and public art. Drinking fountains and wash-down station is dependent on availability of water sources.

Option B – Soccer field improvements only. Cost = $6,199,000

Replace gravel surface soccer field with synthetic turf and add lights to field and pathways.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $53,000
- OPTION A = $25,000
- OPTION B = $9,000

ESTIMATED REVENUE FROM SOCCER FIELD RENTAL = $100,000
Investment Opportunity # 10: Westminster Triangle

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $3,630,000

DESCRIPTION

Westminster Triangle Park would be redeveloped to become a more active park with interactive, playful art and sitting areas as a central feature. To make this a successful park, substantial improvements would be needed along the street frontage. Adding crosswalks, sidewalks, parking and making N150th St. one-way are all features of this design.

OPTIONS

Option A. Cost = $243,000

Install moderate size art sculpture to make this an interesting welcoming feature for Shoreline and point of interest for the neighborhood.

PROJECTED O&M COSTS

- FULL DEVELOPMENT = $19,000
- OPTION A = $1,000
Investment Opportunity # 11: Property Acquisition

Category: Ensure Adequate Parkland

Full estimated cost = $45,000,000
(estimated cost not updated)

DESCRIPTION

The PROS Plan predicted population growth will have a direct impact on the City’s ability to meet our standards for park land and facilities (page 75). The PROS Plan shows there will be a need for an additional 95 acres of parkland in Shoreline of which approximately 43 acres should be in and around the two-light rail station sub-areas. This is a long term need that will difficult to meet. The Council goal set in the PROS Plan is to add 20 acres of land by 2030.

Funding for development of the newly acquired property is included as a component of each Option.

OPTIONS

See Table of Options A-H below.
## Acquisition Options (from PROS Plan Table 6.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (Not updated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cedarbrook Acquisition (1/4 of full cost estimate – assumes partnership)</td>
<td>$2,779,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Rotary Park Acquisition © 1.35 Acres</td>
<td>$3,992,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotary Park Development</td>
<td>$1,406,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>145th Station Area Acquisition – (2.0 acres)</td>
<td>$6,291,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145th Station Area Development</td>
<td>$1,113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>185th &amp; Ashworth Acquisition (0.63 acres)</td>
<td>$1,203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185th &amp; Ashworth Development</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5th &amp; 165th Acquisition (3.0 acres)</td>
<td>$7,041,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th &amp; 165th Development</td>
<td>$4,456,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Paramount Open Space Acquisition (1.0 acres)</td>
<td>$3,734,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paramount Open Space Improvements</td>
<td>$257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Aurora-I-5 155th-165th Acquisition (3.0 acres)</td>
<td>$9,931,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aurora-I-5 155th-165th Development</td>
<td>$1,615,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>DNR Open Space Access Acquisition (185th ST) (1.0 acres)</td>
<td>$2,027,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNR OPEN SPACE Development (185th ST)</td>
<td>$616,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Acquisition Costs (12.9 acres)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,219,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Development Costs for Acquired Properties</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,983,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investment Opportunity # 12: Trails

Category: Enhance Walkability
Full estimated cost = $2,400,000

DESCRIPTION
Survey results identified walking and jogging trails and nature trails as the most important parks and recreation facility. This Investment Opportunity would provide. There are 24 miles of trails in parks currently. An additional six miles of trails are necessary to maintain the current level of service to meet projected population growth through 2035 (PROS Plan, p.77). Funding would be used to add new or substantially rebuild degraded trails in the following parks: Darnell, Northcrest, North City, Paramount Open Space, South Woods, Boeing Creek Park and Open Space, Shoreline, and Twin Ponds.

Specific project scopes would be developed based on level of funding.

OPTIONS
This Investment Opportunity is scalable.

Potential Parks for trail improvements:
- Darnell
- Northcrest
- North City
- Paramount Open Space
- South Woods
- Boeing Creek Park and Open Space
- Shoreline
- Twin Ponds
- Kruckeberg Botanic Garden

9 Enhance Walkability In and Around Parks
Create 2 miles of new nature trails within parks and 2 miles of enhanced pedestrian access to parks by 2023.
Investment Opportunity # 13: Forest Restoration

**Category:** Maintain, Enhance and Protect the Urban Forest

**Full estimated cost = $1,000,000**

**DESCRIPTION**

The City Council adopted the Urban Forest Strategic Management Plan in 2014 recognizing the importance of the urban forest. Full funding would allow the city to catch-up with urban forest restoration needs in natural area parks. This work would primarily include the removal of invasive plants and the installation of native plants.

**OPTIONS**

This Investment Opportunity is scalable.

---

8 Maintain, Enhance, and Protect the Urban Forest

Restore 10 acres of degraded forest land by 2023 and or convert appropriate parkland into natural areas by 2023.
Investment Opportunity # 14: Public Art

Category: Enhance Placemaking Through Public Art

Full estimated cost = $1,000,000

DESCRIPTION

The vision of the City’s Public Art Program is to unleash “the power of art in public places to draw people together, create vibrant neighborhoods where people desire to live, work and visit and stimulate thought and discourse by enhancing visual interest in the built and natural environment. Art is part of the cultural thread that ties generations and civilizations together; creating opportunities for expression, reflection, participation and a landscape that is uniquely Shoreline.” (City Council adopted Public Art Plan 2017-2022). This Investment Opportunity would further the public art program mission by providing funding for permanent pieces of art. The Art Plan envisions permanent art located along Aurora and in neighborhood commercial areas to enhance the sense of place and community.

Specific project scopes would be developed based on level of funding.

OPTIONS

This Investment Opportunity is scalable.

OBJECTIVE:
Install at least one permanent, significant piece of art by 2020, three permanent smaller pieces of public art by 2023 and provide temporary graphic or performing arts annually in Shoreline neighborhoods.
Investment Opportunity # 15: Kruckeberg Botanic Garden

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities

Full estimated cost = $2,000,000

DESCRIPTION

The City of Shoreline acquired Kruckeberg Botanic Garden (KBG) with proceeds from the 2006 Parks Bond. A master plan for the garden was developed in 2010. The KBG mission is to preserve the Garden, with strong public education and potential research, is pertinent for sustainable operations. As the Garden is preserved and enhanced, it will offer more interpretive benefits and educational programs to users. This funding would provide for a match for grants or philanthropic funding to renovate the former Kruckeberg home into an environmental education facility to support the educational mission of the garden. This project would be developed in partnership with the Kruckeberg Botanic Garden Foundation.

OPTIONS

This Investment Opportunity is scalable.
Investment Opportunity # 16: Community and Aquatic Center

Category: Recreation Facility Opportunities
Full estimated cost = $79,800,000

DESCRIPTION
65,000 square foot facility that includes aquatics facility, community meeting and classrooms, fitness and exercise rooms, a gymnasium and walking track, and administrative/support spaces

OPTIONS

Option A. Cost = $71,100,000
50,300 square foot facility that includes aquatics facility, community meeting and classrooms, fitness and exercise rooms, and administrative/support spaces. It does not include a gymnasium or walking track.

Option B. Cost = $53,300,000
28,000 square foot facility that include just aquatics and administrative/support spaces.

OTHER OPTIONS:
C. Add 2 lanes for a total of 8 = $1,200,000
D. Add separated diving capacity at end of pool = $2,700,000
E. Add spectator viewing (roughly 240) = $400,000
F. Add 6,000 sq. feet of dedicated space for senior programs and commercial kitchen = $5,700,000
Appendix C: Maps

Investment Opportunities in Shoreline Neighborhoods and in proximity to parks that received recent improvements (since 2006)
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Appendix D: Proposed Amenities Count - PFAC Priority Options

(Full Development amenity counts are in parenthesis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Briarcrest Community Park (Hamlin)</th>
<th>Hamlin Park North</th>
<th>Hillwood Park</th>
<th>James Keough Park</th>
<th>Park at Town Center</th>
<th>Richmond Highlands Park</th>
<th>Ridgecrest Park</th>
<th>Shoreview Park</th>
<th>Westminster Triangle Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA playground</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New synthetic turf field</td>
<td>0 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray park</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New off-leash area</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard feature</td>
<td>0 (2)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheater</td>
<td>0 (2)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure playground</td>
<td>0 (2.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community garden</td>
<td>.5 (3)</td>
<td>0.5 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replaced playground</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New restroom</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New playground</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose/basketball court</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved loop path</td>
<td>5.5 (9)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0.5 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art installation</td>
<td>2 (9)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Investment Opportunity Scenario Tool
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Opportunity</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Added General Fund O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Short Term (15 Years)</th>
<th>Long Term (30 Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;In&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;In&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>Annual O&amp;M Costs</td>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruggers Bog</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$5,361,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>$5,361,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$2,613,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briarcrest Community Park (Hamlin)</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$9,552,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$6,641,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$3,892,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>$6,641,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlin Park North</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$3,980,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillwood Park</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$13,941,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$10,327,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$4,199,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>$4,199,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Keough Park</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$6,368,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$4,292,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>$4,292,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$1,586,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C (OLA)</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park at Town Center</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Highlands Park</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$9,907,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$5,579,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>$5,579,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$1,770,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgecrest Park</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$5,361,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$3,357,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>$3,357,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreview Park</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$18,122,000</td>
<td>(47,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$1,825,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$6,199,000</td>
<td>(91,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$4,030,000</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Triangle Park</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$3,630,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$243,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$45,000,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
<td>6,063</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$1,213,000</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Restoration</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knuckleberg Botanic Garden</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Aquatics Center</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$79,800,000</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclude Gym and walking track</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$71,100,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aquatics and admin only</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$53,300,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add 2 lanes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add seaperated diving capacity</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$34,700</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add spectactor viewing</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>add dedicated senior space</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$5,700,000</td>
<td>$59,300</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Impact on median valued house</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-year bond impact per $1M in debt</td>
<td>$3.61</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-year bond impact per $1M in debt</td>
<td>$2.98</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-year bond impact per $1M in debt</td>
<td>$2.48</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of 2006 Park Bond that expires in 2021</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-year bond impact per $1M in debt</td>
<td>$3.61</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>$297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-year bond impact per $1M in debt</td>
<td>$2.98</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-year bond impact per $1M in debt</td>
<td>$2.48</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Impact on median valued house NET Increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-year bond impact per $1M in debt</td>
<td>$3.61</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-year bond impact per $1M in debt</td>
<td>$2.98</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-year bond impact per $1M in debt</td>
<td>$2.48</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-Year Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-Year Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$37,679,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$102,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$139,779,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Median Valued Home</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Impact</td>
<td>$389</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Impact (less 2006 expiration)</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years 1-15</th>
<th></th>
<th>Years 16-30</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Impact</td>
<td>$389</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Impact (less 2006 expiration)</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>